Distribution Agreement

In presenting this thesis as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for a degree from Emory University, I hereby grant to Emory University and its agents the non-exclusive license to archive, make accessible, and display my thesis in whole or in part in all forms of media, now or hereafter now, including display on the World Wide Web. I understand that I may select some access restrictions as part of the online submission of this thesis. I retain all ownership rights to the copyright of the thesis. I also retain the right to use in future works (such as articles or books) all or part of this thesis.

Bethany Scheel April 7, 2022

Reaching for Critical Mass: American Ambassadorships to Asia and Gendered Diplomacy in the Post-Cold War Era

by

Bethany Scheel

Chris Suh
Adviser

History

Chris Suh

Adviser

Tehila Sasson

Committee Member

Martine Brownley

Committee Member

2022

Reaching for Critical Mass: American Ambassadorships to Asia and Gendered Diplomacy in the Post-Cold War Era

By

Bethany Scheel

Chris Suh

Adviser

An abstract of
a thesis submitted to the Faculty of Emory College of Arts and Sciences
of Emory University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements of the degree of
Bachelor of Arts with Honors

History

2022

Abstract

Reaching for Critical Mass: American Ambassadorships to Asia and Gendered Diplomacy in the Post-Cold War Era
By Bethany Scheel

Historically, the American Foreign Service has been "white, male, and Ivy League" as described by former Undersecretary of State Benjamin Reid during the 1989 Alison Palmer proceedings which exposed the long-standing gender inequality within the State Department. Though modern research is slowly expanding to investigate how women have shaped international relations in the 20th century, especially in the field of global human rights, there is still a dearth of scholarship that examines women ambassadors and their role as representatives of the United States abroad. Therefore, it is useful to focus on two women ambassadors, Julia Chang Bloch, Ambassador to Nepal 1989-1992, and D. Kathleen Stephens, Ambassador to the Republic of Korea 2008-2011, whose work has not been taken seriously by historians, asking questions such as "Why is their history excluded?" and "What can these women's contributions to American foreign policy teach us about our inter and intranational dynamics?" to help fill a vital gap in women's history. This study hinges on primary sources such as interviews and secondary sources like journal articles to illuminate the entirety of these women's lives and careers. It argues that Ambassadors Julia Chang Bloch and D. Kathleen Stephens's appointments are historically significant, both due to their novelty and to their adherence to preestablished themes found in women's role in American foreign policy. Their lives and careers exemplify the diversity of women ambassadorial appointments to Asia, further informing historians about the significant place these women hold in our collective diplomatic history.

Reaching for Critical Mass: American Ambassadorships to Asia and Gendered Diplomacy in the Post-Cold War Era

By

Bethany Scheel

Chris Suh

Adviser

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Emory College of Arts and Sciences
of Emory University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements of the degree of
Bachelor of Arts with Honors

History

2022

Acknowledgements

This thesis would not have come to fruition without the help of a number of individuals to whom I am eternally grateful. First, to my advisor Dr. Chris Suh: this thesis would simply not exist without you. Thank you for each and every day of support you have shown me throughout this process. Thank you for being patient with me when I was struggling and encouraging me during the difficult moments. You have been my biggest academic influence here at Emory and I will forever be appreciative of that. To my second committee member, Dr. Tehila Sasson: I know this work is not necessarily within your realm of study but thank you for taking a chance on me and this piece. I hope I won't let you down. To my third reader, Dr. Martine Brownley: from the first moment I met you in my freshman year Poetry seminar, I knew you would push me to my academic limits. It is an honor to have to read this work, the culmination of my studies at Emory, and continue to push me to do even better, even in this. To my friends: thank you for encouraging me on the days I didn't feel like working, for practicing with me when I needed to, for sitting with me when I needed to get things done, for celebrating my accomplishments with me. Lastly, and most importantly, to my family: thank you for being there for me throughout the completion of this thesis. Thank you for talking me down from the highs and bringing me up from the lows. Thank you for answering the phone every time I called to chat. Thank you for loving me deeply and fully as I embarked on this journey. Mom, Dad, Hether, and Hannah: this one's for you.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: "The Senior Person on the Ground": Introductions, Historiography, and Methods

"So an ambassador is the senior person on the ground in that country, and even in this globalized world, that makes a difference, who comes as the President, the American President's representative. So there is a very public role to that says: This is the senior person living here with you in this country to represent the United States"

-Ambassador Kathleen Stephens

I can imagine her doing it: filling out the paperwork with rage in every pen stroke, disgusted with how she had been treated thus far, tired of the pushing back and getting nowhere.[1] Walking to her supervisor's office, sharp heels clicking on the floor, there she stood: Alison Palmer, 37 years old, who first joined as a Foreign Service Officer (FSOF) in 1955, and the first person to file an Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) complaint against the State Department.[2] After spending four years battling within the department, the time had come for a formal course of action; 1968 would be the catalyst for many things in America, but for Alison Palmer, few things would match the level of recourse from this moment.[3]

This is where it all began. Alison Palmer's choice to file a complaint led to twenty-one years of legal proceedings within the State Department, twenty one years of women fighting for their

[1] These first few sentences are an effort at critical fabulation in the style of writer and scholar Saidiya Hartman. I greatly admire the work she has done in her field of African American studies and this is my attempt to honor that work. Though Hartman usually works from an incomplete archive to recover the lives of her subjects, I work from a wealth of information about Alison Palmer that informs my critical fabulation of this particular event, of which we know little.

[2] Alison Palmer, interviewed by Karen Lamoree, Jun 14th, 1988, pg. 172.

[3] Palmer v. Rogers, 1973 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 11997, 6 Fair Empl. Prac. Cas. (BNA) 892, 6 Empl. Prac. Dec. (CCH) P8822 (United States District Court for the District of Columbia. September 7, 1973.)

place within the most elite foreign service circles in the United States. Her moment of strength led to the 1989 ruling in the Palmer v. Shultz case which dictated that the State Department was guilty of sexual discriminatory practices in violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.[4] The official ruling cites that

> "The [State] Department shall not discriminate on the basis of sex by disproportionately overassigning women to the consular cone and underassigning women to the political cone and shall not use any written test or other selection procedure or any portion of any written test or other selection procedure in a manner that has the purpose or effect of causing such disproportionate cone assignments".[5]

The decision shook the State Department and its structure to the core, allowing awareness to the gender gap in diplomatic circles and greater access to diplomatic roles for women like Ambassador Julia Chang Bloch and Ambassador Kathleen Stephens. This is the atmosphere of change surrounding Bloch's appointment as Ambassador to Nepal. This is the atmosphere of change surrounding women in the State Department. This is the atmosphere of change I enter as a scholar of feminist diplomatic history.

This thesis critically analyzes the lives and careers of Ambassador Julia Chang Bloch (Nepal, 1989-1993) and Ambassador Kathleen Stephens (Republic of Korea, 2008-2011). Their diplomatic accomplishments highlight the role women ambassadors played in enforcing and interpreting American foreign policy in Asia in the post-Cold War world. By exploring their personal and professional histories, which span from the Vietnam War era up to the present day,

---

[4]Palmer v. Shultz, 662 F. Supp. 1551, 1987 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 5918, 44 Fair Empl. Prac. Cas. (BNA) 289, 44 Empl. Prac. Dec. (CCH) P37,413 (United States District Court for the District of ColumbiaJuly 2, 1987, Filed.)

[5] Palmer v. Shultz, 1989 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 18386 (United States District Court for the District of Columbia, January 31, 1989, Filed).

this project evaluates the degree to which their personal histories influenced their perspectives on diplomacy in their respective posts. This thesis investigates the political, gender, and racial dynamics within the American foreign service at the times of their respective tenures. Lastly, this work assesses the strategic importance of these appointments in Asia and tracks potential trends in the threat-level and economic importance of women ambassadors' posts.

Within the history of American diplomacy, the end of the Cold War and the conclusions reached during the 1989 Palmer v. Shultz case mark what I argue as a deviation from previous years that gatekept ambassadorial roles from women. 1989 was a turning point that began a new generation of women Foreign Service Officers whose previous expertise was increasingly valued and considered in their appointments. As the first Asian American ambassador, Julia Chang Bloch brought a unique perspective to the role that was rooted in a long professional and personal interest in the region that began when she served as a Peace Corps officer in Malaysia (1964-1966). Kathleen Stephens, as the first woman ambassador to the Republic of Korea (ROK), made a significant impression as a dedicated representative of the relationship between the United States and the ROK, where she first lived as a Peace Corps officer (1975-1977). Their gender, intersected with the importance of their posts, is an aspect of research that I pursue in this project. Additionally, these two women were career diplomats, both within and outside of, the State Department. These are the exact type of women diplomats that were affected by the Palmer ruling and whose expertise became much more valued in its wake. Through a gender-specific lens, the history of women ambassadors is necessary to understand the professional progression of women in diplomatic spheres in the United States to the present day. Being aware of how ambassadors, as representatives of the US, previously interacted with foreign powers can both make it easier to understand and aid in forming our current interactions with them. The two

women's appointments evaluated here hold a significant place in this progression because they were historically unique. Ambassadors do not often have the luxury of being frequently discussed in historical scholarship, despite the importance of their role in maintaining healthy relationships between the US and her allies. This thesis rectifies this gap in historical scholarship and recognizes these two women ambassadors for the contributions they have made to American diplomatic history.

I chose these particular women for a number of reasons, but, first, let me tell you a story of forgotten figures. Back when I was still deciding who would comprise the basis for this research, who would be the primary subjects of this thesis, I began with a compendium titled *A to Z of American Women Leaders and Activists* by Donna Hightower-Langston. I had no clue what or who I was looking for, I just knew I needed to begin somewhere. Julia Chang Bloch's section in this book was sparse and gave only the barest of details about her history and career. As she was a "first", she immediately caught my eye. As I continued to research her life and career, I fell deeper in my interest in this woman and her contributions to the history of women in the US foreign service. When I approached my advisor with this figure, I knew I needed a counterpoint, another woman whose career I could compare to Bloch's. Kathleen Stephens was not his first suggestion, but as another "first", her career fascinated me. Neither of these women were my first choice of subject; in fact, I stumbled upon both of them a bit by chance. However, just because I initially came upon them by happenstance doesn't mean I chose them based on luck alone; there are other criteria that they also match that allowed me to truly choose them for this project. Because I am using a comparative model between my two subjects for this thesis, I needed two subjects that were opposites in a way, just as Bloch and Stephens are. They lie on opposite sides of the political spectrum, with Bloch being a majority Republican whose actions

looked more Democratic in reality, and with Stephens being a majority Democrat whose actions looked more Republican in reality. Bloch worked outside of the Foreign Service the entirety of her career before becoming an ambassador, whereas Stephens spent her career within the confines of the State Department. They are from different regions of the world and the US. They have different socioeconomic statuses. Different familial backgrounds. Different racial and cultural backgrounds. While they have their differences, they hold a few key similarities. Both Bloch and Stephens were firsts in their fields in some aspect. Unlike women ambassadors like Clare Booth Luce and Caroline Kennedy, both Bloch and Stephens also held their appointments after long careers in foreign policy organizations in the United States rather than being appointed as political favors to rich elites. Together, both women held long careers dedicated to foreign policy in America that made them ideal candidates for this project.

This thesis differs from previous examples of scholarship due to two aspects of the research: 1) this work will attempt to approach this topic with historical methodology while maintaining a close relationship with the international relations (IR) methodologies that will be useful for general trend analysis; and 2) the subjects of this thesis, Ambassador Bloch, Ambassador Stephens, gender and diplomacy, women ambassadors, and diplomatic appointments in Asia, have rarely been discussed in previous historical scholarship as individual concepts, let alone in tandem. This thesis' focus on these two ambassadors coupled with the dual historical and political science approaches sets it apart as a new and unique piece of historical scholarship to add to the fields of feminist diplomatic history and feminist international relations.

Historiography

Due to the comparative lack of existing scholarship on women's experiences in the US foreign service, some of the seminal works that have influenced this thesis come from outside the

realm of historical scholarship. There exists a large number of women who actively participated in foreign relations without serving in the US State Department as Stephens did. These include American feminists who participated in international pacifist organizations, missionary work, and cultural diplomacy. For example, author Robert Shaffer writes of Pearl S. Buck and her contributions to Cold War foreign policy through critique of gender and the US military relationship with Asian nations.[6] Author Linda Kay Schott describes how influential the women of the US branch of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom were in creating and influencing American foreign policy before the advent of the Second World War.[7] However, there are relatively few works on women in the American Foreign Service.

The two of the three works referenced in this project that use an historical approach to American women ambassadors are *Breaking Protocol: America's First Female Ambassadors, 1933-1964* by Philip Nash and *Her Excellency: An Oral History of American Women Ambassadors* by Ann Miller Morin. I will also discuss *American Ambassadors in a Troubled World: Interviews with Senior Diplomats* by Dayton Mak and Charles Stuart Kennedy as it is a useful source when looking at American ambassadors and their struggles abroad. These two works differ from Nash's in that they are focused on publishing interviews and oral histories rather than writing an overarching narrative of the first six women in the foreign service's experiences. My own work seeks to walk the line between these two approaches by exploring the interviews and oral histories of my two subjects while also thematically analyzing how their careers fall into the pattern of women diplomats before and among them.

---

[6] Shaffer, Robert. "Women and International Relations: Pearl S. Buck's Critique of the Cold War." *Journal of Women's History* 11, no. 3 (1999): 151-175.
[7] Schott, Linda Kay. *Reconstructing Women's Thoughts: The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom Before World War II*. United States: Stanford University Press, 1997.

Philip Nash's book, *Breaking Protocol: America's First Female Ambassadors, 1933-1964* takes a biographical approach to the first six women chiefs of mission, the "Big Six", including the first woman ambassador, Ambassador Eugenie Anderson (Denmark, 1949-1953), tracking trends across all six women that made their diplomacy effective. This text is an exceedingly useful secondary source for scholars of women in US foreign policy as it both collects a thorough history of the early women in the Foreign Service Organization (FSOR) and lays out many of the basic trends within the field that can be traced or compared to future time periods. Nash's work is the closest to what I hope to accomplish in my own work, balancing biography, microhistory, and analysis. Though useful, it is not a perfect text. Nash is apologetic at times for some of the negative actions of these women, like firebrand Clare Boothe Luce's unprofessionally brash speech, a trait that he chided FSOF colleagues for when it was directed at Luce and the rest of the "Big Six".[8] Despite this shortcoming, Nash makes a concentrated effort to acknowledge both the strengths and weaknesses of each of the diplomats in order to collect a full image of the legacy that the "Big Six" left for women in the FSOR in the generations to come.

Ann Miller Morin's goal, as she makes clear, is to make readers "know what it's like to be a woman and an ambassador" by providing personal testimonies of fifteen woman ambassadors and foreign service leaders.[9] This oral history collection falls adjacent to my own work. Though I am not conducting oral history interviews for my project, the bulk of my sources rely on the primary testimony of my subjects. I value Morin's work in that it establishes the significance of oral history collections for this type of scholarship, for the assessment of women's experiences in

[8] Nash, Phillip, *Breaking Protocol: America's First Female Ambassadors, 1933-1964* (Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 2020), 160.
[9] Morin, Ann Miller. 1995. Her Excellency: An Oral History of American Women Ambassadors. New York, NY: Twayne Publishers, 3.

foreign policy circles. My largest critique of Morin's work is how outdated it has become. Though the lives and experiences of the women ambassadors she interviews know no historical fading, in terms of historical scholarship, its publication date of 1995 leaves much to be desired for current feminist diplomatic historians.

The third and final set of authors that provide any sort of historical perspective for the study of women ambassadors and foreign policy leaders would be Dayton Mak and Charles Kennedy in their work *American Ambassadors in a Troubled World: Interviews with Senior Diplomats*. This book, published in 1992, focuses on 71 ambassadors or diplomatic leaders to share their experiences on topics from ambassadorial backgrounds to how to manage an embassy to geographically specific issues that arose before the publication of the work. Though I include this text in my historiography, I also have a significant issue with it. Of the 71 individuals whose interviews are highlighted, only four of them are women. The lack of women's perspectives, coupled with its earlier publication date, make this a less than ideal source, though one I recognize among the texts that are influential in the field.

After these three works, the relevant scholarship falls under the purview of the field of political science, specifically IR. Since 2012, Oxford University Press has been publishing a series titled: "Oxford Studies in Gender and International Relations". Of the 32 books currently published in this series, only two have direct relevance to this thesis: *Women as Foreign Policy Leaders: National Security and Gender Politics in Superpower America* by Sylvia Bashevkin and *Gendering World Politics: Issues and Approaches in the Post-Cold War Era* by Ann Tickner. Bashevkin "[presents] a comparative assessment of four path-breaking American [woman] leaders" by studying the lives and careers of Jeane Kirkpatrick, Madeleine Albright,

Condoleezza Rice, and Hillary Clinton.[10] Bashevkin wastes no time in asserting that "since 1980, women leaders in the United States have made diverse and transformative foreign policy contributions during a series of presidential administrations".[11] Bashevkin's concrete argument drives her strong analysis and opens the door for further inquiry regarding women's place in both political leadership and crafting foreign policy. Bashevkin leans primarily on primary sources such as autobiographies and interviews and secondary sources such as books and articles to underscore her argument. Though a feminist international relations source, Bashevkin walks the line between IR and diplomatic history quite closely. Despite Bashevkin's organizational drawbacks, this book is a fantastic example of how to unite the methodologies of historical and political science perspectives through a strong argument and continuity. The usefulness of this work in feminist diplomatic history (FDH) stems from its interdisciplinary nature, exploring the necessary aspects of the current feminist IR debate in the context of women leaders in American foreign policy. Though this work is relatively recent, published in 2018, its youth does not diminish its status in the field of FDH and feminist IR. This book solidly contributes new perspectives to the field and will continue to spark conversations in the years to come.

Tickner's book is a "celebration of the feminist work of the last ten years".[12] Published in 2001, this work focuses on the post-Cold War transition in IR to increasingly feminist perspectives in the field[13]. This book is one of the foundational volumes in the field of feminist IR and should be celebrated as such, though it does have one primary drawback: its age. Like the work of Morin, Mak, and Kennedy, the age of this work is a considerable drawback for current

[10] Bashevkin, Sylvia B. 2018. Women as Foreign Policy Leaders: National Security and Gender Politics in Superpower America. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 15.
[11] Bashevkin, 2.
[12] Tickner, J. Ann Gendering World Politics: Issues and Approaches in the Post-Cold War Era (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 2001), x.
[13] Tickner, x.

scholars in the field. Though I don't work within the field of feminist IR, this book is still significant enough to include here as a part of my historiographical setting.

McGlen and Sarkees, in their book *Women in Foreign Policy: The Insiders*, attempt to "contribute to the ongoing debate between maximizers and minimizers concerning the impact of women on foreign policy by focusing upon women who are in policy-making positions within the institutions where international politics is crafted".[14] The merit of this work comes from its wealth of interviews of women foreign policy leaders within the Departments of Defense and State. My own approach in this thesis is quite similar in that I also rely on interviews with women foreign policy leaders, though I have not conducted the interviews myself. My work also departs from McGlen and Sarkee's approach, which heavily focuses on women's involvement in "the most critical decisions a nation-state faces…especially the decision of whether to engage in armed conflict" as a barometer for women's involvement in foreign policy at large. To diminish or exclude entirely the commitments women foreign policy leaders make as ambassadors in other economic and social atmospheres is a mistake, and my own work takes full account of these two spheres of human life. Two years later in 1995, McGlen and Sarkees published "The Status of Women in Foreign Policy" under a Headline Series of the Foreign Policy Association. This article "explore[s] several aspects of the situation of women in the U.S foreign policy establishment" and evaluates the state of affairs for women in U.S. foreign policy circles through a series of interviews with men and women in the upper echelons of American foreign policy circles.[15] Though this book was published over twenty five years ago at the time I am writing this piece, the trends it establishes in feminist IR have arisen in my own research. For

[14] Nancy E McGlen and Meredith Reid Sarkees, Women in Foreign Policy: The Insiders (London: Routledge, 1993), 12.
[15] Nancy E. McGlen and Meredith Reid Sarkees, The Status of Women in Foreign Policy (New York, NY: Foreign Policy Association, 1995), 4.

example, one trend noted by McGlen and Sarkees is the tendency for women diplomats to attribute their success to hard work alone, a trend that similarly arose in my own analysis of Bloch and Stephens. Without this text, I would lack any serious chronology in trends from the beginnings of FDH and feminist IR to the present.

Because my work falls into a newer field, I must again look outside the realm of typical books for my historiography. A collection of articles across disciplines have proven useful as background for both my analysis of gender and my analysis of the foreign policy of the first Bush and Obama administrations that Ambassador Bloch and Ambassador Stephens served under. To begin, “Global Gender Policy in the 1990s” by Karen Garner establishes the history of American women’s involvement in diplomatic, governmental, and women’s empowerment organizations beginning in the Carter administration and continuing through the Clinton administration. This article is useful by providing continuity in the gap between Ambassador Bloch’s and Ambassador Stephen’s appointments. Emily Rosenberg’s "Gender” provides context for the state of the field of diplomatic history leading up to 1990 and its engagement with questions of gender and femininity. Again, this article will be useful context for building the thematic arguments surrounding the historical analysis of the ambassadors’ careers and appointments. Lastly, "Gender Relations, Foreign Relations: The United States and South Asia, 1947-1964." by Andrew Rotter describes and evaluates American and British gendered perceptions of India as a nation and how those perceptions influenced American foreign policy in South Asia in the mid-20th century. This article is helpful as precedent for how America perceived other Asian nations throughout the Cold War, namely China and Vietnam, as well as for evaluating what impact these perceptions had for the post-Cold War era of Ambassador Bloch’s and Ambassador Stephen’s appointments.

Methods

The methods used in this paper are pulled from a variety of sources across the disciplines of FDH, feminist IR, other early American history, and the history of the enslaved in America. Because of my lack of historiography, I had to look beyond FDH for my methods as well. I will begin with methods pulled from FDH before moving outwards, further and further away from my topic at hand. I find it very necessary to pull methods from outside the direct field of interest as it expands the base from which one can work with one's own subjects.

To begin, we return to the work of Ann Miller Morin. Morin's work has influenced my own in the way she asks questions of her subjects. Though I have not completed any primary oral history interviews for this thesis myself, I rely heavily on those already conducted with my subjects, Ambassadors Bloch and Stephens. I use Morin's four questions— 1) Do these women have any personality traits in common?; 2) How successful were these women?; 3) What was the impact of being a woman on their tenure as ambassador?; and 4) Did these women influence American foreign policy? —as a baseline for interrogating the resources at my disposal.[16] Morin came up with these questions through her extensive background in foreign policy circles. I am not fortunate to have the background or level of access that Morin had as a wife of an FSOF, but I have tried my best to honor her work.

As Phillip Nash's work aligns most closely with my own topic, I hope this paper feels like a natural continuation of the work he has done in FDH. Though I find issue with parts of his depth of analysis as discussed above, his work is the most direct blueprint to my own. From Nash, I pull much of my outlining. I will begin each of my chapters with a biographical section,

[16] Morin, 2-3.

as does Nash, before leaning into more of an analytical section that assesses Morin's four questions. I will not be using his questions of analysis as I believe Morin's fit better with my objective to critically analyze the history of my two subjects and their importance as women in American foreign policy.

Ann Tickner is who I pull the most from in terms of feminist IR theory. At the outset of *Gendering World Politics*, Tickner states that "Whereas IR [international relations] has generally taken a 'top-down' approach focused on the great powers, feminist IR often begins its analysis at the local level, with individuals embedded in social structures".[17] This is a similar approach to the one I take in my own work. By beginning at the "local level", with these two women "embedded in [their] social structures", it is much easier to track the impacts certain policies and decisions have on women in foreign policy circles.[18] In the cases of Ambassadors Bloch and Stephens, since I work with their interviews as my primary texts, the "local level" is all I have to work with.[19] Additionally, Tickner states that

> "feminist IR, with its intellectual roots in feminist theory more generally, is seeking to understand the various ways in which unequal gender structures constrain women's, as well as some men's, life chances and to prescribe ways in which these hierarchical social relations might be eliminated".[20]

[17] Tickner, 4
[18] Ibid, 4.
[19] Ibid, 4.
[20] Ibid, 4.

Again, this is my primary goal in my own work. Through the lives of Ambassador Bloch and Ambassador Stephens, I will evaluate how the structures within the elite foreign policy circles in the United States affect women's chances at entering said circles.

Chapter 2: "She Wore Smashing, Shocking Pink Jackets" The Life and Career of Julia Chang Bloch

"In Bloch's case, the fact that she wore smashing shocking pink jackets might not have sat well with the Washington traditionalists, but it flew well in Kathmandu; she was liked and heeded."

-Ambassador Teresita Schafer

If, as Ambassador Teresita Schaffer claims, "the U.S. is represented by an individual", Ambassador Julia Chang Bloch falls relatively recently in the long line of those chosen to represent the United States.[21] Her career in public and diplomatic service prepared her for her three-year appointment as the Ambassador to Nepal from 1989 to 1992. As the first Asian American ambassador, Julia Chang Bloch brought a distinctive perspective to the role that was rooted in a long professional and personal interest in the region that began when she served as a Peace Corps officer in Malaysia (1964-1966).

Born in Chifu, Shandong Province, China in 1942 as Chang Chih-hsing, Julia Chang Bloch and her family immigrated to the United States in 1951.[22] She attended University of California, Berkeley, studying Communication and Public Policy, completing her degree and receiving American citizenship by 1964.[23] From 1964 to 1966, Chang worked as a Peace Corps volunteer teaching English to students in rural Malaysia and continued working with the Peace

[21] Stern, Thomas, and Teresita C. Schaffer. Interview with Teresita C. Schaffer. 1998. Manuscript/Mixed Material, 198.
[22] Senator Durenberger, speaking on Julia Chang Bloch, 102nd Cong., 3rd Sess., *Congressional Record 137* (February 20, 1991): S 2093.
[23] Kennedy, Charles Stuart, and Julia Chang Bloch. Interview with Julia Chang Bloch. 1993. Manuscript/Mixed Material, 6. (hereafter referred to as Bloch interview), 3.

Corps as a training officer until 1970.[24] After almost twenty years of working for federal diplomatic and aid organizations such as the United States Information Agency (USIA) and the United States Agency for International Development (AID), Bloch was appointed the new Ambassador to Nepal for the first Bush Administration, an appointment she would hold for three years until the end of her post in 1992.

Bloch's appointment as the first Asian American ambassador and the first woman ambassador to Nepal plays an essential role in the history of women foreign service officers. Women and people of color had been routinely excluded from the upper divisions of the State Department and the Foreign Service since their respective inceptions. Yet Bloch's appointment sits amongst a significant transition in American diplomacy. As I said before, 1989 was a turning point in terms of how women were received and recognized within foreign policy circles.

My study of Bloch and her career in this piece will fall into three sections. I open with a discussion of Bloch's experiences in diplomatic organizations during the changing political ideologies of the 1960s, 70s, and 80s. This section will be followed by an analysis of Bloch's personal and professional experiences that prepared her for and informed her work in and during her assignment in Nepal. Finally, I will conclude with a reflection on the end of Bloch's career to the present and her impact on women in American diplomatic history.

Section I. How Did She Fare? Julia Chang Bloch Amidst the Political Changes of Her Pre-Ambassadorial Career, 1964-1989

Much of what we know about Bloch comes from a singular interview. Conducted on November 18th, 1993, almost exactly six months after the end of her appointment, Ambassador

[24] Ibid, 5.

Julia Chang Bloch was interviewed by Charles Stuart Kennedy as part of the Library of Congress' series titled "Frontline Diplomacy: The Foreign Affairs Oral History Collection of the Association for Diplomatic Studies and Training". Bloch begins her account, at the behest of the interviewer, at the beginning of her life and her immigration to the United States in 1951 with her family. Though immigration from China was difficult during this period due to the Red Scare mentality regarding China, Bloch's father, educated in the United States at Harvard Law School, used his friendship with former classmate Sen. Leverett Saltonstall (R-MA) to lobby for his family's visas. Staltonstall, as the Minority Whip during the 82nd Congress (1951), helped with the passage of the McCarran-Walter Act that ultimately loosened immigration restrictions on Asian nations and allowed Bloch's family to immigrate to the United States.[25] Bloch is not very forthcoming with information on her early years in this interview or her other writings. We can only speculate as to why. Bloch then explains that she attended UC Berkeley and graduated with a degree in Communication and Public Policy before joining the Peace Corps after graduation. She served in the Peace Corps as an English teacher in Sabah, Malaysia from 1964 to 1966, a job she describes in the interview as "the best job [she] ever had".[26]

But what made this job so wonderful? Why does Bloch still regard it so highly after her extensive career? Although Bloch herself didn't elaborate, former Peace Corps Volunteer Stanley Meisler, who wrote a history of the Peace Corps, describes it as "an oasis of idealism and goodness in the vast Washington bureaucracy".[27] I would argue that the unmediated contact between other cultures and her own is what Bloch considers the best part, but then, how did the

[25] Yui, Daizaburo. 1992. "From Exclusion to Integration: Asian Americans' Experiences in World War II." *Hitotsubashi Journal of Social Studies*, 24 (2): 55.
[26] Bloch interview, 6.
[27] Stanley Meisler, *When the World Calls: the Inside Story of the Peace Corps and Its First Fifty Years* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2011), ix.

Peace Corps get to allow such direct diplomacy? What was the political climate of her time in the Peace Corps and beyond? How did the foreign policy goals of the United States change how the Peace Corps was received? How did the foreign policy goals of the United States change other government-supported diplomatic aid organizations? This section will answer these and other questions regarding the history and state of foreign policy goals that affected governmental diplomatic aid organizations in the United States during the beginning of Bloch's career up to her appointment in Nepal.

Bloch entered the Peace Corps in 1964, just one year after its founder, President John F. Kennedy, was assassinated. As "Kennedy's most enduring legacy" the organization was still both in mourning and in the process of restructuring when Bloch was inducted.[28] Director R. Sargent Shriver, brother-in-law of the late President Kennedy, was working both as Director of the Peace Corps and as Director of President Johnson's new War on Poverty initiative during the two years of Bloch's service before resigning in 1966.[29] But with the Cold War and Vietnam tensions continuously escalating, Johnson's priority wasn't establishing and maintaining cordial relations with other countries; it was containing the spread of Communism. Laid out by American diplomat George Kennan in 1946 in his infamous Long Telegram to the State Department, *containment* policy argued that Soviet Communism and its influence must be contained to preserve democracy around the world. In pursuing *containment,* Johnson prioritized arms limitations and deals with the Soviet Union over establishing the sort of diplomatic relations that were eased by organizations like the Peace Corps. When Bloch arrived in Malaysia, it was only one year after formal diplomatic relations had been reestablished recognizing

[28] *When the World Calls*, ix.
[29] Ibid, 68.

Malaysia, Singapore, Sarawak, and Borneo as the Federation of Malaya.[30] Her job in Malaysia, though not a priority to the Johnson Administration's version of *containment*, helped "contain" Soviet sympathies in the Federation by strengthening American sympathies and personal relations amongst the people with whom she stayed.[31]

The Federated Malay States, the first iteration of a unified Malaysia, had been controlled by the British since its founding in 1895. Prior to British control, the area now known as Malaysia had been conquered by the Portuguese and then subsequently the Dutch. Britain controlled the land as a colony until the Second World War when Japan conquered the area as part of their wartime expansion. After the war, control returned to the British. Some sixty-two years after its creation in 1957, and just seven years before Julia Chang Bloch arrived in Sabah, Malaysia, the region was freed from British colonial control. Post-WWII, holding land as colonies had become a taboo topic for the Western allies as they had just fought to free other countries from German and Japanese control. For Britain, this manifested in releasing much of their colonial holdings around the world including India, Malaysia, and the British Mandate in Palestine.

It is with this change in mind that we return to the state of Malaysia. American analyst in Southeast and South Asian Affairs Bruce Vaughn describes the state of the nation then:

"Somewhat like the experience in Vietnam, leftist guerillas who helped the British and Allied forces opposing Japan's occupation, felt after the war that Malaysia remained for all practical purposes a colony ruled indirectly by Britain through the conservative Malay Sultans who

[30] "Malaysia," U.S. Department of State (U.S. Department of State), accessed April 25, 2021, https://history.state.gov/countries/malaysia.
[31] For further reading on Julia Chang Bloch's personal experiences in Malaysia, see pages 5 and 6 of her interview with the Library of Congress.

exercised little real political power".[32] In addition to a government felt to still be controlled by a colonial power, only one political party emerged from independence. Founded in 1946, the United Malays National Organization remains Malaysia's largest and oldest political organization, maintaining power through the current age.

Physically and economically, Malaysia was on the rise. Mostly agricultural land, the state of Sabah, Malaysia had a population of approximately 454,000 in 1963, according to data collected by an American trade group.[33] Economically, Malaysia was one of the key trading partners in Southeast Asia. A 1963 U.S. Trade and Development Mission to Malaysia reported that the country "has one of the highest per capita income levels and the strongest foreign exchange position in Southeast Asia".[34] The country was also "the largest producer of natural rubber and tin" in the world.[35] For the United States, who had not yet fully established trade with Malaysia, it was time to do so in this fresh market. As one title screams in the report: "Malaysians want and need what Americans want, need".[36] Though consular relationships had been present since 1918, the State Department of the United States officially established diplomatic relations with Malaysia on August 13, 1957.[37] When Singapore, Sarawak, and Borneo joined Malaysia to form the Federation of Malaysia in 1963, the US changed the accreditation and all future ambassadors would be resident at Kuala Lumpur.

---

[32] Bruce Vaughn, "Malaysia: Political Transition and Implications for U.S. Policy," Malaysia: Political Transition and Implications for U.S. Policy § (2003), pp. 1-17, 3.
[33] "Trade with Malaysia," Trade with Malaysia § (1963), 13.
[34]Ibid, 3.
[35] Ibid, 3.
[36] Ibid, 5.
[37]"A Guide to the United States' History of Recognition, Diplomatic, and Consular Relations, by Country, since 1776: Malaysia," U.S. Department of State (U.S. Department of State).

The social landscape of Malaysia in the 1960s was fraught to say the least. Even in remote Sabah, Bloch and her colleagues felt the impacts of the *Konfrontasi* or Confrontation. This small-scale military confrontation waged between Indonesia and Malaysia lasted from September of 1963 to May of 1966.[38] Triggered by Indonesia's opposition to the creation of the Federation of Malaysia, this conflict lasted throughout Bloch's tenure in the region.[39] Additionally, in 1964 when Bloch arrived in the country, there was a series of race riots in Singapore between the native Malays and ethnic Chinese. Though Bloch served her Peace Corps tenure on an entirely different piece of land than Singapore, she notes that she still felt the effects of the racial tensions.[40] How did she get around the tension? In her interview, she claims that "when it was appropriate, [she] made sure they saw [her] as an American" rather than someone of Asian, specifically Chinese, descent. However, as part of the Peace Corps, part of Bloch's job was to remain detached from local politics. Thus, descriptions of her time interacting with the major events of the era in Malaysia are greatly lacking.

With the Nixon Administration came a transition to *détente*, a revitalized strategy that called for a "release of tension between rival states" through peaceable talks rather than brute force.[41] *Détente* joined the *containment* of the previous administration, a fluid transition rather than a sharp turn from previous policy. Under Nixon, the "rival states" like China and the Soviet Union were heavily prioritized over other countries, leaving the diplomatic spheres to work with the rest of the world with minimal resources. Though there was an administration change in 1974 when President Nixon resigned, Bloch does not note any major changes during this period while

---

[38] Wey, Adam Leong Kok. "How 'Konfrontasi' Reshaped Southeast Asian Regional Politics." The Diplomat. The Diplomat, September 16, 2021.
[39] Jones, Matthew. Conflict and Confrontation In South East Asia, 1961-1965: Britain, the United States, and the Creation of Malaysia. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
[40] Bloch interview, 5.
[41] Brands, H. W, 1998. "The World in a Word: The Rise and Fall of Détente." *Rhetoric and Public Affairs* 1 (1): 46.

she worked in Senator Charles Percy's (R-IL) office on the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs which addressed "agriculture, food…women, the elderly, [and] health" concerns.[42] As Secretary of State Henry Kissinger remained under President Ford's administration, many of the policies like *détente* and priorities like China and the Soviet Union were unaffected and able to continue without cease.

It was not until the advent of the Carter Administration that Bloch felt the partisan effects on her career. For Bloch, this manifested in the conclusion of her work with the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs and her transition to the Africa Bureau of the United States Information Agency (USIA) in 1976.[43] This new assignment did not align with Bloch's expertise. As she explained in the interview, she didn't have any previous experience in that geographical, economic, or social environment.[44] In some ways, this is not surprising. According to historians Harry Kopp and Charles Gillespie, the priority of diplomatic corps in the United States is to "first fill service needs…and only then to make use of the talents" an individual may have.[45] The Director of the USIA at the time, John Reinhardt, needed to fill positions in the Africa Bureau, beginning with upper-level roles for those like Bloch who had years of experience. She recalls telling Reinhardt that "[she knew] nothing about Africa, I don't speak French, I don't speak any African dialects or languages, I never stepped foot in Africa. How is that you're not putting me in Asia or Latin American even? At least I speak the language in Latin America." Despite her vocal opposition to her appointment in the Africa Bureau, her experience there seems to have had a lasting impact on how she approached further positions. She goes on to

[42] Bloch interview, 8.
[43] Ibid, 8.
[44] Ibid, 9.
[45] Kopp, Harry W., and Charles A. Gillespie. 2011. "Assignments and Promotions." *Career Diplomacy: Life and Work in the U.S. Foreign Service*, Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 208.

elaborate in the interview about the specific dynamics within the department that she had to navigate, especially working in a program that didn't get nearly the attention or funding it deserved or required to run at full effectiveness. She explains that she had to fill "huge gaps in vacancies. Because it was always the last choice". [46] Despite being a major priority for the Carter Administration, it was shirked both in terms of general governmental funding and by Foreign Service Officers in terms of potential appointments.

Excluding a semester long fellowship at the Harvard Institute of Politics, Ambassador Bloch transitioned almost immediately from USIA to the United States Agency for International Development (AID), where she remained through the end of the Carter Administration and almost to the end of the Reagan Administration.[47] Despite the administration that brought attention to Africa in the context of the Cold War coming to an end in 1981, African affairs were still a priority for Bloch and the rest of the administration as she worked as the Assistant Administrator for Food for Peace and Voluntary Assistance during the first half of her tenure at AID. Bloch does not remark on any major changes occurring with the new administration even though she had been working in her department for a year and a half before the new administration came into power. The Reagan Administration's aim to end the Cold War by outspending the Soviets and avoiding antagonizing other potential communist allies resulted in continued aid to African nations without addressing the governmental roots of the issues and civil rights abuses that may have alienated potential allies and pushed them towards Soviet support. Though her department was not completely directed at African affairs, much of Bloch's

[46] Bloch interview, 9.
[47] Ibid, 11.

time in this position was spent coordinating with private volunteer organizations to distribute food in Africa, specifically throughout the continent-wide famine in 1984.[48]

Bloch's penultimate assignment before her Ambassadorship, excluding a short fellowship at the US-Japan Relations Program at Harvard's Center for International Affairs, was as Assistant Administrator for Asia and the Near East.[49] Previously, her career moves had aligned with changes in administration, but she cites a need for "a second career" as the reason she changed departments in the middle of the Reagan Administration.[50] As the primary goal of the Reagan Administration was to outspend the Soviet Union in all aspects of the Cold War, diplomatic and humanitarian aid were still priorities as they had been during the Carter Administration. Bloch's responsibility in this role was primarily managing diplomatic and humanitarian aid dispersals in countries "from Northern Ireland to the South Pacific".[51] For example, to deter Vietnamese, and therefore communist, influence, the United States pledged an annual $5 million of overt aid to Cambodia that was channeled through AID beginning in 1985.[52] The aid to Cambodia served both as humanitarian aid in that it provided necessary funding to the nation to improve the quality of life of its citizens and as diplomatic aid in that it brought the American government into the good graces of the anti-Communist forces within the country. Situations like this that straddle the line between humanitarian aid and aid provided to curry favor with a potential Cold War enemy riddled Bloch's career but were most prevalent during the Reagan Administration as the Cold war came to a close.

---

[48] Bloch interview, 12-13.
[49] "Julia Chang Bloch," The American Academy of Diplomacy, August 23, 2018.
[50] Bloch interview, 14.
[51] Ibid, 14.
[52] Robinson, Courtland. 2000. "Refugee Warriors at the Thai-Cambodian Border", *Refugee Survey Quarterly*, 19 : (1), 30.

Bloch is quite candid throughout her interview regarding her experiences during changes of administrations. In her experience, the ideological changes that seem relatively sudden in the public eye during an administration change don't affect the actual day-to-day operations of diplomatic organizations. It is a much slower change in overall policy that alters where government-funded diplomatic organizations' focus is going to be. While she was still working for the Peace Corps as a training officer in 1969, the Nixon administration came into office. About this change, Bloch says "I don't think the ideological sort of tensions [within the organization], I don't think they really started until later".[53] For Bloch, the final year of her time with the Peace Corps was unaffected by the party change that came with the new administration and its new priorities. In 1981 when she was working for AID and the Reagan administration began, she again said there wasn't much of a change between the three years she was working for AID before the administration came and the eight years she spent there before her Ambassadorship. Comprehending this difference allows for a deeper understanding of how diplomatic corps in the US, though definitely impacted by domestic politics, operate on a separate level whose government influence becomes more diluted the further you are from the reach of the State Department office.

Many of the diplomatic goals throughout Bloch's career were centered on winning the Cold War and built upon previous efforts to do so. *Containment* was the sole strategy before *détente* was utilized during the Nixon and Ford Administrations. The Carter Administration continued to make the Middle East and the Soviet Union a priority, while introducing emphasis on the Cold War in Africa. The Nixon Administration still paid attention to Africa but in the context of the larger plan to outspend the Soviet Union on military expenditures. For Bloch to be

[53] Bloch interview, 7.

named Ambassador at the end of the Cold War, when all the previous strategies and policies that had remained for the last forty-four years were quickly becoming obsolete, is a significant appointment. As she went into Nepal, Ambassador Bloch had a new president to serve, a new world order to navigate, and a wealth of diplomatic knowledge at her disposal that would need to be utilized to the fullest to tackle her new challenge.

Section II. How Prepared Was She? Ambassador Julia Chang Bloch's Experiences as an Asia Expert and How They Informed Her Work in Nepal

Though born in China, Bloch does not cite her personal background as contributing to her interest or expertise in Asia. She more frequently refers to these professional positions. Additionally, she cites her year-long fellowship at the US-Japan Relations Program at Harvard's Center for International Affairs as another major placement that contributes to her confidence in her knowledge of Asian, specifically East Asian, nations. How then did this expertise inform her work in Nepal? I hope to answer this vital question as I move through Bloch's abundance of positions that contribute to her expertise about Asia.

One of the most interesting dichotomies Bloch herself displays is within what she considers to be the origins of her interest in Asia. As stated before, Bloch was born in China, more specifically Chifu, Shandong Province, and did not immigrate to the United States with her family until she was nine years old. She did not receive her American citizenship until she was in college.[54] For the first twenty-one or twenty-two years of her life, she was perceived as Asian to most outside perspectives.[55] However, in her Library of Congress interview, Bloch lays out an interesting dynamic regarding her origins. When discussing potential tensions between the

[54] Bloch interview, 1.
[55] Ibid, 2.

Malaysian community she was stationed in during her time in the Peace Corps, Bloch states "when it was appropriate, I made sure they saw me as an American. When it was otherwise appropriate, I made sure they saw me as an Asian."[56] For her, the two identities are not inclusive of one another; they hold separate places and purposes in her life. This separation explains one half of the dichotomy to her origins of interest, the other half of which lies in her initial Peace Corps tour in Sabha, Malaysia. Bloch herself states how much she loved this job. She states that she "taught English, [but] at the same time I used my teaching as a venue, a vehicle to reach out to the community at large.", and it is from this point forward that Bloch shows a stronger interest in Asia, even completing a Masters in East Asia Regional Studies.[57] However, there is evidence of an interest in Asia before this volunteer tour. When Bloch describes how she first got her Peace Corps assignment, she said she "was cheeky enough to say I wanted Asia… I wanted to go to Asia. And they gave me an Asian assignment, just like that."[58] She admits to a preliminary interest in the region before her assignment but does not cite a reason for the interest. How can we read this contradiction? I believe her hesitance to commit to either part of her identity, as both an Asian and an American, is telling of her own struggle with her Asian American identity. Rather than speaking about her experiences in diplomacy as an Asian American woman, it is easier for her to separate the two parts of her identity and use them when they serve her best. As a public figure, it gives her a measure of distance between the outside perceptions of her and her own perceptions of herself.

Now knowing the origins of her personal interests in Asia, it is necessary to track how those interests were fostered and manifested throughout her professional career, building the

[56] Ibid, 5.
[57] Ibid, 6.
[58] Ibid, 4.

skills that served her best during her appointment in Nepal. I would argue that the two most significant appointments she held were her years working for USIA's Africa Bureau and at AID in the Food for Peace and Voluntary Assistance program and the Asia and the Near East Bureau. Created in 1953 by President Dwight Eisenhower, the United States Information Agency (USIA)'s mission was "to understand, inform and influence foreign publics in promotion of the national interest, and to broaden the dialogue between Americans and U.S. institutions, and their counterparts abroad".[59] Often described as a propaganda machine, USIA was one of the primary organizations in the US government dedicated to public diplomacy throughout the Cold War. Bloch's work within this organization, however, was less concerned with the dissemination of public information that shed a positive light on the United States and was more concerned with providing physical aid to other nations. As a deputy in the Africa Bureau office, Bloch was a self-described "manager", working to staff a department that wasn't a priority for most.[60] She doesn't spend much of her interview dwelling on this position, but I believe she learned skills in this department that assisted her when she arrived in Nepal. By her own description, Nepal "was a very sleepy little outpost".[61] Having already worked in a department with little staff and few resources, Bloch was able to transfer the management skills to her new appointment that allowed her to quickly get settled and organize the new staff she would be working with for the next three years. Additionally, there was an USIA mission in Nepal at the time of her ambassadorship, an organization she was then able to use as a resource due to her prior knowledge of its operations.

Just as her work in the Africa Bureau at USIA directly contributed to her success in Nepal, so too did her many years at the United States Agency for International Development

[59] Chodkowski, William M. 2012. "The United States Information Agency Fact Sheet," American Security Project.
[60] Bloch interview, 9.
[61] Ibid, 16.

(AID). Founded by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 under the executive order of President John Kennedy, AID is devoted to "administering aid to foreign countries to promote social and economic development".[62] Bloch worked for AID in two different capacities across approximately eight years, first as the Assistant Administrator for the Food for Peace and Voluntary Assistance (FPVA) and then as the Assistant Administrator for Asia and the Near East (ANE). The first assignment, though very much regionally focused on Africa, was concentrated on organizing aid in the form of food and other nutritional supplements at the time that Bloch was there. Bloch describes it as "one of the more complex [programs] of any that [she] ever dealt with", as every decision was made by a committee comprised of 7 agencies including AID.[63] In this assignment, Bloch learned how to work across organizations to achieve mutual goals, a skill that again served quite useful in Nepal. When she arrived in Kathmandu, she found a collection of American aid organizations. AID, the CIA, the Department of Defense, the Peace Corps, the State Department, and USIA all had active offices and operations in the country.[64] She describes her mindset at this arrival as "[she] immediately set about to run a Mission and not the State Department. Not an Embassy."[65] Having learned how to work across 7 organizations with differing priorities at AID, she had already learned the skills necessary to do something similar in Nepal. Though it had never been done, "the whole Mission [working] together for a national objective", the organizational structure allowed her to maximize the resources of each of the missions to achieve the diplomatic goals set out by the State Department.[66]

---

[62] "USAID History," U.S. Agency for International Development, May 7, 2019, https://www.usaid.gov/who-we-are/usaid-history.
[63] Bloch interview, 12.
[64] Ibid, 17.
[65] Ibid, 17.
[66] Ibid, 17.

Bloch's second assignment as the Assistant Administrator for ANE, was wildly different than her first posting with AID. The division serviced a much larger geographical region, sometimes with much higher political and military tensions than FPVA, and often much higher priorities for the State Department and the US government. Having spent the past twenty-one years of her career, from her first Peace Corps posting through her FPVA position, working on places that didn't have true diplomatic priority, there was an adjustment. I believe this position, with its high tensions and constant balancing act, prepared Ambassador Bloch for the trials of the collapse of the Nepali monarchy after the beginning of her ambassadorship. Additionally, in this job, Bloch was able to reorient herself, in a professional sense, with the dynamics within Asia itself. Though I thoroughly doubt she was fully uninformed about Asian relations during period she was professionally separated from it, the position in ANE allowed her focus to come back to the region in which she was originally interested.

Section III. How Did She Thrive? Julia Chang Bloch's Ambassadorship to Nepal and the Challenges She Faced.

It would be unwise to discuss Bloch's appointment to Nepal without first discussing the state of relations between the United States and Nepal at the time of her appointment. The United States sought and formalized diplomatic relations with Nepal on February 6, 1948, formalizing an embassy eleven years later in 1959.[67] Wedged between the two major trading partners of China and India, Nepal is a country rife with economic and political strategic advantage for the United States. According to the State Department, "Primary U.S. objectives in Nepal include supporting a stable, democratic Nepal that respects the rule of law; promoting investor-friendly

[67] "Nepal", U.S. Department of State (U.S. Department of State).

economic development; and improving disaster risk management systems."[68] Though this is the modern interpretation of US objectives, they were largely the same when Bloch set foot in Kathmandu in 1989.

The primary issue that dominated Bloch's time in Nepal was the collapse of the Panchayat system and the monarchy under King Birendra in 1990. The Panchayat system, established in 1960 by King Mahendra, Birendra's father, created "six government- sponsored class and professional organizations for peasants, laborers, students, women, former military personnel, and college graduates" as "substitutes for the prohibited political parties and provided alternate channels for the articulation of group or class--rather than national—interests".[69] For thirty years, the monarchy suppressed political organizations as a means to maintain control of the nation. Despite all best efforts and amidst the collapse of significant trade deals with India and China, the monarchical system was overthrown just a few months after Bloch arrived in Nepal. During those first few months, Bloch and the Embassy had two priorities: "support Nepal's sovereignty [regarding China and India] and to support Nepal's economic development."[70] However, after the initial fall of the monarchy, the focus of the embassy shifted to making sure Americans in Nepal were safe and disseminating information to other American aid organizations within the country.[71]

Later, Bloch described the overthrow as starting "sort of placidly" but eventually picking up momentum.[72] Demonstrations and massive organizing broke out across the country, led primarily by the Congress Party that advocated for the establishment of a democratic Congress.

---

[68] "US Relations With Nepal" U.S. Department of State (U.S. Department of State).
[69] "Nepal - The Panchayat System," Nepal - The Panchayat System (The Library of Congress).
[70] Bloch interview 17.
[71] Ibid, 18.
[72] Ibid, 19.

Bloch attributes the pro-democratic sentiments to the fall of the Soviet Union, saying that "Word was getting into Nepal, even the Uhmaru Kingdom of Nepal, and people wanted more say [in their government]".[73] Bloch and her embassy's focus became "minimiz[ing] violation and [keeping] open dialogue" between the crumbling monarchy and the citizen leaders.[74] Over months of negotiations and demonstrations, the Congress Party eventually succeeded in dissolving the monarchy in favor of the creation of the Nepali Congress. For American interests, this new government was ideal "because when the dust settled, the government really sent us [the embassy] all kinds of appreciation letters. And with the new government we had complete access, even with the communists".[75]

As Bloch's appointment ended, she and her staff "developed and established a program for what we considered the transition phase and the move into the consolidation phase" to assist the new democracy through the change in American support.[76] In her reflections on her appointment, Bloch emphasizes the challenge in being in Nepal, not from a physical standpoint, but from a monetary one. She admits that despite all of the work she and her staff did to foster as smooth a transition to democracy for Nepal as possible, "Nepal was never a priority [for the United States]. We could never be considered in the same plateau as any other democracies".[77] Regardless of the implications of Nepal's place between India and China, Nepal was exceedingly low on the State Department's priority list. For Bloch, this lack of direct support resulted in her integrated aid approach being a necessity to maintain an aid network within Nepal. Ambassador Bloch's ability to work with other organizations and minimal resources to maximize results was

[73] Ibid, 19.
[74] Ibid, 19.
[75] Ibid, 20.
[76] Ibid, 21.
[77] Ibid, 22.

one of the key skills that made her appointment in Nepal a success and solidifies her importance in women's diplomatic history.

Section IV. Where Did She Go from There? Julia Chang Bloch Post-Ambassadorship and Her Impacts on Women's Diplomatic History

The final questions the interviewer asks Bloch is how she felt when she left Nepal. Her response is simple: "Great. I thought I left on a high".[78] Following her successes in Nepal, Bloch left government work for the private sector where she still actively works today. Her personal and professional interests push her to continue to moderate relations between the US and Asian nations, namely China, in her capacity as the President of the U.S.-China Education Trust, "a program devoted to promoting American Studies in China".[79]

Julia Chang Bloch's appointment in Nepal was the pinnacle of a long career in governmental and diplomatic aid organizations. She used skills such as knowledge of the innerworkings of organizations like the Peace Corps and AID to working a massive project on minimal staff that were garnered from decades of experiences to achieve the goals set out to her and her embassy by the State Department. Each of her positions within the Peace Corps, Congress, AID, USIA and the State Department prioritized assisting others and focusing on their wellbeing.

[78] Ibid, 22.
[79] "Julia Chang Bloch," The American Academy of Diplomacy, August 23, 2018.

Chapter 3: "Shared Problems": The Life and Career of D. Kathleen Stephens

"Whether it's in the area of women's participation in the broader societies or our broader social and political challenges, I don't wanna over-simplify it, but I think there's a lot of shared problems... We have a lot of shared values, but we have a lot of shared problems"

-Ambassador Kathleen Stephens

Like Bloch, much of what we know about Stephens and her career comes from a singular interview with the Korea Society, an American organization "dedicated solely to the promotion of greater awareness, understanding, and cooperation between the people of the United States and Korea".[80] Like Bloch, Ambassador Doris Kathleen Stephens' career was also extensive and rife with diplomatic experience, though within the bounds of the Foreign Service and the State Department. Like Bloch, Stephens too experienced difficulties that prepared her for her appointment as Ambassador to Korea. In this chapter, I will explore three aspects of Stephens' life: her beginnings as a Peace Corps volunteer in Korea from 1975-77, her second tenure in Korea as an FSOF from 1983-89, and her final tenure in Korea as the Ambassador to Korea from 2008-11.[81]

I. Beginnings

Doris Kathleen Stephens was born in El Paso, TX in 1952, but moved to Scottsdale, AZ at the age of 7.[82] There are very few resources that discuss Stephen's childhood, fewer even than Bloch's short discussion, so we must pick up her story in college. "I got interested in Asia in

[80] "Home," Home, 2022, https://www.koreasociety.org/.
[81] Though Stephens had a much longer career in the Foreign Service during the 1990s, it is not remarked upon during her interview with the Korea Society and, as such, is outside the scope of this exploration.
[82] Ryan Pronk, "One-Time E.V. Resident Now Ambassador to S. Korea," East Valley Tribune, September 1, 2008, https://web.archive.org/web/20081007213705/http://www.eastvalleytribune.com/story/126347.

college…in part because I had a great professor" begins Stephens when asked about her origins of interest in Asian culture, politics, and society during her interview.[83] While at Prescott College, Stephens was fortunate enough to spend a year abroad in Hong Kong which she cites as "a very early, formative experience…at the age of 18".[84] Stephens graduated from Prescott with a degree in East Asian Studies before deciding that she wanted to continue her studies of Asia.[85] Much of Stephens' interests fell towards China and its relationships with other East Asian, Asian, and global nations. Though she was very interested in the US relationship with China, the United States did not have normalized relations with the nation and wouldn't for another decade and a half.[86]

Though Korea was not Stephens's first choice to study, she did not lack for interest in the small nation. When asked why she chose Korea over other countries in East Asia, Stephens says: "I knew Korea was deeply influenced by China, and I was very interested in things like the way that the countries of Asia had responded to all the challenges that occurred in the 19th and the early 20th century. So, Korea just seemed like it'd be a really sort of interesting point to see that on the ground".[87]As Stephens was primarily interested and had a background in China, she only saw Korea as a window for exploration of China and its relationship with neighboring countries.

[83] Interview with Ambassador Stephens via the Korea Society (hereafter referred to as Stephens interview), [00:04:07].
[84] Ibid, [00:04:17].
[85] "Senate Confirms Nomination of New US Envoy to Korea," The Korean Times, August 3, 2008.
[86] Stephens interview, [00:05:13]
[87] Ibid, [00:05:34]

After graduation, Stephens enrolled as a Peace Corps volunteer teaching English in the Republic of Korea (ROK) from 1975 to 1977.[88] "I thought I knew a thing or two about Asia" remarks Stephens on her arrival to the country.[89] Though Stephens had traveled throughout Asia during her time abroad in Hong Kong, rural Korea was a new challenge. "It wasn't a very comfortable place to be in many ways. There was no indoor plumbing. There was not a place to take a bath unless you go into a public bathhouse. Rice was rationed" says Stephens about the physical aspects of the country she was just arriving in to.[90] Stephens' placement in the countryside of Korea was partially a political precaution. Though most Peace Corps volunteers are sent into rural areas of their host countries, those in Korea had a secondary reason for leaving the city. Stephens cites "the political situation with a lot of protests within the university" as the reason for avoiding placements in cities like Seoul or Busan.[91]

But what is this "political situation" to which she is referring? What tensions were prominent in Korea at the time that Kathleen Stephens arrived in 1975?

Three years before Stephen's arrival, Korea entered its Fourth Republic with the passage of the Yushin Constitution in November of 1972.[92] The Yushin, or "renewal", Constitution solidified the powers of President Park Chung-hee, a former five-star general of the Republic of Korea Army, reinforcing his power as the de facto dictator of Korea.[93] Park and his Democratic Republican Party ruled the country autocratically, the entire time Stephens was in the country with the Peace Corps. The primary episode that influenced Stephens' comment about the

---

[88] "The next US Ambassador to Korea '33 Years Ago, an English Teacher in the Budget," Yonhap News, January 28, 2008.
[89] Stephens interview, [00:06:45]
[90] Ibid, [00:06:49].
[91] Ibid, [00:07:37].
[92] Byung-Kook Kim and Ezra F. Vogel, *The Park Chung Hee Era: The Transformation of South Korea* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2013), 6.
[93] Ibid, 6.

political situation in Korea would be the People's Revolutionary Party Incident in April of 1975. Though demonstrations against Park's government has begun two years prior with the enactment of the Yushin Constitution, the protests reached a boiling point in April of 1974 when 1024 individuals were "arrested without warrant…under the National Security Law".[94] The final straw came one year later when the Supreme Court ordered the execution of eight of the individuals associated with the People's Revolutionary Party who had been imprisoned one year prior for plotting to overthrow the Park regime by force: Do Yejong, Yeo Jeongnam, Kim Yongwon, Lee Subyeong, Ha Jaewan, Seo Dowon, Song Sangjin, and Woo Hongseon.[95] These eight deaths caused such an uproar amongst the proponents of democracy that even Peace Corps volunteers were affected by the political turmoil. This was the political climate Stephens ventured into upon her arrival into the peninsula. Stephens doesn't discuss her time in the Peace Corps in detail, but does give us enough elaboration to get a reading on the atmosphere of her experience.

II. Back in Korea

A year after she returned to the United States upon finishing her Peace Corps assignment, Stephens then joined the Foreign Service in 1978 where she returned to the ROK for two of her Foreign Service assignments in Seoul (1983-1987) and Busan (1987-1989), respectively.[96] This six-year period is the second formative experience that prepared Stephens for her eventual ambassadorial appointment in Korea. As a new FSOF, "There were very few, almost no one in the Foreign Service at that time who had even a minimal amount of Korean language on their personal record"[97]. And so Stephens made an offer to her superiors: "I [Stephens] raised my hand

[94] "Executions Still Smart 30 Years After," *The Chosunilbo*, April 8, 2005.
[95] Ibid.
[96] "Senate Confirms Nomination of New US Envoy to Korea," The Korean Times, August 3, 2008.
[97] Stephens interview, [00:12:08].

and said, I do speak some Korean and here are my test results again, and I'd like, to study more, and I'd like to go back to Korea."[98] Without further ado, Kathleen Stephens was back in Korea, this time for six years.

She arrived back in Korea in the wake of a series of extraordinary events. Park Chung-hee was assassinated in October of 1979.[99] After his death, Republic of Korea Army Major General Chun Doo-hwan, commander of the Security Command, enacted a violent takeover of the Korean government called the Coup d'état of December Twelfth of 1979.[100] This event, along with the Coup d'état of May Seventeenth of 1980, launched a new Fifth Republic under Chun Doo-hwan for Stephens and her colleagues to contend with. Stephens was now "doing the complete opposite" of what she had done in the Peace Corps: "following domestic politics [in South Korea]".[101] As a Peace Corps volunteer in the 1970s, "we [Stephens and her colleagues] were told…stay far away from that".[102] Now as an FSOF, understanding how Korea viewed itself, the United States, and the world became her primary concern.

Much of Stephens' placement in Korea this time around concerned South Korea's domestic politics and the relationship between Korea and North Korea's. Though Chun Doo-hwan had held power in Korea since 1980, elections held in 1981 solidified his reign and elected him President.[103] Students were widely opposed to Chun's election, forming demonstrations on campuses across the country. Additionally, a wave of anti-US sentiment was fostered

---

[98] Ibid, [00:12:08].
[99] Byung-Kook Kim and Ezra F. Vogel, *The Park Chung Hee Era: The Transformation of South Korea* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2013), 638.
[100] Wikipedia. 2022. "Coup d'état of December Twelfth." Last modified February 20, 2022. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Coup_d%27%C3%A9tat_of_December_Twelfth.
[101] Stephens interview, [00:12:32].
[102] Ibid, [00:12:32]
[103] C. I. Eugene Kim. "South Korea in 1985: An Eventful Year Amidst Uncertainty." Asian Survey 26, no. 1 (1986): 68.

simultaneously amongst student groups in Korea. One event in particular, the seizure of the United States Information Services (USIS) Library in Seoul from May 23rd to May 26th, consumed the US Embassy and prompted a response from the US Ambassador to Korea at the time, Richard Walker, Kathleen Stephen's boss on the ground in Korea.[104] Walker and the Embassy condemned the protesters violent actions and requested they immediately stop occupying the USIS Library and release its workers.[105] Though the declaration was ultimately unsuccessful, the students did eventually retire peacefully.[106]

In 1987, Stephens witnessed the declining power of dictatorship as Korea reinstated direct presidential election of the president in the wake of popular protests. Chun's hand-picked successor, President Roh Tae-woo, was a former general in the Republic of Korea Army as well, but Rho's presidency witnessed South Korea's transition to democracy, especially as a result of the dictatorship. The June 29th Declaration, which was described as "a sweeping democratization proposal" was put in place by then-President Roh Tae-woo.[107] According to a more recent article in *The Korea Times*,

"Two theories exist on the historiography of the nation's democratization. The first view is that the ruling elite made a calculated compromise for a step-by-step transition to democracy. The more plausible theory is that illegitimate leaders bowed to popular

[104] Young H. Lee, "South Korean Students, Police Clash as Sit-in at USIS Library Continues," The Washington Post (WP Company, May 25, 1985).
[105] Ibid.
[106] C. I. Eugene Kim. "South Korea in 1985: An Eventful Year Amidst Uncertainty." Asian Survey 26, no. 1 (1986): 71.
[107] *Protest Dialectics: State Repression and South Korea's Democracy Movement, 1970-1979*; Chang-sup Lee, "Revisiting June 29 in 1987," Korea Times (The Korea Times, June 28, 2012).

demand."[108] In either case, democracy had now swept through Korea, a win for the United States in its Cold War fight for democracy around the world. Now the next task could begin: preparing for the 1988 Summer Olympics in Seoul.

However, inter-Korean relations got in the way before the Olympics could arrive. In November of 1987, just months after the June Declaration, North Korean agents planted a bomb on Korean Air flight 858 that destroyed the plane and killed everyone onboard.[109] The flight was scheduled between Baghdad, Iraq and Seoul, South Korea with two stopovers, one in Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates and the other in Bangkok, Thailand.[110] On the first stopover, the two North Korean agents planted a bomb in an overhead compartment which then detonated over the Andaman Sea, killing all 104 passengers and 11 crew members.[111] Stephens does not remark directly on this event in her interview with the Korea Society, though we know the United States condemned the act wholly, from the two embassies in Korea up to the Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs. This event only heightened the tensions between Korea and North Korea, leaving the United States to take Korea's side again and push the Cold War even closer to the edge.

Although Stephens was stationed in Busan at the time of the Olympics, we can assume her office was also highly involved in the planning, logistics, and assessment process for the United States while the Olympics took place. This being the last of the Cold War Olympics with heightened tensions, this Olympics, however, did not have the boycotts of its predecessors in the

[108] Chang-sup Lee, "Revisiting June 29 in 1987," Korea Times (The Korea Times, June 28, 2012), http://www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/news/opinon/2015/03/298_114038.html.
[109] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Korean_Air_Flight_858
[110] Ibid.
[111] Ibid.

1984 Los Angeles and the 1980 Moscow games.[112] North Korea, unsurprisingly, boycotted this Olympics on political grounds. The USSR, in its final Olympics, dominated the games and took home a total of 132 medals.[113] Stephens doesn't remark on the Olympics during her interview with the Korea Society, though these were a monumental series of games.

About her tenure in the Foreign Service in Korea, Stephens comments that "People tend to focus on the title Ambassador but that [her time in Korea from 1983 to 1989] was an extraordinary time when I learned so much about American diplomacy, its strengths and its shortcomings, about the Korean political ambition as well as the economic ambition to really achieve a democracy".[114] Past this quotation, Stephens is vague about what "strengths and shortcomings" were. For Stephens, though her ambassadorship is one of the pinnacles of her career, these experiences in Seoul and Busan rank just as highly.

III. To Ambassadorship and Beyond

"So, an ambassador is the senior person on the ground in that country" begins Ambassador Kathleen Stephens about her third tenure in Korea, this time as Ambassador.[115] She, however, did not transition directly from her time in Korea during the 1980s to her ambassadorship. Throughout the 1990s, Kathleen Stephens served in various roles in the US Foreign Service before transitioning to leadership roles in the early 2000s. From 2003 to 2005, Stephens served as the Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for European and Eurasian Affairs before being promoted to the position of Principal Deputy Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs (2005-2007), a position from which she was finally chosen to serve as the

[112] Wikipedia. 2022. "1988 Summer Olympics." Last modified February 24, 2022. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1988_Summer_Olympics.
[113] Ibid.
[114] Stephens interview, [00:13:03].
[115] Stephens interview, [00:20:35].

Ambassador to the ROK from 2008-2011.[116] Stephens does not remark upon her years in Europe and only mentions it during her interview with the Korea Society as a precursor to her return to Korea. According to the State Department, Stephens' wealth of experience in Korea and in the Foreign Service made her "the sole candidate for the post" to fill the position of Ambassador to Korea, a notion that Stephens herself agreed with.[117] When asked about her feelings towards potential ambassadorship, Stephens notes that, "You know, if I'm gonna be ambassador anywhere…I think I should be Ambassador to Korea because I actually speak a little Korean" a seemingly necessary requirement that had been sorely lacking in ambassadors past.

When prompted to explain what her role is as ambassador, she explains that "part of what an ambassador and embassy are there to do is to kinda figure out what is possible here and what is going to work and what's not going to work"[118]. Though we are not privy to what was included in Ambassador Stephens' Presidential Letter from President Obama which "lay[s] out in very broad terms what the [foreign policy] priorities are" we do know what Obama's foreign policy goals were for East Asia and we know what events Stephens dealt with as ambassador.[119] In contrast to the previous George W. Bush administration that had been preoccupied with the Middle East, the Obama administration instituted the "Pivot to Asia" policy.[120] As communicated by Secretary of State Hillary Clinton in her essay "America's Pacific Century", the administration

"will proceed along six key lines of action: strengthening bilateral security alliances;

---

[116] "Kathleen Stephens," Freeman Spogli Institute for International Relations, accessed March 28, 2021.
[117] "US White House approves nominee for next envoy to South Korea." Yonhap News Agency (Seoul, South Korea), January 10, 2008.
[118] Stephens interview, [00:23:36].
[119] Stephens interview, [00:23:16].
[120] Richard Bush, "The Response of China's Neighbors to the U.S. 'Pivot' to Asia," *Brookings*, January 31, 2012.

> deepening our working relationships with emerging powers, including with China; engaging with regional multilateral institutions; expanding trade and investment; forging a broad-based military presence; and advancing democracy and human rights".[121]

Though these goals were released in 2011 at the end of Stephens' tenure, we can still note their influence over the events under Stephens' purview: "the Free Trade Agreement", "the North Korea issues", "the sinking of the Cheonan", and "the shelling of Yeonpyeong Island".[122] These priorities were very clearly different from the second Bush administration who had ignored the region for the entirety of their tenure.

Officially called the U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement, the Free Trade Agreement to which Stephens is referring was originally signed on June 30, 2007 and "entered into force on March 15, 2012".[123] Though Stephens was not there for the crafting of the agreement or the official enactment, she cites her involvement, though not exactly what that involvement was. The larger issue of Ambassador Stephens' tenure in Korea was the relationship between Korea and its northern counterpart. Two major military incidents plagued her time in Korea: the sinking of the ROKS *Cheonan* and the shelling of Yeonpyeong Island.

North Korea sunk the ROKS Cheonan on March 26, 2010, near Beangnyeong Island in the Yellow Sea..[124] Out of the 104 personnel aboard the ship, 46 were killed in the incident.[125] Although North Korea did not claim responsibility for the destruction, a task force called the Joint Civilian-Military Investigation Group of the Republic of Korea, which included members

---

[121] Hillary Clinton, "America's Pacific Century," Foreign Policy, October 11, 2011.
[122] Stephens interview, [00:22:09].
[123] https://ustr.gov/trade-agreements/free-trade-agreements/korus-fta
[124] "Report: South Korean Navy Ship Sinks," CNN (Cable News Network, March 26, 2010).
[125] Ibid.

from Australia, Sweden, the United Kingdom, and the United States, performed an investigation that concluded the attack was carried out by North Korea.[126] As a result, the Republic of Korea imposed five primary sanctions against North Korea: "a complete ban" on "North Korean vessels navigation through South Korean waters, inter-Korean trade, South Korean nationals visit to the North, the South's new investments in the North, and South Korea's aid programs for the North".[127] Despite the gravity of this event in inter-Korean relations, Ambassador Stephens did not remark upon her role within it in her interview with the Korea Society.

Secondly, the shelling of Yeonpyeong Island also proved to be a significant event in the course of Stephens' time in Korea. On November 23rd, 2010, "North Korean forces fired around 170 artillery shells and rockets at Yeonpyeong Island, hitting both military and civilian targets" "following a South Korean artillery exercise in disputed waters near the island".[128] Four Koreans were killed, with 19 others injured.[129] The affair caused tensions between the Koreas to escalate to levels last seen during the Korean War. Again, despite the gravity of this event, Ambassador Stephens did not remark upon her role within it in her interview with the Korea Society.

According to the State Department archives on South Korea during Stephens' tenure, much of the relationship between the US and Korea concerned armaments and nuclear research and development. Of the nine memorandums and announcements available from the State Department, almost all of the documents dictate military priorities. Stephens herself is quite

---

[126] Park In-kook, "Letter Dated 4 June 2010 from the Permanent Representative of the Republic of Korea to the United Nations Addressed to the President of the Security Council ," Letter dated 4 June 2010 from the Permanent Representative of the Republic of Korea to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council § (n.d.), pp. 1-9, 1.
[127] "'May 24 Measure' Halting Inter-Korean Exchange to Be Lifted," www.donga.com (*Dong-a Ilbo*, August 19, 2013).
[128] "N.K. Artillery Strikes S. Korean Island," The Korea Herald (The Korea Herald, November 23, 2010), http://www.koreaherald.com/view.php?ud=20101123001048.
[129] Ibid.

vague when it comes to this period, despite its importance in her career. She mentions the "extraordinary, blossoming the way that the ties between Korea and the United States are so much deeper, are so much more complex and rich than they were when I first went there" but does not elaborate further.[130] However, I think it is safe to speculate, between Stephens' own comment and the current relationship between the US and Korea, that relations between the two nations were decidedly improved during her tenure in Korea.

After Ambassador Stephens' tenure came to a close, she began working with a number of organizations aimed at supporting US-Korea relations.

> "Stephens was William J. Perry Fellow for Korea at Stanford University's Shorenstein Asia Pacific Research Center, 2015-2018. She has also been Endowed Chair Professor for Language and Diplomacy at Hankuk University of Foreign Studies in Seoul, and Senior State Department Fellow at Georgetown University's Institute for the Study of Diplomacy. She chairs the board of The Korea Society and is Vice-chair of the Board of Trustees of The Asia Foundation. She is a member of the American Academy of Diplomacy and the Council on Foreign Relations,"

explains her biography on the Korea Economic Institute website. We can safely say Kathleen Stephens has continued to dedicate her life and career to the study and improvement of US-Korea relations even after the end of her ambassadorship.

[130] Stephens interview, [00:37:04]. DOUBLE CHECK TIMING

Chapter 4: "Truly Representative of the American People": Themes in the Careers of Julia Chang Bloch and Doris Kathleen Stephens

Though the individual careers of Bloch and Stephens are vital to understanding how women diplomats interact with American foreign policy in Asia, there are greater themes that emerge and can be understood through the lenses of their experiences. Women have acted upon American foreign policy since its very beginnings, though only within the last century has it been in official diplomatic capacities. During that century, only approximately the last 35 years have shown marked emphasis on women's role in American foreign policy. In the history of American diplomacy, the end of the Cold War marks what I argue as a departure from previous years that gatekept ambassadorial roles from women. 1989, the beginning of Ambassador Bloch's appointment, began a new generation of women Foreign Service Officers whose previous expertise was increasingly valued and considered in their appointments.

As the first Asian American ambassador, Julia Chang Bloch brought a unique perspective to the role, rooted in a long professional and personal interest in the region, which began when she served as a Peace Corps officer in Malaysia (1964-1966). Kathleen Stephens, as the first woman ambassador to the Republic of Korea (ROK), made a significant impression as a dedicated representative of the relationship between the United States and ROK, where she first lived as a Peace Corps officer (1975-1977).

Through a gender-specific lens, the history of women ambassadors is necessary to understand the professional progression of women in diplomatic spheres in the United States to the present day. Being aware of how ambassadors, as representatives of the US, previously interacted with foreign powers can both make it easier to understand and aid in forming our current interactions with them. The two women's appointments evaluated in this thesis hold a

significant place in this progression due to their historical uniqueness. Ambassadors do not often have the luxury of being frequently discussed in historical scholarship, despite the importance of their role in maintaining healthy relationships between the US and her allies.

In this chapter, I will discuss three central themes I have discovered in my research. First, I will discuss the tendency of women that work in American foreign policy to attribute the credit to their success as to hard work or good fortune alone. This perspective tends, on the surface, to erase these women's work as experts. In a deeper sense, it portrays women foreign policy professionals as being ignorant of the patriarchal structures that act upon them. However, I have seen, through the lenses of Bloch and Stephens, that women are often critically aware of the pressures upon them as women. I will also discuss the lack of recognized change in the wake of the seminal Palmer v. Schultz ruling. Though structural changes were made in the hiring process of new women Foreign Service officers, very few significant changes occurred during Bloch's tenure in Nepal and only began to truly change at the time of Stephens' appointment in Korea. For example, neither Bloch nor Stephens mention the Palmer decision in their interviews. Though the decision was a monumental turning point, it is not recognized as such by those that are directly affected by it. Lastly, I will discuss the tendency of women foreign policy leaders to place women as a secondary priority. This practice is familiar to both their male colleagues and to the women they serve as it follows a pattern in the work done by previous ambassadors. The themes in each of these three sections come together to illustrate the struggles women ambassadors and other women foreign policy professionals face within the State Department and other American foreign policy institutions.

One organization in particular has tracked the major tendencies of women in American foreign policy. The Women's Foreign Policy Group (WFPG) was co-founded in 1995 by Julia

Chang Bloch and Patricia Ellis "to promote the leadership and influence of women in global affairs".[131] Today, WFPG works to "[expand] the constituency in international affairs by convening global experts and creating a vital network of women with diverse backgrounds and experience" as well as "connect aspiring leaders with role models, providing students and young professionals with the tools they need for career advancement".[132] Just three years after their creation, WFPG published a May 1998 report titled "Leading By Example: U.S. Women Leaders in International Affairs". Authored by Nanette Levinson and Pauline Baker, two prominent international studies experts, the report is broken up into seven sections, the primary of which being "Career Advancement", "Barriers and Challenges", and "Perceptions of Work Style and Private Life".[133] This report details some of the major challenges diplomatic women face in foreign policy institutions in the United States, as well as their insights into the patriarchal structures within those institutions.

The first sentence of the "Career Advancement" section perfectly captures the main theme of this and the following two sections: "The women surveyed were virtually unanimous in agreeing that hard work was key to their professional success".[134] Despite many of the women surveyed having careers within the State Department, and all of them having the years of expertise that go along with careers in foreign policy, they still place hard work at the top of the list that has contributed to their success. As women, the structure of foreign policy circles, even in the wake of legal action like the Palmer decision, does not work for them as it does for their male counterparts. Management consultant Marilyn Loden coined the term "glass ceiling" in

---

[131] "WFPG New Leadership," Home, accessed March 20, 2022, https://www.wfpg.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=735.
[132] Women's Foreign Policy Group, "About Wfpg," Home, accessed March 20, 2022.
[133] Nanette Levinson and Pauline Baker, "Leading By Example: U.S. Women Leaders in International Affairs" (Washington , D.C.: Women's Foreign Policy Group, 1998), 2.
[134] Ibid, 5.

1978, referring to the incorporeal, but very real, "ceiling" that prevents women in many industries from professionally progressing to the highest levels in their fields.[135] Exactly twenty years later, at the advent of this study, it has not budged.

Julia Chang Bloch reflects the pattern exemplified by this study. In her interview with Charles Stuart Kennedy as part of the Foreign Affairs Oral History Collection of the Association for Diplomatic Studies and Training series at the Library of Congress, Bloch does not comment on her status as the first woman ambassador to Nepal, nor does she comment on her status as the first Asian American ambassador.[136] Additionally, she does not comment on either topic in many of her writings. However, in a chapter titled "Women and Diplomacy" in the book *Bonds Across Borders: Women, China, and International Relations in the Modern World* (2007), Bloch is much more open about her experiences. In an essay published fifteen years after the end of her career in the Foreign Service, she explains that when she first started her career in the Peace Corps, she was "repeatedly" told Asian nations would not accept a woman in a supervisory role and that her jobs would remain relegated to Washington offices rather than foreign outposts.[137] She continues to say that she "realized very quickly that if [she] were to gain even a foothold in diplomacy, [she] would have to work harder, be smarter, and constantly exceed performance expectations".[138] In these two quotations, Bloch shows that she is highly aware of the pressures upon her and obstacles in her career as a woman. However, she, like many of the other women surveyed by the WFPG, uses hard work as a coping mechanism to continue to succeed. She

---

[135] "100 Women: 'Why I Invented the Glass Ceiling Phrase'," BBC News (BBC, December 13, 2017).
[136] Bloch interview.
[137] Julia Chang Bloch, "Women and Diplomacy," in Bonds Across Borders: Women, China, and International Relations in the Modern World, ed. Priscilla Roberts and He Peiqun (Newcastle, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2007), 140. (hereafter referred to as Women and Diplomacy)
[138] Ibid, 141.

knows her education and professional experience were not enough to see her to success without outperforming those around her.

However, D. Kathleen Stephens takes a different approach to this issue. Though Stephens never negates the hard work required to achieve her postings, we can track a change in perspective between herself and Bloch of the slightly earlier generation of women foreign policy professionals. Stephens cites her "great good fortune" in being nominated to return to Korea as ambassador.[139] For Stephens, her place as a woman in the structure of the State Department is a natural progression in the fight for women's equality in foreign policy circles. In her interview with the Korea Society, she notes that she was "the first woman in a lot of jobs" which she cites as "no particular reflection on [her] aptitude" but as a generational issue.[140] She has moved past the need for justifying her position with hard work and is now beginning to discuss the much more systemic way in which women have been excluded, recognizing that the process of including women at the upper levels of organizations like the State Department is a slow one. To be sure, that she is "the first woman in a lot of jobs" speaks to the exclusion of the women before her, but her rise in the State Department often paralleled the increasing, albeit limited, opportunities in this profession over course of the three decades that she was in the State Department.[141]

Both Bloch's chapter in *Bonds Across Borders* and Stephens' interview with the Korea Society were published or posted long after their respective tenures as ambassador. Bloch's chapter was published in 2007, fifteen years after her appointment, and Stephens' interview occurred nine years after her tenure. I would argue that this temporal distance is vital for the

[139] Stephens interview, [00:14:07]
[140] Ibid, [00:45:16-00:46:23].
[141] Ibid.

ambassadors to understand the broader impacts of how gender discrimination in their careers has impacted them.

A second recurring theme that I have noticed throughout my research is that despite the structural changes put in place in the wake of the Palmer decision, the lasting change towards accessibility for women in foreign policy circles took much longer than advertised. Despite the ruling that "The [State] Department shall not discriminate on the basis of sex", women were still trapped by Loden's glass ceiling.[142] Data is not available that specifically tracks the change over time of the written entrance test for Foreign Service Officers (FSOs). Without this data, we cannot see the concrete changes that were made to combat the sex discrimination inherent within the State Department's hiring methods. Instead, we must look to actual percentages of women employed within the Foreign Service. In "Women and Diplomacy", Bloch remarks that women did not gain a "critical mass" in the Foreign Service until the 1990's, beginning at 26 percent in 1993, the year after Bloch finished her tenure as ambassador, and finally reaching 34.7 percent by 2007, the year before Kathleen Stephens was appointed as ambassador.[143] Bloch's critical mass still falls well below 50 percent, even almost twenty years after the changes resulting from the Palmer decision were established. In comparison, women comprised "58.3 percent of Civil Service Employees in the State Department" in 2007.[144] This considerable gap is telling of the continuing gender inequality in the State Department. According to this data, women are qualified enough to enter the Civil Service, but those same women are not qualified enough to serve in the Foreign Service.

[142] Palmer v. Shultz, 1989 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 18386 (United States District Court for the District of Columbia, January 31, 1989, Filed).
[143] Women and Diplomacy, 137.
[144] Women and Diplomacy, 137.

The final theme that arose within my research around Julia Change Bloch and Kathleen Stephens is that women foreign policy leaders, specifically ambassadors, still prioritize women's issues in their respective nations though it may not be perceived in such a way to an outside perspective. I would argue that foreign policy typically prioritizes two aspects of a nation above all: its economics and its defense. For women to be taken seriously in foreign policy circles, they often choose to also prioritize these issues, eliminating a potential point of contention with their male colleagues that could see them dismissed professionally. Ambassador Bloch and Ambassador Stephens both chose to prioritize economic and defense issues while stationed abroad, though they both saw education as a priority further required to assist women within their respective nations. It is only through Bloch's own writings that we learn of how she helped women during her career and her tenure as ambassador. As a young aide on Capitol Hill, Bloch "served as midwife" "to the Percy Amendment, which requires US aid programs to include women" and prioritizes their economic development.[145] However, during Bloch's interview with the Library of Congress, she makes no mention of the amendment or its impacts. Only in the work specifically focused on women does Bloch mention the work she did for women during her career, though it is still an economically focused project. As an ambassador, a similar trend is clear for Bloch. Again, her work for women in Nepal was not discussed in her Library of Congress interview, and these aid programs focused on providing Nepali women with sources of income.[146] As Bloch says: "investments in women yield big development gains".[147] These seven words are the heart of how women are viewed by diplomats from other nations. Though often not explicitly, they place women at the center of society, the hinge upon which development for

[145] Women and Diplomacy, 142.
[146] Ibid, 141.
[147] Ibid, 141.

the remainder of the nation rests. As women diplomats continue to make their way into foreign policy circles in the United States, these implicit priorities will move to the explicit, more openly declaring the place women hold in societies around the world.

Each of these three themes provides vital insight into how women foreign policy leaders, specifically ambassadors, perceive and work within foreign policy institutions in the United States. Women foreign policy leaders work harder to achieve their goals and best serve their women constituents, despite institutional shortcomings that make this work significantly more difficult. Women are not allowed to perceive their work as just a job; it is something that must be committed to with their entire self to begin to overcome some of the institutional obstacles that are placed before them. The Palmer decision, which was supposed to change the State Department's hiring practices at a fundamental level to include more women, is shown to have not made as much of a significant impact as first thought. Finally, women foreign policy leader's work, despite its challenges, still chooses to prioritize the women in the nation it is serving. As women's contributions to American foreign policy continue to come to light, it is our job as historians to assess and explore the themes that arise from their work. Let this piece be the first of many that puts their work under a microscope, recording what has happened for the future.

Chapter 5: "Critical Mass": How Close or Far are We Really?

"The only level where the proportion of women reaches 50 percent is the support level, and there it exceeds 50 percent by a fairly wide margin."[148]

-Women at State (1984)

The work done in this thesis is far from over. Due to the limitations of my sources, I still have three aspects of my research that I would like to further explore: gender, class, and tenure. To begin, I would have liked to further explore the gender dynamics between Bloch and Stephens and those around them. Neither Bloch nor Stephens are entirely forthcoming in their discussions of gender and its effect on their careers. How did gender affect how they interacted with their peers? Their superiors? Their administrations? Each of these questions could have been its own section within their respective chapters that I could have explored in more detail.

The second aspect of my research that I would have liked to continue is a discussion of class and where Bloch and Stephens fall into the discussion. Though not quite within the scope of this thesis, class and gender are so closely intertwined that one is inescapable from the other. Both Bloch and Stephens come from upper middle class, college educated backgrounds. For example, Bloch's father was a Harvard-educated man who used his college connections to lobby for his family's immigration to the United States. Though we know nothing about Stephens' parents, we know she earned both an undergraduate and a master's degree at a time when financial aid for students was significantly less than it is now. She was also able to study abroad in Hong Kong for a year, a feat that would have been impossible for a student with a less than

[148] Olmsted, M. S., B. Baer, J. Joyce, and G. M. Prince. 1984. "Women at state: An inquiry into the status of women in the United States Department of State." *Washington: Women's Research and Education Institute of the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues*, 10.

ideal financial status. Each of these women were privileged enough to have had opportunities that might not have been afforded to them had they been less well off. Though their gender led to discrimination within their respective careers, their class shielded them from other aspects of discrimination and even, I would argue, allowed them within foreign policy circles that would have otherwise excluded them.

The final aspect of research that I would have liked to further explore would be Bloch and Stephens' respective tenures. Neither Bloch nor Stephens explore much of their ambassadorships in their respective interviews. What were the biggest issues of their ambassadorships? How did they deal with them? What did Kathleen Stephens deal with during the 1990s in her positions working on policy in Europe? How did Julia Chang Bloch deal with the fall of the monarchy in Nepal just after her arrival? Do they have memories of these events, or do they not deem them important enough in their careers? I would like to have answered these questions and more to fully round out the scope of this thesis.

These discussions of gender, class, and tenure could have been rectified if I had gotten to interview Bloch and Stephens directly. Though I had a lead on an interview with Stephens, my connection did not pan out and I did not have a potential connection to Bloch. I fully acknowledge the limits of this thesis without those direct interviews. I would welcome further research, either by myself or another scholar, to fill in these gaps and provide the field of feminist diplomatic history with a more fleshed out version of this research.

The quotation at the beginning of this chapter from a 1984 study titled "Women at State: An inquiry into the status of women in the United States Department of State" explains perfectly the issue of this thesis: women have not been included within the State Department and other aspects of foreign policy circles at a significant level. Though this statistic is from 1984, before

the Palmer decision, women have still yet to reach that 50 percent, that critical mass to which Julia Chang Bloch refers. While I don't necessarily agree that an even 50 percent would mean gender equity within the foreign policy institutions in the United States, it is a good benchmark to strive for. The trouble comes in that it has yet to be reached at the time of this thesis in the ninety-eight years since the Foreign Service was founded.

I believe the merit of this work is that it tells untold stories. Ambassador Bloch and Ambassador Stephens' stories have not been told except in this thesis, though they each hold a significant place within the feminist history of diplomacy in America. These two microhistories help us establish larger themes in women in foreign policy that can be useful to continuing scholarship in feminist diplomatic history and feminist international relations. Our job as scholars is to find these histories and reconstruct them for the future.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Government Documents

Series IV. Subject Files: Members of Congress Correspondence: Durenburger, David. 1989-1993. MS Box 159, Folder 79, The National Gay and Lesbian Taskforce Records, 1973 2000: Series IV. Subject Files. Cornell University Libraries. *Archives of Sexuality and Gender*.

Southeast and South Asian Affairs Foreign Affairs, Defense and Trade Division, and Bruce Vaughn, Malaysia: Political Transition and Implications for U.S. Policy § (2003).

United Nations. Security Council, and Park In-kook, Letter dated 4 June 2010 from the Permanent Representative of the Republic of Korea to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council § (n.d.).

United States. Congress. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

Nominations of Julia Chang Bloch [and Others], 1981.

Statement of D. Kathleen Stephens to be Ambassador to the Republic of Korea, 2008.

United States. Department of Commerce. Supplement to *International Commerce*.

Trade with Malaysia: Trade Mission Report, 1963.

US Trade Mission Report, Trade with Malaysia § (1963).

Interviews/Oral Histories

The Foreign Affairs Oral History Collection of the Association for Diplomatic Studies and Training, Manuscript Division. Library of Congress, Washington D.C.

Interview with Albert A. Thibault Jr., 2005.

Interview with Ambassador Teresita C. Schaffer, 1998.

Interview with Julia Chang Bloch, 1993.

Interview with John D. Pielemeier, 1997.

Interview with Mildred Marcy, 1991.

Interview with Stuart Marshall Bloch, 2010.

Lee, Vivian. A Conversation with Ambassador Kathleen Stephens. Interview. *The Korea Society's Women in Leadership Series*, January 28, 2021. https://www.koreasociety.org/special-events/item/1462-a-conversation-with-ambassador-kathleen-stephens.

Periodicals

Asia Pulse

Associated Press

BBC

Brookings

CQ Today

Chosun Ilbo

CNN

Dong-a Ilbo

East Valley Tribune

Foreign Policy

MidWeek Magazine

The Kansas City Star

The Korea Herald

Korea Times

The New York Times

Yonhap News

Photographs

Department of Labor. Office of Public Affairs. Division of Audiovisual Communications. ca. 1992. Office of the Secretary - Secretary Elaine Chao Meets with Ambassador Julia Chang Bloch.

Works by Thesis Subjects

Bloch, Julia Chang. 1991. "A US-Japan Alliance?" In *Yen for Development: Japanese Foreign Aid & the Politics of Burden-Sharing*, edited by Shafiqul, Islam 64-85 New York: Council on Foreign Relations Press.

Bloch, Julia Chang. 1997. "Commercial Diplomacy" In *Living With China: U.S.-China Relations in the Twenty-first Century*, edited by Vogel, Ezra F. 185-216 New York: The American

Assembly at Columbia University, W.W Norton.

Bloch, Julia Chang. “Women and Diplomacy.” Essay. In *Bonds Across Borders: Women, China, and International Relations in the Modern World*, edited by Priscilla Roberts and He Peiqun. Newcastle, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2007.

Bloch, Julia Chang. 2005. “Nepal: The End of Shangri-La.” *Liberal Democracy Nepal Bulletin* 1, no. 1. Nepal Study Center.

Stephens, Kathleen, James Person, Gi-Wook Shin, and Katharina Zellweger. “The North Korea Crisis.” Panel discussion at CISAC/Shorenstein APARC, Stanford: CA, May 30, 2017.

Stephens, Kathleen, Gi-Wook Shin, Yong Suk Lee, and Daniel Sneider. “Wind of Change? South Korea under the New Administration.” Colloquium at Shorenstein APARC Korean Program, Stanford: CA, May 22, 2017.

Stephens, Kathleen and others. “Impeachment and After: What Does the Future Hold for Korea’s Politics?” Discussion at Shorenstein APARC Korean Program, Stanford: CA, Jan 26, 2017.

Secondary Sources

Articles

Brands, H. W, 1998. "The World in a Word: The Rise and Fall of Détente." *Rhetoric and Public Affairs* 1 (1): 45-60.

Buterbaugh, Kevin, Calin, Costel. 2019. “Male versus Female Career Ambassadors: Is the US Foreign Service Still Biased?”. *Foreign Policy Analysis* 15 (2): 205–223.

C. I. Eugene Kim. “South Korea in 1985: An Eventful Year Amidst Uncertainty.” Asian Survey 26, no. 1 (1986): 66–77.

Costigliola, Frank. 1997. ""Unceasing Pressure for Penetration": Gender, Pathology, and Emotion in George Kennan's Formation of the Cold War." *The Journal of American History* 83 (4): 1309-339.

Del Pero, Mario. 2004. “American Pressures and Their Containment in Italy during the Ambassadorship of Clare Boothe Luce, 1953–1956.” *Diplomatic History* 28 (3): 407–39.

Garner, Karen. 2012. “Global Gender Policy in the 1990s.” *Journal of Women’s History* 24 (4): 121–48.

Khadka, Narayan. 2000. "U.S. Aid to Nepal in the Cold War Period: Lessons for the Future." *Pacific Affairs* 73 (1): 77-95.

Nash, Philip. 2005. “America’s First Female Chief of Mission: Ruth Bryan Owen, Minister to Denmark, 1933–36.” *Diplomacy & Statecraft* 16 (1): 57–72.

Nash, Philip. 2002. "'A Woman's Touch in Foreign Affairs'? The Career of Ambassador Frances E. Willis." *Diplomacy & Statecraft* 13 (2): 1.

Robinson, Courtland. 2000. "Refugee Warriors at the Thai-Cambodian Border", Refugee Survey Quarterly, 19 : (1), 30.

Rosenberg, Emily S. 1990. "Gender." *The Journal of American History* 77 (1): 116-24.

Rotter, Andrew J. 1994. "Gender Relations, Foreign Relations: The United States and South Asia, 1947-1964." *The Journal of American History* 81 (2): 518-42.

Shaffer, Robert. "Women and International Relations: Pearl S. Buck's Critique of the Cold War." *Journal of Women's History* 11, no. 3 (1999): 151-175.

Yui, Daizaburo. 1992. "From Exclusion to Integration: Asian Americans' Experiences in World War II." *Hitotsubashi Journal of Social Studies*, 24 (2): 55-67.

Books

Hogan, Michael J ed. 1995. *America in the World : The Historiography of American Foreign Relations since 1941*. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kim, Byung-Kook, and Ezra F. Vogel. *The Park Chung Hee Era: The Transformation of South Korea*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2013.

McGlen, Nancy E., and Meredith Reid Sarkees. 1993. *Women in Foreign Policy: The Insiders*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Meisler, Stanley. 2011. *When the World Calls : The inside Story of the Peace Corps and Its First Fifty Years*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Chapters

Kopp, Harry W., and Charles A. Gillespie. 2011. "Assignments and Promotions." *Career Diplomacy: Life and Work in the U.S. Foreign Service*, Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Monographs

Bashevkin, Sylvia B. 2018. *Women as Foreign Policy Leaders: National Security and Gender Politics in Superpower America*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Jones, Matthew. 2001. *Conflict and Confrontation In South East Asia, 1961-1965: Britain, the United States, and the Creation of Malaysia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jamieson, Kathleen Hall. 1995. *Beyond the Double Bind: Women and Leadership*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Mitchell, Nancy. 2016. *Jimmy Carter in Africa : Race and the Cold War*. Cold War International

History Project Series. Washington, D.C : Stanford, California: Woodrow Wilson Center Press ; Stanford University Press.

Morin, Ann Miller. 1995. *Her Excellency: An Oral History of American Women Ambassadors*. New York, NY: Twayne Publishers.

Nash, Philip. 2020. *Breaking Protocol: America's First Female Ambassadors, 1933-1964*. Lexington, Kentucky: University Press of Kentucky.

Schott, Linda Kay. *Reconstructing Women's Thoughts: The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom Before World War II*. United States: Stanford University Press, 1997.

Tickner, J. Ann. 2014. *A Feminist Voyage Through International Relations*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Tickner, J. Ann. 2001. *Gendering World Politics: Issues and Approaches in the Post-Cold War Era*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Publications

Chodkowski, William M. 2012. “The United States Information Agency Fact Sheet,” American Security Project.

Olmsted, M. S., B. Baer, J. Joyce, and G. M. Prince. 1984. "Women at state: An inquiry into the status of women in the United States Department of State." *Washington: Women's Research and Education Institute of the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues*.

Web Sources

"100 Women: 'Why I Invented the Glass Ceiling Phrase'." BBC News. BBC, December 13, 2017. https://www.bbc.com/news/world-42026266.

"Biography of Kathleen Stephens." U.S. Department of State. U.S. Department of State. https://2001-2009.state.gov/p/eur/rls/or/29465.htm.

"Home," 2022. https://www.koreasociety.org/.

"Julia Chang Bloch," The American Academy of Diplomacy, August 23, 2018, https://www.academyofdiplomacy.org/member/julia-chang-bloch/.

"Kathleen Stephens." Freeman Spogli Institute for International Relations. https://fsi.stanford.edu/people/kathleen_stephens.

"Kathleen Stephens: U.S. Ambassador to the Republic of Korea." About the Ambassador – Embassy of the United States Seoul, Korea. https://web.archive.org/web/20100527172907/https://seoul.usembassy.gov/biography.ht

ml.

"Nepal - The Panchayat System," Nepal - The Panchayat System (The Library of Congress). http://countrystudies.us/nepal/60.htm

"Office of the Historian of the State Department Guide to Country Recognition and Relations" U.S. Department of State. https://history.state.gov/countries.

Malaysia

Nepal

Republic of Korea (South Korea)

"USAID History," U.S. Agency for International Development, May 7, 2019. https://www.usaid.gov/who-we-are/usaid-history.

"WFPG New Leadership." Home. Accessed March 20, 2022. https://www.wfpg.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=735.

Women's Foreign Policy Group. "About Wfpg." Home. Accessed March 20, 2022. https://www.wfpg.org/about-wfpg.

Wikipedia Sources

Wikipedia. 2022. "Coup d'état of December Twelfth." Last modified February 20, 2022. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Coup_d%27%C3%A9tat_of_December_Twelfth.

Wikipedia. 2022. “Korean Air Flight 858.” Last modified March 19, 2022. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Korean_Air_Flight_858.

Wikipedia. 2022. “1988 Summer Olympics.” Last modified February 24, 2022. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1988_Summer_Olympics.