Annual Review of Political Science

Gender and International Relations

Laura Sjoberg[1] and Cameron G. Thies[2]

[1]Royal Holloway, University of London, London, United Kingdom;
email: laura.sjoberg@rhul.ac.uk

[2]James Madison College, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, USA;
email: thiescam@msu.edu

Annu. Rev. Political Sci. 2023. 26:451–67

The *Annual Review of Political Science* is online at polisci.annualreviews.org

https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-051120-110954

Keywords

gender, sexuality, international relations, political economy, foreign policy

Abstract

This is both an exciting and fraught time in the study of gender and sexuality in global politics. On the one hand, feminist scholars build on more than 30 years of research in the field, with increasingly diverse scholars doing increasingly interdisciplinary research. On the other hand, crises like the COVID-19 pandemic, the war in Ukraine, and global inflation have shown that there are many sites of sharp, continuing gender inequities. In response to this combined excitement and challenge, this article addresses four areas of gender and IR research that are both enduring and growing: gender and political economy, gender and security, queer approaches, and feminist foreign policy. As we discuss each of these areas, we begin with a recent exemplar of scholarship and then discuss other scholarship in that area to give a sense of contours of each subfield of inquiry.

I have been a woman
for a long time
beware my smile
I am treacherous with old magic
and the noon's new fury
with all your wide futures
promised
I am
woman
and not white.

—Audre Lorde, "A Woman Speaks"

INTRODUCTION

This is both an exciting and fraught time in the study of gender and sexuality in global politics. On the one hand, feminist scholars of international relations (IR) specifically and global politics generally have more than 30 years of explicit scholarly engagement with gender and global politics to read, engage, and build from—a canon, which did not exist when pioneering scholars such as Tickner (1988), Whitworth (1989), Peterson (1992), Zalewski (1993), Weber (1994), Sylvester (1993), Pettman (1996), Enloe (1989), and Cohn (1987), among others, started relying on interdisciplinary work to theorize explicitly feminist international relations.[1] On top of that built "body" of scholarship, the community studying gender and global politics is both more interdisciplinary and more diverse than it has ever been before.[2] These voices are communicating with a much more engaged set of policy communities than earlier generations of scholars have been able to access. Across the international policy landscape, discussions of women's rights, gender equality, and gender mainstreaming have gone from the exception to the norm (see, e.g., Arat 2015, Inglehart & Norris 2003, Kristoff & WuDunn 2009).

On the other hand, crises like the COVID-19 pandemic (Harman 2021), the war in Ukraine (Peng 2022), and global inflation (Caglar 2022) have shown that there are many sites of sharp, continuing gender inequities in global politics, overlaid on increasingly visible and violent transphobia (Tudor 2021), the strength of the carceral state (Axster et al. 2021), and economic crisis (Waylen 2021). The blindnesses of some (increasingly plural) feminisms to sexualities (e.g., Richter-Montpetit 2018, Leigh 2017), race (e.g., Shepherd 2022, Chowdhry & Nair 2003, Agathangelou 2013, Weerawardhana 2018), and coloniality (e.g., Agathangelou 2017, Gomes & Marques 2021, Picq 2013) have come to be both more easily recognizable and more easily understood as problematic. After 30 years of disciplinary (and even "disciplined") feminist work in IR,[3] feminist scholars still struggle to find acceptance of feminist knowledge in the field generally and in the United

[1]This list is nowhere near comprehensive. Some of the interdisciplinary works that inspired early feminist work in IR (also not a comprehensive list) are those of Keller (1985), Harding (1986), Reardon (1985), and Stiehm (1982).

[2]For an example of this, see the 2022 *International Feminist Journal of Politics* Conference Program, **https://www.ifjpglobal.org/2022-conference-program**, which is multinational, multilingual, and multidisciplinary. For exemplars of recent scholarship, see de Almagro & Ryan (2019), Gentry (2020), Henry (2021), and Lai (2020).

[3]We use the term "disciplined" to talk about the efforts made in feminist IR work to fit into IR as such—efforts that alter the appearance and structure of some feminist inquiries.

States specifically. Cooptation (e.g., Keohane 1989) and trivialization (e.g., Reiter 2015) continue to plague relations between feminist and so-called mainstream (malestream) IR, despite increasing acknowledgment of the importance of gender in global politics. Old issues like the relationship between gender and peace and newer questions like how feminisms and queer approaches intersect are important for the field to engage, and serve to inspire continuing research.

Lorde's poem, then, feels timely for feminist IR. The field must continue to defend its existence and its research practices, and within the field, race-based exclusions remain. It is unclear how to address some of these structural problems and/or define relationships going forward. Yet, several exemplar works exist, and many scholars are doing a good job navigating these tough dynamics. As such, like most times in any "herstory" of feminist IR research, this moment holds a sense of both accomplishment and challenge. In this article, we address four areas of gender and IR inquiry that are both enduring and growing: research on gender and political economy, research on gender and security, queer IR research, and research on feminist foreign policy. In each of these areas, we begin with a discussion of one recent exemplar of scholarship and then review other scholarship in that area to give a sense of contours of each subfield of inquiry. We critically reflect on significant developments in each subfield and look forward to the ways in which the inquiry may continue to grow and adapt.

GENDER AND GLOBAL POLITICAL ECONOMY

What does it mean to look at global political economy through gender lenses?[4] Feminist scholars have repeatedly suggested that this is the wrong question, because looking at political economy without attention to gender cannot present a comprehensive picture. When one ignores gender, one misses not only the gendered structures of political economies but also many of the gendered locations of political-economic activity, gendered political-economic processes, and gendered discourses around political-economic institutions and exchanges. Feminist scholars asking where gender is in political economy, then, have suggested that it must be understood as *everywhere*—across institutions, processes, and actors in the global political economy. And it is *everyday*—always a part of lived experiences in a wide variety of contexts.

Juanita Elias and Shirin Rai's (2019) "Feminist Everyday Political Economy: Space, Time, and Violence" serves as an exemplar of where the literature on gender and global political economy is, and where it could go. The piece focuses a feminist international political economy (IPE) perspective on "the everyday," which is "conceptualized both as a site of political struggle and a site within which social relations are (re)produced and governed" (Elias & Rai 2019, p. 201). With feminist IR theorizing more broadly, Elias and Rai draw attention away both from the institutions on which traditionally recognized scholars and scholarship have focused and from traditional methods of analysis. This is not because those institutions are unimportant but because analysis of those institutions constitutes only a small part of what global political economy should see; it is imperative to go beyond the traditional scope of disciplinary engagement to look at a broader picture. Bringing to bear a feminist reading of the everyday, the authors center their view of the everyday in political economy around social reproduction, with theorizations of space, time, and violence (Elias & Rai 2019, p. 201). With this perspective, Elias & Rai (2019, p. 202) elucidate a variety of the gendered and raced dimensions of global capitalisms in people's lives—where they "set out an analytical framework that makes visible the coconstitutiveness of social reproduction and everyday life by showing how space, time, and violence shapes and remakes both." Complementing past

[4]We take "gender lenses" from Peterson & Runyan (1992), who describe it as looking for gender and seeing what you find.

feminist work that focused on structural readings (e.g., Peterson 2004, Fraser & Jaeggi 2018) of gendered international political economies, Elias & Rai (2019, pp. 207, 210, 214) look at everyday experiences as "embedded in regimes of class-, racialized, and sex-based exclusion" and therefore engage in "mapping space and positioning women and men within it" to reveal "how gendered violence underpins the everyday. . .[in] regimes of labor, law, and policy." Addressing themes from work hours to household organization, Elias & Rai (2019, p. 219) look to "prevent a refraction of the public and the private worlds, the marketised and nonmarketised economies of work and care," working instead to recognize the "gendered politics of the everyday" in the functions of both personal and international political economies.

Elias & Rai's (2019) focus on the everyday both echoes themes that have been resonant in feminist political economy (e.g., Elias & Roberts 2016, Hoskyns & Rai 2007, Rai et al. 2014) and builds on previous research by critically evaluating everyday life rather than taking it as a conceptual given. Pairing critical feminist research on everyday labor (e.g., Prugl 1999; Mies 1982; Chin 1998, 2013; Tungohan 2013)[5] with theoretical approaches to understanding political economies from feminist perspectives (e.g., Peterson 2010, True 2012, Pateman 1988, Elson 2010, Agathangelou 2004), the authors explore complex, but intrinsic, relationships between genders, races, power, and political economies (Elias & Rai 2019, Wright 2006). This contributes to a decades-long research program that has worked to critique "the mainstream of economics" in favor of "a gendered understanding of institutions and economic processes," which "has examined the place of gender relations in the emerging global political economy and changing international division[s] of labor" (Waylen 1997, p. 206, citing Whitworth 1994; see also Beneria 1995, Ong 1987).

In this context, feminist research on political economy has retheorized relationships between capitalism and carceral relations (LeBaron & Roberts 2010, Collins 2000), corporeal capitalism (Smith & Lee 2015, Smith 2012), the political economy of crisis and scandal (Hozic & True 2016, 2017; Kantola 2018), and globalizations (Bergeron 2001, Marchand & Runyan 2010). Recent research in feminist political economy has explored the intersections between political economy and security research, substantively (Chisholm & Stachowitsch 2017, Elias 2015, de Almagro & Ryan 2020, Agathangelou 2017) and methodologically (Wibben 2014, Stern 2017); drawn attention to the potentialities of queer political economy (Smith 2020, Gore 2022, Weber 2016a, Kapoor 2015); and used the tools of feminist analysis to investigate the COVID-19 pandemic (Cohen & van der Meulen Rodgers 2021, Lokot & Bhatia 2020, Kabeer et al. 2021). This builds on work that explores global trade politics (Hannah et al. 2021), transnational business feminisms (Roberts 2015b), banking (Griffin 2009), and finance (Roberts 2015a, Griffin 2013). Across these contributions, "feminist political economists have also critiqued existing economic analyses and approaches, making great strides in improving the tools of economic analysis in both gendering existing ones and developing new ones" (Rai & Waylen 2014, p. 9; see also Bedford & Rai 2010, Pettman 1996).

Returning to the question of what it means to look at global political economy through gender lenses, then, recent work demonstrates in specific and careful context the early feminist claim that it is indeed impossible to look at global political economy comprehensively *without* gender lenses. Such approaches miss both structural genderings and gendered lived experiences, and therefore tell inaccurate stories of what political economies are, as well as how they work, how they can be accessed, and how they can be understood. Intersectional feminist analysis of global political economies has made a strong case that gender, race, class, and political economies are so intricately interwoven that they must be analyzed together. Looking to leverage this body of work

[5] See also *I-PEEL: International Political Economy of Everyday Life* (**http://i-peel.org**).

both for future scholarly analysis and in policy advocacy, feminist global political economists have made a case for, and continue to show the importance of, integrating gender analysis into every study of global political economy and every political-economic policy, practice, and process. That means continuing to work on moving "gender and political economy" from an often-marginalized subfield of political-economic work (and feminist work) to the center of theoretical and practical analyses.

GENDER AND SECURITY

A similar case can be made for thinking about the relationship between gender and security in the global political arena. Feminist scholars looking for gender lenses have shown that security in global politics takes place not only between great powers or in military strategy but among various actors and across various situations. When Enloe (1983) asked where the women are in global security, she was not just asking the field to look for female people and record what they do. Instead, she was making the argument that looking for women also reveals gendered spaces, places, processes, and impacts that were previously invisible to or ignored by those who designated themselves as the scholars of security in IR. Rather than just assuming women are irrelevant to the concerns of war and security and/or unidimensionally positioned to advocate for peace, work in Feminist Security Studies (FSS)[6] has shown the many ways that gender matters in security contexts, and the complexities of gender dynamics in international security.

Feminist work on the Women, Peace, and Security (WPS) agenda is an example of both of these key moves—showing the importance of gender in security contexts, and revealing that gender in security has many multidimensional, rather than simple, implications. Along these lines, Laura Shepherd's (2021) *Narrating the Women, Peace, and Security Agenda* studies the stories that are told about the WPS agenda, built from United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325, in global politics. Seeing WPS "as a policy agenda that emerges in and through the stories are told about it," Shepherd (2021, p. 6) argues that how WPS is narrated "is as politically significant" as the resolution itself and claims made about it. Approaching not only the WPS agenda but (gender and) security from a poststructuralist feminist perspective, Shepherd (2021, p. 16) finds logics of (in)coherence, (im)possibility, (dis)location, and ambivalent practice in accounts of the evolution of WPS—with parentheticals because the logics are "intrinsically plural, resisting closure." In addition to providing a masterclass in the study of narratives, discourse, and logic for IR scholars of all stripes, *Narrating the Women, Peace, and Security Agenda* offers an in-depth account of ownership and origin stories; narratives of success and failure; narratives of tension and pressures; and narratives of silence, secrets, and sensibilities surrounding the WPS agenda. Along the way, Shepherd (2021) expertly deals with questions of what it means to represent women, what it means to represent gender, and how gender/security assemblages come to have meaning. The book tackles difficult questions about when feminist principles meet policy intricacies, what comes of advocates' ambitions when they seem to get what they want but it turns out not to be all they aspired to, and the complexities of what it might mean to seek gender equality in the security sector specifically and global politics generally. Interested in the "how-possible" questions, Shepherd (2021, pp. 7,

[6]"FSS" was informally used as a term of art in early feminist work on security (e.g., Tickner 1997, Hansen 2001), and more formally later (e.g., Sjoberg 2009, Shepherd 2009, Wibben 2010). Suggestions that the label FSS is too mainstream-facing (e.g., Cohn 2011), is problematically Eurocentric (e.g., Basu 2013, Teaiwa & Slatter 2013, D'Costa & Lee-Koo 2013, Parashar 2013), and constitutes an artificial separation between security and political economy (e.g., Elias & Rai 2015, de Almagro & Ryan 2020, Agathangelou 2017) have inspired the exercise of caution in this grouping of late.

147) argues that "effective political engagement" with (gender-based) policy agendas "depends on sitting with, and finding the productive potential in, multiplicity, polysemy, and ambivalence."

Shepherd's (2021) *Narrating the Women, Peace, and Security Agenda* both builds on and exemplifies many recent trends in the study of gender and global security. For more than 30 years, feminist scholars in IR have been meticulously looking at how a range of security situations in the global political arena are gendered, from cans of soup (Enloe 1983) to camptown prostitution (Moon 1997), from intrastate conflict (Parashar 2014) to private military corporations (Eichler 2015), from "intimate warfare" (Pain 2015) to nuclear warfare (Das 2010), and from disarmament and demobilization processes (MacKenzie 2009) to international courts (Sellers 2009). Across this work, feminists have argued that gender is "necessary, conceptually, for understanding international security, it is important in analyzing causes and predicting outcomes, and it is essential to thinking about solutions and promoting positive change in the security realm" (Sjoberg 2009, p. 200). To accomplish this, feminist scholars have found it indispensable to look at the discursive deployment of gender in security (e.g., Shepherd 2008, 2017), the intersections between gender and race in international (in)security (e.g., Agathangelou 2013, de Leon 2020, Henry 2021), the complexity of relationships between gender and violence (e.g., Medie 2020, True 2015, Sjoberg et al. 2018), and the importance of sexualities in security (Weber 1999, 2016a; Rao 2018).

If feminist research on security has shown the ways that associations with gender have shaped and been shaped by a variety of security interactions (e.g., Shepherd 2008), it has also shown that not all associations of gender and security are the same, and that it is important to see the many dimensions and complexities in gender and security in theory and in practice. The WPS agenda is a case in point: Some of the WPS resolutions suggest a necessary (or essential) relationship between women and peace—where women are "essential to international peace and security" in part because women are associated with peace and peacefulness (for elaboration, see Shepherd 2008, Sjoberg 2013).[7] This gender essentialism can feed (and be fed by) a notion that women are essential to national security not because they are people but because of their peacefulness (e.g., Hudson et al. 2012), which can instrumentalize women and cause unrealistic expectations (e.g., Kronsell 2012, de Almagro 2018, Razavi 2021). The question is not whether women are more peaceful or whether femininities are associated with peacefulness, but how gender tropes and understandings of war and peace are interrelated. These complexities suggest that there is not just one reading of gender, gendering, or security, but myriad perspectives. A strong and still-developing research program in gender and security shows the many ways that gender is integral to theorizing security, across levels of analysis, across time and space, and intersectionally with race, class, culture, religion, and nationalities (for more comprehensive accounts of the field, see, e.g., Dingli & Purewal 2018, Gentry et al. 2018, Medie & Kang 2018, Sjoberg 2020).

Asking what security looks like through gender lenses, then, leads to multiple answers, all of which show the centrality of gender to thinking about international security. Following Cohn's (2011) reflection, work in gender and security has pursued both what it looks like to do security studies (as traditionally understood) with a feminist perspective, and also what it looks like to reconceptualize security as feminist security (with attention to gendered securities and insecurities first). The combination of these perspectives is fueling feminist inquiry into a number of contemporary security situations, including but not limited to the war in Ukraine (e.g., Peng 2022), climate-based migration (e.g., Detraz & Windsor 2014), and antigender movements (Thomson &

[7] While significant scholarship on gender and security has traced the importance of feminist peace movements (e.g., Confortini 2012, Cockburn 2010, de Alwis 2009), this is not to be confused with the idea that women are more peaceful than men. There is a significant research program in FSS on women's participation in (even gendered) violence (e.g., Gentry 2020, Parashar 2014, Giri 2021).

Whiting 2022). At the core of many of these questions is how (and how essentially) gender tropes are intertwined with ideas and practices of security. Looking forward, feminist work on security has the potential to pursue an increasingly nuanced approach to the relationship between gender and peace (e.g., Vayrynen et al. 2021) as well as security practices (e.g., Shepherd 2021) and security theory (e.g., Sjoberg 2013).

QUEER INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

In early work in gender and international relations, feminist scholars focused on the ways that IR scholars had neglected women—from women leaders to the spaces across global politics occupied by women to the ways in which the lived experiences of women broaden how global politics might be understood. Even early in feminist IR, though, scholars made sure to point out that gender cannot be reduced to sex binaries (e.g., Peterson & Runyan 1992, Tickner 1992) and that it is important to understand how sex and sexualities matter in global politics (Peterson 1999, Weber 1999). "Queer International Relations" came into popular usage less than a decade ago (see, e.g., Weber 2015, 2016a,b; Weber & Sjoberg 2014), but queer work in the field is not as young as the formal label. Weber's (1999) *Faking It* demonstrated that US policy toward Cuba can be accounted for in part by sexualized notions of masculine nationalisms, and Peterson's (1999) "Political Identities/Nationalism as Heterosexism" argued that nationalisms rely on and reify heterosexisms. Building on globally focused queer scholarship (e.g., Puar 2007, Binnie & Bell 2000, Haritaworn et al. 2014) and feminist IR, queer IR work has engaged in "analyzing figurations of 'the homosexual' and sexualized orders of IR. . .read[ing] plural figures and plural logics that signify as normal *and/or* perverse (and which might be prescribed as queer)" (Weber 2016b, p. 11, italics in original). This work has grown into a research program that examines sex and sexuality in global politics, leverages queer theory to understand various global political situations, and looks at the intersections between gender, race, sexuality, and coloniality in global politics.

Out of Time: The Queer Politics of Postcoloniality (Rao 2020) both exemplifies and furthers all three of these research trends. In it, Rahul Rao (2020, p. 9) examines "the manner in which contemporary struggles over queer freedoms return to the scene of the colonial," especially as "the project of decoloniality might itself become a vehicle for the politicization of 'homophobia.'" As Rao (2020, p. 10) relates, "queer postcolonial presents are marked by the shadow of both past and future, with temporal zones offering distinct resources and terrains for struggle." Looking at moments of intersections of postcoloniality and homosexuality across geography and institutions in global politics, Rao (2020, p. 26) works "in the interstices between international relations, political theory, and queer studies" to temporally contextualize Western modernity and show the ways that a colonial sense of temporal belatedness is used as a signifier in debates about sexualities in (global) politics. *Out of Time* pairs a rigorous case for the global relevance of decolonial queer theorizing with an impressive queer analysis of time, space, and movements for LGBTI (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, intersex) emancipation (Rao 2020). Chapter 2 elucidates "two discursive constructions of homophobia in Uganda" (p. 34)—one that pictures homophobia as deep-rooted and pervasive there and another that holds Western antigay activists almost entirely responsible for homophobia in Uganda—and theoretically "navigates between the perils of homonationalism and homoromanticism" (p. 71).

In exploring this, Rao (2020, p. 71) looks to "unsettle orientalist practices of locating homophobia" through a reading "out of time." Across the rest of the text, Rao (2020, pp. 135, 138, 181) explores "structural dependence of racism and queerphobia" in British evocations of the queer enslaved, relationships between homocapitalism and temporal references to queerness, and juridical temporalities of queerness in India, among other relationships between coloniality, sexuality, and

time. At once extending the key postcolonial move of "countering orientalism by demonstrating the mutual constitution of core and periphery" and offering the contribution of temporal and spatial "dis-orientation," Rao (2020, pp. 219, 220) contributes the latest careful study to a growing literature in what has come to be called queer IR while also providing key insights for fieldwork and decolonial studies.

Queer work in IR, then, has addressed a wide variety of issues in global politics, from sexual histories of capitalism (e.g., Smith 2020, Rao 2020) to the WPS agenda (e.g., Hagen 2016), from Iraq war crimes (e.g., Richter-Montpetit 2007) to global queer rights (e.g., Rahman 2014), from airport security (Shepherd & Sjoberg 2012) to military cultures (e.g., Belkin 2012), and from reproduction (Weissman 2017) to conflict sexual violence (Drumond et al. 2020). Scholars have thought about queer IR's allies (Nayak 2014), the "proper objects" of IR scholarship (Wilcox 2014), and how queer visibility matters in global politics (Lind 2014). Queer research in IR has also considered whether queer IR and feminist IR are fellow travelers, and how to resolve tensions between studies of gender(s) and studies of sexualities (e.g., Weber 2016a, Leigh 2017). Recent work has looked at the intersections between sexualities and race across global politics (e.g., Rao 2020, Weerawardhana 2018, Weber 2016a, Diaz Calderon 2021). Across this work, as Richter-Montpetit (2018, p. 240) explains, "the emerging 'queer turn' in IR extends and reworks critical IR epistemologies, ontologies, and methods." This includes questioning and critiquing binary understandings of sex/gender and other phenomena in global politics, looking for how sexualities play a role in global social and political relations, and taking care to recognize the plethora of different figurations of sexualities and sexual figurations in global politics (Weber 2016a).

In a review of four recent books on queer IR (Weber 2016a, Picq & Thiel 2015, Altman & Symons 2016, Weiss & Bosia 2013), Rao (2018, p. 142) identifies needs to pay attention to "queer life outside the frame of LGBT identity politics," to preserve the "radical potential" of queer theorizing, and to look into the ways that "deployment of queer insights disrupts IR-as-usual in a necessary prelude to the imagination of alternative worlds." These goals match with some recent work on gender, sexuality, and global politics, including Gentry's (2020) *Disordered Violence: How Gender, Race, and Heteronormativity Structure Terrorism*, which gives a comprehensive account of heterosexisms in terrorism studies, and Lauren Wilcox's *War Beyond the Human* (unpublished book manuscript), which accounts for queer subjects and objects in/of posthuman warfare. In addition to providing substantive information on sexuality and global politics (e.g., Picq & Thiel 2015), queer IR work has made theoretical contributions toward making IR theorizing more complex and more capable of accounting for sexualities (e.g., Weber 2016a), and providing methodological contributions to fieldwork (e.g., Rao 2020) and how to conceptualize global politics (e.g., Weber 2016b, Perez 2022). Research synergies between queer IR, global queer theory, and feminist work on sexuality are growing and continue to contribute to the understanding of gender(s) and sexuality/ies in global politics (for more comprehensive accounts, see, e.g., Richter-Montpetit 2018, Rao 2018, Richter-Montpetit & Weber 2017, Weissman & Sjoberg 2019, Langlois 2016).

Looking forward, there are a number of questions for queer IR to approach, both in global politics and in disciplinary IR. In the global political arena, queer work can and will continue to explore gender and sexualities, as well as the different ways that recognizing gender and sexualities through queer theory can provide greater understanding of dynamics across global politics. In disciplinary IR, queer research can and will continue to explore questions related to the relationship between queer and feminist work (Richter-Montpetit 2018), the ways in which queer epistemology and methods can contribute to IR inquiry (Weber 2016a), and the ways in which queer approaches can help to clarify the meanings and analyses of traditional concepts in IR (Weber & Sjoberg 2014).

FEMINIST FOREIGN POLICY

One of the questions that gender and IR scholarship has dealt with throughout its history is what to make of substate actors, states, and international organizations that express explicit commitment to gender equality and even feminisms. As we discussed above with reference to the United Nations Security Council's leadership on the WPS agenda, the identification of gender as a policy priority is not always accompanied by gender-just results, or even by the intent to pursue gender justice. Instead, "official" commitments to gender equality range from genuine and effective to instrumental or even disingenuous. Over the last decade, several states have come to adopt what they identify as feminist foreign policy—that is, a foreign policy which is (or at least claims to be) supported by explicit commitments to feminisms. Gender and IR scholars have asked what feminism means in these contexts, how feminist foreign policies are constructed, how feminist foreign policies are instituted, how the institution of feminist foreign policies is received by other states and institutions, and how effective feminist foreign policies have been or could be.

A recent exemplar of analysis of the intricacies of feminist foreign policy is Fiona Robinson's (2021) "Feminist Foreign Policy as Ethical Foreign Policy? A Care Ethics Perspective," which contributes to a growing literature studying the development of feminist foreign policies by states in the global political arena (e.g., Aggestam et al. 2019, Thomson 2020, Bergman Rosamond 2020). Robinson echoes a theme which other feminist scholars of politics have observed in a variety of contexts: that (especially states) calling something feminist does not render it unproblematic and does not mean that it either seeks or produces gender equality or gender justice (see, for example, the literature on state feminism, e.g., Lovenduski 2005, McBride & Mazur 2010, Mazur 1995, Walby 2005). Instead, Robinson (2021, p. 20) explains that "a liberal cosmopolitan approach to feminist foreign policy reproduces existing relations of power, including gender power relations and Western liberal modes of domination." Noting the academic interest in feminist foreign policy in response to publicly declared commitments to the principle by Sweden and Canada (e.g., Aggestam & Bergman Rosamond 2016, Vucetic 2017), Robinson (2021, pp. 21, 22) explores "the discursive positioning of 'feminist' public and foreign policy as 'ethical' and the implications of this for both feminism and ethics" by looking at "recent diplomatic crises faced by Sweden and Canada in their relationships with the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia." Uncomfortable with the positioning of feminist foreign policy as an ethical alternative to unethical foreign policy behavior, Robinson (2021, p. 29) instead suggests that "feminist governments should interrogate the role of states—including their own—in supporting liberal militarism, and thereby contributing to its gendered effects" (citing Stavrianakis 2016). After critiquing approaches to feminist foreign policy based on liberal cosmopolitanism, Robinson (2021, p. 31) argues that "an ethic of care might inform a feminist foreign policy in ways that allow it to challenge, rather than reinforce, gendered binaries between realism and idealism, order and justice, and masculine and feminine."[8] Particularly, Robinson (2021, p. 34) finds it crucial that "feminist foreign policy must not be driven by shaming and punishing 'backward' countries while simultaneously seeking to empower their girls and women" in ways that "fail to reveal the roots of the problem of women's oppression."

Robinson's (2021) approach to feminist foreign policy is one among many in this developing literature. Aggestam & Bergman Rosamond (2018, p. 30) examine "how the politicization of this gender-security nexus is discursively articulated and practiced in the case of feminist foreign policy" to look at different forms of political rationality, fluctuations in the politicization of security, and the likelihood of an upswing in that politicization. Characterizing particularly Swedish feminist foreign policy as both a discursive shift and a show of substantive continuity, Aggestam &

[8]Robinson (2021) citing Gilligan (1993, 2011), Hekman (1995), and Tronto (2013).

Bergman Rosamond (2018, p. 44) see it as having potential for "building on historical practices as well as adding a new stronger emphasis to the links between gender equality and political and transformative global security change." On the other hand, Achilleos-Sarll (2018, p. 34) suggests that it is crucial to "theorise more effectively the relationship among gender, sexuality, race, and foreign policy." To do this, Achilleos-Sarll (2018, pp. 36, 40, 41, 43) looks to "develop a postcolonial feminist approach to foreign policy (analysis)" to address the fact that "western, first world feminist discourse has a troubled relationship with colonialism"[9] by centering intersectionality[10] to ask "how gender—and its interlocking modalities of race and sexuality—conditions the process of policy-making as well as the production of policies."

The idea that foreign policy should be feminist in some way is broader than the adoption of explicitly feminist foreign policy (see, e.g., Hudson et al. 2012, McDermott 2015, Diaz & Valji 2019, Brysk & Mehta 2014). Scheyer & Kumskova (2019, p. 57) emphasize caution in designing feminist foreign policies; while "governments that adopt such action envision a world where women's rights are equally important to those of men," it is problematic that "current practices of purportedly feminist foreign policy do not reflect an authentically feminist approach." Given that "there is no agreed on definition of feminist foreign policy," Scheyer & Kumskova (2019, p. 61) draw up a number of indicators for distinguishing feminist foreign policy from "adding women." These include political dialogue, safety and well-being, empathetic community, inclusion and intersectionality, and gender analysis. Zhukova et al. (2022, p. 195) frame feminist foreign policies as strategic narratives rather than as straightforward, and they engage the different bases (in liberalism and in intersectionality) and different foci (in law, economics, security, and rights).[11] Analysis of feminist foreign policy has been applied widely across global politics, including to policy development in South Africa (e.g., Haastrup 2020), Australia (Aggestam & Bergman Rosamond 2019, Lee-Koo 2020), and even Iran and the United States (Moghadam 2021). Scholars have addressed the security sector (Zhukova 2021), political economy (Brannstrom & Gunneflo 2021), and human rights (Smith & Ajadi 2020). This growing literature examines questions of the complex relationships between feminist advocacy, foreign policy making, instrumentality, and gender equality.

This work engages with early questions in the field about what a feminist perspective on a particular policy issue might be—like Zalewski's (1995) question about what a feminist perspective on Bosnia might be. With Zalewski, the growing literature on feminist foreign policy argues that there is not one feminist perspective but many, and that there are many layers to fraught, gendered policy situations that neither start nor end with self-identification as feminist or interested in gender equality.

LOOKING FORWARD

Perhaps every scholar who studies gender and IR has a view of what they hope the future of the field might be, and perhaps all of those wish lists are different. We ourselves are not particularly interested in advancing a single research agenda or even a set of research agendas—we are more interested in thinking about the commitments that we hope *our* future scholarship on gender and IR might have. We are inspired by and hope to continue the intricate, complex, intersectional analyses that have been developed in gender and IR scholarship in recent years.

[9] Achilleos-Sarll (2018) citing Grewal & Kaplan (1994).
[10] Achilleos-Sarll (2018) citing Crenshaw (1991), Collins (1989), and Nagel (2003).
[11] Zhukova et al. (2022) citing Bergman Rosamond (2020), Parisi (2020), Aggestam & True (2021), and Haastrup et al. (2019).

This makes us think of a series of principles that we intend to keep in mind. First, we hope that our future gender and IR scholarship, like much of the work we have highlighted here, pays close attention to what is going on in local and global politics at the time that we are doing the research—tracking the pulse of contemporary struggles and their gender-unequal effects. Second, also in keeping with what we see as a sustainable trend in feminist scholarship on/in global politics, we hope that our future gender and IR scholarship is intersectional, both in how it thinks about gender in global politics and in its scholarly and citational practices. Third, perhaps contrary to a trend in the field, we hope that our future scholarship in gender and global politics continues to be committed to both feminist and queer lenses, where feminisms are explicitly interested in redressing gender subordination, and queer scholarship is invested in both overturning heteronormativity and disordering global politics scholarship (e.g., Shepherd 2008, Weber 2016a). Fourth, we hope that our scholarship in gender and global politics does not dictate others' work in the field. Rather than look for coherence or progressiveness, we are interested in exploring creative directions for our scholarship, and we hope others do as well. Finally, we hope that our and others' scholarship works to broaden rather than narrow the field, where trends in the field are democratizing and decolonizing (e.g., rethinking gender and decentering global politics) rather than disciplining (e.g., privileging measurability and publication venue).

We are excited about adopting these principles to contribute to not only one stream of work in gender and IR, but multiple streams that address multiple different contexts in innovative ways. The breadth and diversity of scholarship on gender and IR have been strengths of the subfield since its inception, and those strengths continue to grow. Gender and IR work is more and more international, more and more intersectional, and more and more decolonial. Going forward, it will be important to continue a long feminist tradition of reflexivity about the power dynamics in and of feminist research—among researchers, in the field, in the world, and at their many intersections—relying on feminist epistemologies, feminist methods, and feminist practices (e.g., Ackerly et al. 2006).

DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The authors are not aware of any affiliations, memberships, funding, or financial holdings that might be perceived as affecting the direction of this review.

LITERATURE CITED

Achilleos-Sarll C. 2018. Reconceptualising feminist foreign policy as gendered, sexualised, and racialised: toward a postcolonial feminist foreign policy (analysis). *J. Int. Women's Stud.* 19(1):34–49

Ackerly B, Stern M, True J, eds. 2006. *Feminist Methodologies in International Relations*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press

Agathangelou AM. 2004. *The Global Political Economy of Sex: Desire, Violence, and Insecurity in Mediterranean Nation States*. Basingstoke: Palgrave

Agathangelou AM. 2013. Neoliberal geopolitical order and value: queerness as speculative economy and anti-Blackness as terror. *Int. Fem. J. Politics* 15(4):453–76

Agathangelou AM. 2017. From the colonial to feminist IR: feminist IR studies, the wider FSS/GPE research agenda, and the questions of value, valuation, security, and violence. *Politics Gender* 13(4):739–46

Aggestam K, Bergman Rosamond A. 2016. Swedish feminist foreign policy in the making: ethics, politics, and gender. *Ethics Int. Aff.* 30(3):323–34

Aggestam K, Bergman Rosamond A. 2018. Re-politicising the gender-security nexus: Sweden's feminist foreign policy. *Eur. Rev. Int. Stud.* 5(3):30–48

Aggestam K, Bergman Rosamond A. 2019. Feminist foreign policy 3.0: advancing ethics and gender equality in global politics. *SAIS Rev. Int. Aff.* 39(1):37–48

Aggestam K, Bergman Rosamond A, Kronsell A. 2019. Theorising feminist foreign policy. *Int. Relat.* 33(1):23–39

Aggestam K, True J. 2021. Political leadership and gendered multilevel games in foreign policy. *Int. Aff.* 97(2):385–404

Altman D, Symons J. 2016. *Queer Wars: The New Global Polarization over Gay Rights*. Cambridge, UK: Polity

Arat ZFK. 2015. Feminisms, women's rights, and the UN: Would achieving gender equality empower women? *Am. Political Sci. Rev.* 109(4):674–89

Axster S, Danewid I, Goldstein A, Mahmoudi M, Tansel CB, Wilcox L. 2021. Colonial lives of the carceral archipelago: rethinking the neoliberal security state. *Int. Political Sociol.* 15(3):415–39

Basu S. 2013. Emancipatory potential in feminist security studies. *Int. Stud. Perspect.* 14(4):455–58

Bedford K, Rai SM. 2010. Feminists theorize international political economy. *Signs J. Women Cult. Soc.* 36(1):1–18

Belkin A. 2012. *Bring Me Men: Military Masculinity and the Benign Façade of American Empire, 1898–2001*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press

Beneria L. 1995. Toward a greater integration of gender in economics. *World Dev.* 23(11):1839–50

Bergeron S. 2001. Political economy discourses of globalization and feminist politics. *Signs J. Women Cult. Soc.* 26(4):983–1006

Bergman Rosamond A. 2020. Swedish feminist foreign policy and "gender cosmopolitanism." *Foreign Policy Anal.* 16(2):217–35

Binnie J, Bell D. 2000. *The Sexual Citizen: Queer Politics and Beyond*. Cambridge, UK: Polity

Brannstrom L, Gunneflo M. 2021. Swedish foreign policy feminisms: women, social democracy and capitalism. *Aust. Fem. Law J.* 47(2):207–27

Brysk A, Mehta A. 2014. Do rights at home boost rights abroad? Sexual equality and humanitarian foreign policy. *J. Peace Res.* 51(1):97–110

Caglar G. 2022. Decentering political authority and power: feminist global governance studies in Europe. In *Feminist IR in Europe*, ed. M Stern, AE Towns, pp. 153–70. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan

Chin CBN. 1998. *In Service and Servitude: Foreign Female Domestic Workers and the Malaysia Modernity Project*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press

Chin CBN. 2013. *Cosmopolitan Sex Workers: Women and Migration in a Global City*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press

Chisholm A, Stachowitsch S. 2017. (Re)integrating feminist security studies and feminist global political economy: continuing the conversation. *Politics Gender* 13(4):710–15

Chowdhry G, Nair S, eds. 2003. *Power, Postcolonialism, and International Relations*. New York: Routledge

Cockburn C. 2010. Gender relations as causal in militarization and war: a feminist standpoint. *Int. Fem. J. Politics* 12(2):139–57

Cohen J, van der Meulen Rodgers Y. 2021. The feminist political economy of COVID-19: capitalism, women, and work. *Glob. Public Health* 16(8–9):1381–95

Cohn C. 1987. Sex and death in the rational world of defense intellectuals. *Signs J. Women Cult. Soc.* 12(4):687–718

Cohn C. 2011. "Feminist security studies": toward a reflexive practice. *Politics Gender* 7(4):581–86

Collins PH. 1989. The social construction of Black feminist thought. *Signs J. Women Cult. Soc.* 14(4):745–73

Collins PH. 2000. Gender, Black feminism, and Black political economy. *Ann. Am. Acad. Political Soc. Sci.* 568(1):41–53

Confortini CC. 2012. *Intelligent Compassion: Feminist Critical Methodology in the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press

Crenshaw K. 1991. Mapping the margins: intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Rev.* 43(6):1241–99

Das R. 2010. Colonial legacies, post-colonial (in)securities, and gender(ed) representations in South Asia's nuclear policies. *Soc. Identities* 16(6):717–40

D'Costa B, Lee-Koo K. 2013. The politics of voice: feminist security studies and the Asia-Pacific. *Int. Stud. Perspect.* 14(4):451–54

de Almagro MM. 2018. Producing participants: gender, race, class, and women, peace, and security. *Glob. Soc.* 32(4):395–414

de Almagro MM, Ryan C. 2019. Subverting economic empowerment: towards a postcolonial-feminist framework on gender (in)securities in post-war settings. *Eur. J. Int. Relat.* 25(4):1059–79
de Almagro MM, Ryan C. 2020. Introduction: (Re)integrating feminist security studies and global political economy: continuing the conversation through empirical perspectives. *Politics Gender* 16(3):e12
de Alwis M. 2009. Interrogating the "political": feminist peace activism in Sri Lanka. *Fem. Rev.* 91:81–93
de Leon J. 2020. Lakota experiences of (in)security: cosmology and ontological security. *Int. Fem. J. Politics* 22(1):333–62
Detraz N, Windsor L. 2014. Evaluating climate migration: population movement, insecurity, and gender. *Int. Fem. J. Politics* 16(1):127–46
Diaz PC, Valji N. 2019. Symbiosis of misogyny and violent extremism. *J. Int. Aff.* 72(2):37–56
Diaz Calderon J. 2021. A decolonial narrative of sexuality and world politics when race is everywhere and nowhere. *Crit. Stud. Secur.* 9(1):17–21
Dingli S, Purewal N. 2018. Gendering (in)security: interrogating security logics within states of exception. *Third World Themat.* 3(2):153–63
Drumond P, Mesok E, Zalewski M, eds. 2020. Special section: sexual violence in the wrong(ed) bodies: moving beyond the gender binary in international relations. *Int. Aff.* 96(5):1145–226
Eichler M, ed. 2015. *Gender and Private Security in Global Politics*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press
Elias J. 2015. Introduction: feminist security studies and feminist political economy: crossing divides and rebuilding bridges. *Politics Gender* 11(2):406–8
Elias J, Rai S. 2015. The everyday gendered political economy of violence. *Politics Gender* 11(2):424–29
Elias J, Rai S. 2019. Feminist everyday political economy: space, time, and violence. *Rev. Int. Stud.* 45(2):201–20
Elias J, Roberts A. 2016. Feminist global political economies of the everyday: from bananas to bingo. *Globalizations* 13(6):787–800
Elson D. 2010. Gender and the global economic crisis in developing crisis: a framework for analysis. *Gender Dev.* 18(2):201–12
Enloe C. 1983. *Does Khaki Become You? The Militarisation of Women's Lives.* Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
Enloe C. 1989. *Bananas, Beaches, and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics*. London: Pandora
Fraser N, Jaeggi R. 2018. *Capitalism: A Conversation in Critical Theory*. Cambridge, UK: Polity
Gentry C. 2020. *Disordered Violence: How Gender, Race, and Heteronormativity Structure Terrorism*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press
Gentry C, Shepherd LJ, Sjoberg L, eds. 2018. *The Routledge Handbook of Gender and Security*. London: Routledge
Gilligan C. 1993. *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press. 2nd ed.
Gilligan C. 2011. *Joining the Resistance*. Cambridge, UK: Polity
Giri K. 2021. Do all women combatants experience war and peace uniformly? Intersectionality and women combatants. *Glob. Stud. Q.* 1(2):ksab004
Gomes MS, Marques RR. 2021. Can securitization theory be saved from itself? A decolonial and feminist intervention. *Secur. Dialogue* 51(1 Suppl.):78–87
Gore E. 2022. Understanding queer oppression and resistance in the global political economy: towards a theoretical framework for political economy. *New Political Econ.* 27(2):296–311
Grewal I, Kaplan C. 1994. *Scattered Hegemonies: Postmodernity and Transnational Feminist Practices.* Minneapolis/London: Univ. Minn. Press
Griffin P. 2009. *Gendering the World Bank: Neoliberalism and the Gendered Foundations of Global Governance*. London: Palgrave
Griffin P. 2013. Gendering global finance: crisis, masculinity, and responsibility. *Men Masculinities* 16(1):9–34
Haastrup T. 2020. Gendering South Africa's foreign policy: toward a feminist approach? *Foreign Policy Anal.* 16(2):199–216
Haastrup T, Wright KAM, Guerrina R. 2019. Bringing gender in? EU foreign and security policy after Brexit. *Politics Gov.* 7(3):62–71
Hagen J. 2016. Queering women, peace, and security. *Int. Aff.* 92(2):313–32
Hannah E, Roberts A, Trommer S. 2021. Towards a feminist global trade politics. *Globalizations* 18(1):70–85

Hansen L. 2001. Gender, nation, rape: Bosnia and the construction of security. *Int. Fem. J. Politics* 3(1):55–75
Harding S. 1986. *The Science Question in Feminism*. Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Press
Haritaworn J, Kuntsman A, Posocco S, eds. 2014. *Queer Necropolitics*. New York: Routledge
Harman S. 2021. Threat not solution: gender, global health security, and COVID-19. *Int. Aff.* 97(3):601–23
Hekman SJ. 1995. *Moral Voices, Moral Selves: Carol Gilligan and Feminist Moral Theory* Cambridge, UK: Polity
Henry M. 2021. On the necessity of critical race feminism for women, peace, and security. *Crit. Stud. Secur.* 9(1):22–26
Hoskyns C, Rai SM. 2007. Recasting the global political economy. *New Political Econ.* 12(3):297–317
Hozic AA, True J, eds. 2016. *Scandalous Economics: Gender and the Politics of Financial Crises*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press
Hozic AA, True J. 2017. Brexit as a scandal: gender and global Trumpism. *Rev. Int. Political Econ.* 24(2):270–87
Hudson V, Ballif-Spanvill B, Caprioli M, Emmett C. 2012. *Sex and World Peace*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press
Inglehart R, Norris P. 2003. *Rising Tide: Gender Equality and Cultural Change around the World*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press
Kabeer N, Razavi S, van der Meulen Rodgers Y. 2021. Feminist economic perspectives on the COVID-19 pandemic. *Fem. Econ.* 27(1–2):1–29
Kantola J. 2018. Gender and the economic crisis: political parties as sites of feminist struggles. *Soc. Politics Int. Stud. Gender State Soc.* 25(3):361–82
Kapoor I. 2015. The queer Third World. *Third World Q.* 36(9):1611–28
Keller EF. 1985. *Reflections on Gender and Science*. New Haven, CT: Yale Univ. Press
Keohane RO. 1989. International relations theory: contributions of a feminist standpoint. *Millennium J. Int. Stud.* 18(2):245–53
Kristoff N, WuDunn S. 2009. *Half the Sky: Turning Oppression into Opportunity for Women Worldwide*. New York: Knopf
Kronsell A. 2012. *Gender, Sex, and the Postnational Defense: Militarism and Peacekeeping*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press
Lai D. 2020. What has justice got to do with it? Gender and the political economy of post-war Bosnia and Herzegovina. *Rev. Int. Political Econ.* 27(6):1257–79
Langlois AJ. 2016. International relations theory and global sexuality politics. *Politics* 36(4):385–99
LeBaron G, Roberts A. 2010. Toward a feminist political economy of capitalism and carcerality. *Signs J. Women Cult. Soc.* 36(1):19–44
Lee-Koo K. 2020. Pro-gender foreign policy by stealth: navigating global and domestic politics in Australian foreign policy making. *Foreign Policy Anal.* 16(2):236–49
Leigh D. 2017. Queer feminist international relations: uneasy alliances, productive tensions. *Alternatif Politika* 9(3):343–60
Lind A. 2014. "Out" in international relations: why queer visibility matters. *Int. Stud. Rev.* 16(3):601–4
Lokot M, Bhatia A. 2020. Unequal and invisible: a feminist political economy approach to valuing women's care labor in the COVID-19 response. *Front. Sociol.* 6:588279
Lovenduski J, ed. 2005. *State Feminism and Political Representation*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press
MacKenzie M. 2009. Securitization and desecuritization: female soldiers and the reconstruction of women in post-conflict Sierra Leone. *Secur. Stud.* 18(2):241–61
Marchand MH, Runyan AS, eds. 2010. *Gender and Global Restructuring: Sightings, Sites, and Resistances*. London: Routledge
Mazur A. 1995. *Comparative State Feminism*. London: Sage
McBride DE, Mazur AG. 2010. *The Politics of State Feminism: Innovation in Comparative Research*. Philadelphia: Temple Univ. Press
McDermott R. 2015. Sex and death: gender differences in aggression and motivations for violence. *Int. Organ.* 69(3):753–75
Medie P. 2020. *Global Norms and Local Action: The Campaigns to End Violence against Women in Africa*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press
Medie P, Kang AJ. 2018. Power, knowledge, and the politics of gender in the Global South. *Eur. J. Politics Gender* 1(1–2):37–54

Mies M. 1982. *The Lace Makers of Narsapur: Indian Housewives Produce for the World Market*. London: Zed Books
Moghadam V. 2021. Iran and the United States: What might a feminist foreign policy look like? *Peace Freedom* 81(1):4–6
Moon KHS. 1997. *Sex Among Allies: Military Prostitution in U.S.-Korea Relations*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press
Nagel J. 2003. *Race, Ethnicity, and Sexuality: Intimate Intersections, Forbidden Frontiers*. Oxford, UK: Oxford Univ. Press
Nayak M. 2014. Thinking about queer international relations' allies. *Int. Stud. Rev.* 16(4):615–22
Ong A. 1987. *Spirits of Resistance and Capitalist Discipline: Factory Women in Malaysia*. Albany: State Univ. New York Press
Pain R. 2015. Intimate war. *Political Geogr.* 44:64–73
Parashar S. 2013. Feminist (in)securities and camp politics. *Int. Stud. Perspect.* 14(4):440–43
Parashar S. 2014. *Women and Militant Wars: The Politics of Injury*. London: Routledge
Parisi L. 2020. Canada's new feminist international assistance policy: business as usual? *Foreign Policy Anal.* 16(2):163–80
Pateman C. 1988. *The Sexual Contract*. Cambridge, UK: Polity
Peng AY. 2022. A Chinese feminist analysis of Chinese social media responses to the Russian invasion of Ukraine. *Int. Fem. J. Politics* 24(3):482–501
Perez JO. 2022. The Dilma Rousseff presidency: from motherly discourses to queer impeachment. *Int. Fem. J. Politics* 24(1):40–62
Peterson VS. 1992. Transgressing boundaries: theories of knowledge, gender, and international relations. *Millennium J. Int. Stud.* 21(2):183–206
Peterson VS. 1999. Political identities/nationalism as heterosexism. *Int. Fem. J. Politics* 1(1):34–65
Peterson VS. 2004. *A Critical Rewriting of Global Political Economy: Integrating Reproductive, Productive, and Virtual Economies*. London: Routledge
Peterson VS. 2010. Global householding and global crisis. *Politics Gender* 6(2):271–81
Peterson VS, Runyan AS. 1992. *Global Gender Issues*. Boulder, CO: Westview
Pettman JJ. 1996. *Worlding Women: A Feminist International Politics*. London: Routledge
Picq ML. 2013. Critics at the edge? Decolonizing methodologies in international relations. *Int. Political Sci. Rev.* 34(4):444–55
Picq ML, Thiel M, eds. 2015. *Sexualities in World Politics: How LGBTQ Claims Shape International Relations*. London: Routledge
Prugl E. 1999. *The Global Construction of Gender: Home-Based Work in the Political Economy of the 20th Century*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press
Puar J. 2007. *Terrorist Assemblages: Homonationalism in Queer Times*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press
Rahman M. 2014. Queer rights and the triangulation of Western exceptionalism. *J. Hum. Rights* 13(3):274–89
Rai SM, Hoskyns C, Thomas D. 2014. Depletion: the cost of social reproduction. *Int. Fem. J. Politics* 16(1):86–105
Rai SM, Waylen G. 2014. Feminist political economy: looking back, looking forward. In *New Frontiers in Feminist Political Economy*, ed. SM Rai, G Waylen, pp. 1–18. London: Routledge
Rao R. 2018. The state of "Queer IR." *GLQ J. Lesbian Gay Stud.* 24(1):139–49
Rao R. 2020. *Out of Time: The Queer Politics of Postcoloniality*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press
Razavi N. 2021. NatSec feminism: women security experts and the US counterterror state. *Signs J. Women Cult. Soc.* 46(2):361–86
Reardon B. 1985. *Sexism and the War System*. New York: Teachers Coll. Press
Reiter D. 2015. The positivist study of gender and international relations. *J. Confl. Resolut.* 59(7):1301–26
Richter-Montpetit M. 2018. Everything you always wanted to know about sex (in IR) but were afraid to ask: the "queer turn" in international relations. *Millennium J. Int. Stud.* 46(2):220–40
Richter-Montpetit M. 2007. Empire, desire, and violence: a queer transnational feminist reading of the prisoner "abuse" in Abu Ghraib and the question of "gender equality." *Int. Fem. J. Politics* 9(1):38–59
Richter-Montpetit M, Weber C. 2017. Queer international relations. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of International Relations*, ed. N Sandal. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press. **https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228637.013.265**

Roberts A. 2015a. Gender, financial deepening, and the production of embodied finance: towards a critical feminist analysis. *Glob. Soc.* 29(1):107–27
Roberts A. 2015b. The political economy of "transnational business feminism": problematizing the corporate-led gender equality agenda. *Int. Fem. J. Politics* 17(2):209–31
Robinson F. 2021. Feminist foreign policy as ethical foreign policy? A care ethics perspective. *J. Int. Political Theory* 17(1):20–37
Scheyer V, Kumskova M. 2019. Feminist foreign policy: a fine line between "adding women" and pursuing a feminist agenda. *J. Int. Aff.* 72(2):57–76
Sellers PV. 2009. Gender strategy is not a luxury for international courts. *Am. Univ. J. Gender Soc. Policy Law* 17(2):301–27
Shepherd LJ. 2008. *Gender, Violence, and Security: Discourse as Practice*. London: Zed Books
Shepherd LJ. 2009. Gender, violence, and global politics: contemporary debates in feminist security studies. *Political Stud. Rev.* 7(2):208–19
Shepherd LJ. 2017. *Gender, UN Peacebuilding, and the Politics of Space: Locating Legitimacy*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press
Shepherd LJ. 2021. *Narrating the Women, Peace, and Security Agenda: Logics of Global Governance*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press
Shepherd LJ. 2022. White feminism and the governance of violent extremism. *Crit. Stud. Terrorism* 15(3):727–49
Shepherd LJ, Sjoberg L. 2012. Trans- bodies in/of war(s): cisprivilege and contemporary security strategy. *Fem. Rev.* 101:5–23
Sjoberg L. 2009. Introduction to *Security Studies:* feminist contributions. *Secur. Stud.* 18(2):183–213
Sjoberg L. 2013. *Gendering Global Conflict: Toward a Feminist Theory of War*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press
Sjoberg L. 2020. Feminist security theorizing. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of International Relations*, ed. N Sandal. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press. **https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190846626.013.437**
Sjoberg L, Kadera K, Thies CG. 2018. Reevaluating gender and IR scholarship: moving beyond Reiter's dichotomies towards effective synergies. *J. Conflict Resolut.* 62(4):848–70
Smith H, Ajadi T. 2020. Canada's feminist foreign policy and human security compared. *Int. J.* 75(3):367–82
Smith NJ. 2012. Body issues: the political economy of male sex work. *Sexualities* 15(5–6):586–603
Smith NJ. 2020. *Capitalism's Sexual History*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press
Smith NJ, Lee D. 2015. Corporeal capitalism: the body in international political economy. *Glob. Soc.* 29(1):64–69
Stavrianakis A. 2016. Legitimising liberal militarism: politics, law and war in the arms trade treaty. *Third World Q.* 37(5):840–65
Stern M. 2017. Feminist global political economy and feminist security studies? The politics of delineating subfields. *Politics Gender* 13(4):727–33
Stiehm JH. 1982. The protected, the protector, the defender. *Women's Stud. Int. Forum* 5(3–4):367–76
Sylvester C. 1993. Editor's introduction: feminists write international relations. *Alternatives* 18(1):1–3
Teaiwa T, Slatter C. 2013. *Samting Nating:* Pacific waves at the margins of feminist security studies. *Int. Stud. Perspect.* 14(4):447–50
Thomson J. 2020. What's feminist about feminist foreign policy? Canada's and Sweden's foreign policy agendas. *Int. Stud. Perspect.* 21(4):424–37
Thomson J, Whiting S. 2022. Women, peace, and security national action plans in anti-gender governments: the cases of Brazil and Poland. *Eur. J. Int. Secur.* 7(4):531–50
Tickner JA. 1988. Hans Morgenthau's principles of political realism: a feminist reformulation. *Millennium J. Int. Stud.* 17(3):429–40
Tickner J. 1992. *Gender in International Relations*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press
Tickner JA. 1997. You just don't understand: troubled engagements between feminists and IR theorists. *Int. Stud. Q.* 41(4):611–32
Tronto J. 2013. *Caring Democracy: Markets, Equality, and Justice*. New York: New York Univ. Press
True J. 2012. *The Political Economy of Violence Against Women*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press
True J. 2015. Winning the battle but losing the war on violence: a feminist perspective on the declining global violence thesis. *Int. Fem. J. Politics* 17(4):554–72

Tudor A. 2021. Decolonizing trans/gender studies? Teaching gender, race, and sexuality in times of the rise of the global right. *Transgender Stud. Q.* 8(2):238–56
Tungohan E. 2013. Reconceptualizing motherhood, reconceptualizing resistance: migrant domestic workers, transnational hyper-maternalism and activism. *Int. Fem. J. Politics* 15(1):39–57
Vayrynen T, Parashar S, Feron E, Confortini CC, eds. 2021. *Routledge Handbook of Feminist Peace Research*. London: Routledge
Vucetic S. 2017. A nation of feminist arms dealers? Canada and military exports. *Int. J.* 72(4):503–19
Walby S. 2005. Gender mainstreaming: productive tensions in theory and practice. *Soc. Politics* 12(3):321–43
Waylen G. 1997. Gender, feminism, and political economy. *New Political Econ.* 2(2):205–20
Waylen G. 2021. Gendering global economic governance after the global financial crisis. *Rev. Int. Political Econ.* 29(4):1007–26
Weber C. 1994. Good girls, little girls, and bad girls: male paranoia in Robert Keohane's critique of feminist international relations. *Millennium J. Int. Stud.* 23(2):337–49
Weber C. 1999. *Faking It: US Hegemony in a Post-Phallic Era*. Minneapolis: Univ. Minn. Press
Weber C. 2015. Why is there no queer international theory? *Eur. J. Int. Relat.* 21(1):27–51
Weber C. 2016a. *Queer International Relations: Sexuality, Sovereignty, and the Will to Knowledge*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press
Weber C. 2016b. Queer intellectual curiosity as international relations method: developing queer international relations theoretical and methodological frameworks. *Int. Stud. Q.* 60(1):11–23
Weber C, Sjoberg L, eds. 2014. The forum: queer international relations. *Int. Stud. Rev.* 16(4):596–622
Weerawardhana C. 2018. Profoundly decolonizing? Reflections on a transfeminist perspective of international relations. *Meridians* 16(1):184–213
Weiss ML, Bosia MJ, eds. 2013. *Global Homophobia: States, Movements, and the Politics of Oppression*. Champaign: Univ. Ill. Press
Weissman AL. 2017. Repronormativity and the reproduction of the nation-state: the state and sexuality collide. *J. GLBT Family Stud.* 13(3):277–305
Weissman AL, Sjoberg L. 2019. The queer in/of international relations. In *Oxford Bibliographies in International Relations*, ed. P James. Oxford, UK: Oxford Univ. Press. **10.1093/OBO/9780199743292-0177**
Whitworth S. 1989. Gender in the inter-paradigm debate. *Millennium J. Int. Stud.* 18(2):265–72
Whitworth S. 1994. Theory as exclusion: gender and international political economy. In *Political Economy and the Changing Global Order*, ed. R Stubbs, G, Underhill, pp. 116–29. London: Macmillan
Wibben ATR. 2010. *Feminist Security Studies: A Narrative Approach*. London: Routledge
Wibben ATR. 2014. Researching feminist security studies. *Aust. J. Political Sci.* 49(4):743–55
Wilcox L. 2014. Queer theory and the "proper objects" of international relations. *Int. Stud. Rev.* 16(4):612–15
Wright MW. 2006. *Disposable Women and Other Myths of Global Capitalism*. New York: Taylor & Francis
Zalewski M. 1993. Feminist standpoint theory meets international relations theory: a feminist version of David and Goliath? *Fletcher Forum World Aff.* 17(2):13–32
Zalewski M. 1995. Well, what is the feminist perspective on Bosnia? *Int. Aff.* 71(2):339–56
Zhukova E. 2021. Postcolonial logic and silences in strategic narratives: Sweden's feminist foreign policy in conflict-affected states. *Glob. Soc.* 37(1):1–22
Zhukova E, Sundstrom MR, Elgstrom O. 2022. Feminist foreign policies (FFPs) as strategic narratives: norm translation in Sweden, Canada, France, and Mexico. *Rev. Int. Stud.* 48(1):195–216