

Women and the History of International Thought

Patricia Owens*
University of Sussex

Did few, if any, historical women think very deeply about international relations? Existing surveys and anthologies convey just this impression; women in the past did not think seriously about international politics. This article provides evidence of the scale of historical women's exclusion, analyzing sixty texts in the history of international thought and disciplinary history. It also begins the process of remedying this exclusion, mapping a new agenda for research on the history of women's international thought. Existing work in feminist historiography and new archival research suggests that a diverse array of historical women thought deeply about international relations, but their intellectual contributions have been obscured, even actively erased. To illustrate what can be gained by pursuing a research agenda on historical women's international thought, the article reveals a neglected but at the time extremely important figure in what might be called 'white women's IR', the influential scholar of colonial administration, Lucy Philip Mair.

Recent years have witnessed an exciting and cross-disciplinary revival of scholarship on the history of international thought and discipline of International Relations (IR) (Armitage, 2013; Leira and Carvalho, 2015). Yet there are currently no histories of women in the early years of IR, nor a substantial body of scholarship challenging the neglect of women in the 'canon' of international thought. Survey texts and anthologies are still published as if women in the past did not think seriously about international politics. What explains the neglect of historical women? It might be assumed that there simply were no women in the earliest years of the new science that emerged at the end of the nineteenth-century. Perhaps few, if any, women in the past thought very deeply about relations between peoples, empires, and states.

If so, then women's absence from the relevant histories would not require much further examination. The more urgent task would be to decrease the citation gap that disadvantages contemporary women, people of color, and scholars from the Global South, as suggested in the author guidelines for this journal (ISQ, 2017). But what if a diverse array of *historical* women, that is women writing before the late twentieth-century, had thought deeply about international relations? Recent efforts to address the citation gap for contemporary scholars can do little to recover and analyze historical work that remains unknown. There may even be a persistent connection between the absence of a recognized and respected history of women's thought on international politics and their status in the field today. Robert Vitalis (2015) has recently argued that this is the case for African-American women and men.

* This article builds on conversations initiated at a CHASE-German Historical Institute workshop in 2015, 'Languages of the Global: Women and International Political Thought', led by the historians Katharina Rietzler, Valeska Huber, and Tamson Pietsch, and continued at a BISA workshop in June 2017 on 'Women Thinkers of the International', and during invited talks at Oxford and Cambridge. For extremely helpful comments on earlier drafts I'm grateful to the two anonymous reviewers, the ISQ editors, Katharina Rietzler, Kimberly Hutchings, Glenda Sluga, Lene Hansen, Helen Kinsella, Robert Vitalis, Andrew Hurrell, Lucian Ashworth, Louiza Odysseos, Paul Kirby, David Long, and Jaclyn Granick. Special thanks to Sue Donnelley, the LSE Archivist.

For some time, scholars in History, Political Theory, Philosophy, Sociology, and English Literature have identified the processes of women's exclusion from disciplinary canons and begun the difficult work of transforming the institutional and intellectual histories of these fields (Deegan, 1981; Platt, 2003; Hagemann and Quataert, 2007; Weiss, 2009). Indeed, a small but rapidly growing literature on women's international thought has begun to emerge, largely outside IR. Historians have drawn attention to women's pioneering contributions to liberal, socialist, conservative, and black internationalisms (Sluga, 2015; Gottlieb, 2015; May, 2007). Preliminary studies indicate that women wrote many textbooks and model syllabi for the new science of IR (Sluga, 2014; 2017). Often women thought and wrote about international relations from outside the academy, as social workers, journalists, and members of the anti-colonial, pan-African, pan-Arab, and women's suffrage movements (Shaarawi, 1987; Higashida, 2011; Umoren, 2013). There is an extensive literature on the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (Blackwell, 2004; Plastas, 2011; Confortini, 2012). Historians have written on Germaine de Staël (Sluga, 2015), Emily Greene Balch (Jacobs, 2007) and Barbara Wootton (Rosenboim, 2014).

Within IR, there is one canonical woman whose international thought is the subject of a monograph, the German-American political theorist, Hannah Arendt (Owens, 2007). Craig Murphy (2017) has identified, but not yet fully analyzed, a women-led tradition of 'radical' IR in American women's colleges in the 1910s and 1920s. And there are a few episodic studies of Helena Swanwick, Rebecca West, Virginia Woolf, Simone Weil, Merze Tate, Coral Bell and Susan Strange (Ashworth, 2011; Hansen, 2011; Wilson, 2013; Kinsella, 2014; Vitalis, 2015; Ball and Lee, 2014; Germain, 2016).

Despite these initial and often recent forays there is no body of scholarship systematically documenting and analysing the full diversity and complexity of historical women's international thought. It is women's absence rather than presence that is most striking in the relevant literature. IR's intellectual and disciplinary historians have rarely questioned the sex/gender assumptions and categories underlying their work (Sylvester, 2002: 11). They also have little sense of the intellectual traditions that might constitute historical women's international thought or whether they could be put into conversation across time and space. Recovering and analyzing women's intellectual work in this domain is long overdue.

Building on work in feminist historiography (Spender, 1982; Weiss, 2008), this article argues that women's absence from histories of international thought is not based on a lack of historical women's thinking about international politics or contribution to the early science of IR. Indeed, the very term 'international thought' is traced to Florence M. Stawell's *The Growth of International Thought* (1929). A diverse array of historical women thought deeply about international relations and significant numbers were present in the early years of IR, especially in the first decades of the twentieth-century. The intellectual contributions of these historical women were obscured, on occasion even actively erased.

This claim is based on original archival research and the findings of a near exhaustive survey of sixty disciplinary and intellectual histories from 1929 until the present. The purpose of the survey was to establish the number, proportion, and identity of historical women across eighteen histories of international thought; eighteen anthologies of canonical 'great thinkers'; fourteen 'state of the art' surveys of IR research; and ten histories of the IR discipline. Across all texts, of 4421 references to historical figures there

were one hundred and thirty to historical women: 2.94%. The one hundred and thirty references yielded seventy-nine individual historical women with at least partial recognition in IR's intellectual and disciplinary history. We should not assume that the small number is due to an absence of historical women. Based on similar studies in other fields, we should expect that this number is the tip of the iceberg of those historical women who in different ways are part of the history of international thought (Deegan, 1981). Since there was little convergence on which historical women were referenced across the texts larger numbers may be completely hidden from view, pointing to the need for a much wider research agenda of recovery and analysis.

As a step in this direction, I selected one of the historical women identified through the survey to illustrate in more detail what can be gained from taking historical women seriously as contributors to international thought and founders of the IR discipline. Some of the most recent and cutting-edge research in this history has pointed to IR's emergence out of the field of colonial administration (Schmidt, 1998: Ch.4; Vitalis, 2015). Hence, I followed up on a brief reference to one historical woman whose IR research was cited in one of the sixty texts (Wright, 1955: 181). Lucy Philip Mair was a scholar of Colonial Administration in the pre-World War II International Relations Department (IRD) at the London School of Economics (LSE), one of the earliest and largest such departments. I found that Mair's subsequent neglect is founded on at least one identifiable act of dual-erasure, of her own IR scholarship and her field of colonial administration. This is a case study of a high-profile historical woman, a prolific writer, teacher, and advisor of governments on one of the centrally important IR questions of her day, written out of disciplinary history.

The article proceeds in four steps. The first part interrogates the concept of historical women's international thought and sets out the historiographical method and assumptions of the article. The second part presents and analyzes an original dataset to measure and challenge the scale of historical women's exclusion *and partial inclusion* in the relevant intellectual and disciplinary histories. The third section begins the process of rectifying historical women's exclusion, mapping a new agenda for research on the history of women's international thought appropriate for each sub-genre. The fourth part illustrates what can be gained by systematically pursuing such a research agenda, revealing an almost totally neglected but at the time extremely important figure in what could be called 'white women's IR': Lucy Philip Mair. The article concludes that taking women seriously as producers of international thought could be more than a mere add-on to existing intellectual and disciplinary histories. It could fundamentally transform what it means to have played a foundational role in the gendered and raced domains of international thought and disciplinary history and raise fundamental questions about the sex/gender categories that are used in the process of writing history.

What is Historical Women's International Thought?

What is this thing, historical *women's* international thought and how does one construct a narrative about it? Does it require an essentialist notion of 'women'? For some time, feminists have contested the sex/gender binary around which modern politics and economies have been organized (Butler, 1990). The sex/gender binary posits that 'women'

are dichotomous from ‘men’ and that sex and gender map onto each other (with biological/anatomical males contrasted to biological/anatomical females). This article does not assume that there are stable and coherent gender identities; or that there is some necessary content to the category of ‘women’. In order to write about historical women’s international thought we need only assume that the historical construct of the sex/gender binary produced an identity of ‘women’, which intersects with other identities and positions, and this has shaped intellectual production. As Patricia Hill Collins (1998: 327) has put it, ‘Race, gender, social class, age, and sexuality are not descriptive categories of identity applied to individuals. Instead, these elements of social structure emerge as fundamental devices that foster inequality resulting in groups’.

Existing feminist historiography suggest that there is a highly gendered politics to the formation of discipline-specific canons and intellectual histories (Deegan 1981; McDonald, 1994). Indeed, as Bonnie Smith (2000) argued in her influential book *The Gender of History*, the late-nineteenth and early twentieth-century professionalization of History was a process of masculinization defined precisely in opposition to amateur women practitioners of historical writing and women as significant historical figures in their own right (also see Scott, 1986). But existing histories of international thought have paid almost no attention to the gendered, or indeed raced and classed, manner in which historical research is produced, largely assuming the universality of elite white men’s intellectual experiences. Indeed, to write about historical women’s international thought does not assume that historical women’s marginal position is the most fundamental and important axis of exclusion or more significant than the exclusion of non-Western and/or people of color from international intellectual history.

Further research is required to fully establish the gendered, raced, and classed manner in which IR’s canon was formed. However, based on comparable studies in other fields, we should expect a similar intellectual double-standard in which seemingly objective criteria for inclusion such as originality and significance are ‘biased, tainted, narrow or incomplete’ (Weiss, 2009: 27; Spender, 1982: 26). Particularly in literature seeking to establish a canon of ‘great thinkers’ there is a highly gendered and often circular process for justifying the selection of works. On the rare occasions when editors acknowledge historical women’s absence/exclusion it is quickly passed over (Brown, et. al., 2002: 3) or they engage in self-praise for including a single (contemporary) woman when other similar volumes included none (Wæver, 1997: 4). Here we find forms of ‘pseudo-inclusion’ (Thiele, 1986: 30-34) in which a small number of usually contemporary feminists are taken to represent women ‘in general’.

To date, intellectual and disciplinary histories in IR have largely failed to understand historical women as producers of international thought or as co-founders of the discipline. In contrast, this article adopts a multi-methodological strategy that seeks to provide evidence of the *scale* of historical women’s absence in IR’s intellectual and disciplinary history; to assess whether different genres vary in the degree of historical women’s inclusion/exclusion; and to begin to remedy the neglect of historical women’s thought. Details of the quantitative analysis of existing histories of international thought are provided in the next section. The method for beginning to remedy historical women’s neglect was to use the survey to select one previously marginalized historical woman; examine their university’s archives, including lecture and faculty lists, and university personnel files; consult published scholarship and secondary literature to evaluate their

contributions; and suggest how, in part, they were excluded from proper consideration in existing histories of international thought.

Recovering and identifying the work of neglected academic women is obviously central to rewriting disciplinary history. However, feminist historiography suggests that to more fully capture women's intellectual work we also need to extend the locations and empirical sources of international thought. A history of women's international thought should not be envisaged as a project on academic women alone or straightforward process of including some already well-known historical women in the pre-existing intellectual canon (Kerber, 1997; Bay et. al., 2015). It potentially involves rewriting the history of international thought itself, transforming its accepted practices, genres, and locations, and moving beyond the customary way in which we search out international thinkers, including by expanding our sources and archives (Broad and Green, 2009: 7).

Historical Women in Existing Histories of International Thought: A Quantitative Analysis

There can be little doubt that IR's existing intellectual and disciplinary histories have marginalized historical women. And yet, paradoxically, a close examination of the relevant histories of the field can form part of the process of remedying this neglect. Because the purpose of the study was to measure the scale of historical women's inclusion/exclusion in existing histories of international thought there were some constraints on what could be included in the quantitative analysis. Existing scholarship on the history of the academic discipline of IR and the wider history of international thought is almost exclusively Anglo-American and written in the English language. Hence, all but one of the sixty texts analyzed is focused on IR as developed in Britain and the United States (c.f. Jørgensen and Knudsen, 2006). Yet the sixty representative texts do cover the Anglo-American discipline as a whole, rather than specialist subjects, subfields, or works of international theory as such. They also cover the range of approaches, both 'mainstream' and 'critical'. In lieu of a much larger and multi-lingual research project on global historical women's international thought, the sixty texts and the seventy-nine historical women identified are a tolerable basis on which to begin what must be a much larger and globally inclusive process of reconstructing historical women's international thought.

The methodology for determining the number and proportion of historical women included in intellectual and disciplinary history varied depending on which of four different sub-genres was examined. I used two different methodologies. In studies of international thought and disciplinary histories, the method for determining the figures for each volume involved a close reading of the texts, crosschecked against those named in the index. The index was used to confirm the approximate overall number of historical thinkers. For anthologies of canonical thinkers and for works aiming to provide a 'state of the art' of the discipline the number and proportion of historical women was determined by a relatively simple process. I identified them by name as authors or subjects on the table of contents.*

* For a small number of 'state of the art' surveys, the calculation was more complicated because editors chose more than one reading from the same author (Sprout and Sprout, 1945). In those cases, the calculation reflects the number of historical women authors included, rather than the number of their works selected. Of course, in some cases, there is a great deal of overlap between different genres. For example, Wright's (1955) *The Study of International Relations* includes a history of international thought and a summary of the 'state of the art' in the period. However, as a

The number, proportion, and identity of ‘historical women’ in existing histories of international thought was established through the identification of gendered names, pronouns, and titles. However, such seemingly obvious markers of identity are problematic and tell us little about the sex/gender *self*-identity of those designated as ‘historical women’. It can only tell us how figures with names, pronouns, and titles associated with women appear, or not, in histories of international thought. Thus, for the purposes of this study, all such gender identifications refer only to discursive and historical constructions rather than biological difference or individual identity. We are then able to show that within the history of international thought the operations of the sex/gender binary have contributed to the exclusion of groups defined as women and the celebration of groups defined as (white) male.

The concept of *historical* is just as important as that of women, and has two meanings in the study. It indicates that the concept of ‘women’ has a past and therefore a politics, but also that we are primarily focused on those figures whose major contributions to international thought and/or disciplinary history were *before* the late twentieth-century. This excludes those currently active in the field or whose major contributions date from the late twentieth-century. For example, Cynthia Enloe (1938-), is coded as a ‘contemporary’ IR scholar because her work appeared in the late twentieth- and early twenty-first century. In contrast, the late international political economist Susan Strange (1923-1998) is coded as an historical figure. She began teaching international relations in 1949, making major intellectual contributions in the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s, as well as the 1980s.[†]

The late twentieth-century is an important threshold. This is the period of the return of feminist IR, return because it was one of the most prominent sources of international thought in the early twentieth-century (Ashworth, 2011: 26; Confortini, 2012). Since the 1980s, IR feminism’s influence on the field has grown exponentially. From this period, we begin to see some contemporary IR feminists included in some surveys and disciplinary histories. However, to count the feminists sometimes included would give a distorted picture. The point is not to *exclude* feminist IR scholars. Far from it. Rather to include *late twentieth-century* IR feminists, or any late twentieth-century figures, would lead to a misrepresentation of the inclusion/exclusion of *historical* women.

The results of the study are summarized in Table 1, ‘Historical Women in Sixty Histories of International Thought’. However, with some variation across genre, the findings are broadly consistent. As a point of comparison and interest, both historical and contemporary women are named in the table but contemporary women are not included in any of the figures. To include them would also distort the findings because the overall numbers do not include contemporary men. Yet even to include late twentieth-century women, calculating the references to all women across the texts, the number only increases by 35 to 165: 3.73%. But, again, this significantly overstates their total representation since the overall figure does not include the large number of contemporary men across many of the texts. Since the vast majority of the references to historical women were brief mentions,

monograph focused primarily on the academic discipline of IR, rather than a collection of readings, it is categorized as a work of disciplinary history.

[†] The most difficult, borderline figure, potentially coded as either ‘historical’ or ‘contemporary’, is the late political theorist, Jean Bethke Elshtain (1941-2013). Though she was born three years after Enloe, Elshtain could sensibly be regarded as a ‘historical’ figure because she is deceased. However, she is coded ‘contemporary’ because she produced her major works from the 1980s onwards.

often citations with little extended discussion, the figure of 2.94% also overstates historical women's presence within the texts.

Nonetheless, these are important findings. Locating these 130 references has yielded the names of seventy-nine historical women. Of these, only twenty-two are mentioned more than once, nearly half of these twenty-two mentioned just twice. These twenty-two are listed in Table 6, including their dates, primarily location, and intellectual specialisms. Only four women of color are among the seventy-nine, all from a single text that focuses on IR's racist past (Vitalis, 2015): the African-Americans Merze Tate (1905-1996), Eslanda Robeson (1895-1965), Lorraine Hansberry (1930-1965) and Pauli Murray (1910-1985). The only contemporary woman of color is Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. No women working outside the US, UK, or Europe is included among those mentioned more than once, reflecting the well-known Anglo-American bias in IR historiography and the profound intellectual influence of continental and Jewish European thinkers (Rösch, 2014). The historical woman most recognized was the British Susan Strange. But in second and third place are both Jewish women, Prussian-born Hannah Arendt and Polish-born Rosa Luxemburg.

I expect that this number of seventy-nine, drawn only from highly gendered histories of international thought, represents just a fraction of historical women's intellectual labors *even* in Europe and North America. The claim is not that the authors and editors in the survey have consciously sought to exclude historical women or engage in intellectual tokenism. Many were probably not even always aware that exclusion had occurred. To write or compile such collections in this manner only requires scholars to act in the customary way.

Table 1. Historical Women in Sixty Histories of International Thought

| Publication in chronological order | Type of Text | No. of historical men* | Number and percentage of historical women* | Name of historical women* (contemporary women* in italics and brackets) |
|---|---------------------------------------|------------------------|--|---|
| Stawell (1929) <i>The Growth of International Thought</i> | Canonical Thinkers (C) | 67 (approx.) | 1 (1.47%) | Ruth (biblical) |
| Russell (1936) <i>Theories of International Relations</i> | History of International Thought (HT) | 181 (approx.) | 1 (.5%) | Frances Melian Stawell |
| Sprout and Sprout (1945) <i>Foundations of National Power</i> [‡] | IR 'state of the art' (IR) | 81 | 4 (4.7%) | Helen Mears, Harriet Moore, Marthe Rajchman, Margaret Sprout |
| Kirk (1947) <i>The Study of International Relations in American Colleges and Universities</i> | IR | 100 (approx.) | 8 (8%) | M. Margaret Ball, Gwendolen M. Carter, Ruth C. Lawson, D. Beatrice McCown, Elizabeth L. Fackit, Ellen J. Hammer, Edith Ware, Ruth Savord |
| Morgenthau and Thompson (eds.) <i>Principles and Problems of International Politics: Selected Readings</i> (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1950) | IR | 49 | 0% | |
| Wright (1955) <i>The Study of International Relations</i> | Disciplinary History (D) | 297 (approx.) | 15 (5%) | Ruth Nanda Anshen, Jessie Bernard, Dorothy Blumenstock, Margaret E. Burton, Dorothy Arden Dean, Eleanor Dennison, Anna Freud, Gertrude Himmelfarb, Suzanne K. Langer, L.P. Mair, Ruth D. Masters, |

[‡] Contains 151 readings from eight-five authors or co-authors across 769 pages. There are ten extracts by four historical women.

| | | | | |
|---|----|---------------|---------------|--|
| | | | | Margaret Mead, Mrs. Charles E. B. Russell (Lillian M Rigby), Ruth Savord, Margaret Sprout |
| Wolfers and Martin (1956) <i>The Anglo-American Tradition in Foreign Affairs: Readings from Thomas More to Woodrow Wilson</i> | C | 22 | 0% | |
| Hoffmann (1964) <i>Contemporary Theory in International Relations</i> | IR | 94 (approx.) | 1 (1.05%) | Jessie Bernard |
| Forsyth et. al. (eds.) (1970) <i>The Theory of International Relations: Selected Texts from Gentili to Treitschke</i> | C | 9 | 0% | |
| Porter (1972) <i>The Aberystwyth Papers: International Politics, 1919-1969</i> | D | 118 (approx.) | 8 (6.7%) | Gwendoline Davies, Margaret Davies, Margaret Gowing, Nina Heathcote, Margaret Sprout, Susan Strange, Lilian Vranek (Friedlander) Barbara Ward |
| Parkinson (1977) <i>The Philosophy of International Relations: A Study in the History of Thought</i> | HT | 136 | 2 (1.47%) | Hannah Arendt, Rosa Luxemburg |
| Taylor (1978) <i>Approaches and Theory in International Relations</i> | IR | 13 | 0% | |
| Beitz (1979) <i>Political Theory and International Relations</i> | HT | 70 | 2 (2.78%) | Adda Bozeman, Rosa Luxemburg |
| Thompson (1982) <i>Masters of International Thought</i> | C | 16 | 0% | |
| Parker (1985) <i>Western Geopolitical Thought in the Twentieth Century</i> | HT | 72 (approx.) | 2 (2.7%) | Martha Haushofer, Ellen Churchill Semple |
| Williams (1989) <i>IR in the Twentieth Century: a Reader</i> | IR | 20 | 0% | |
| Olson and Groom (1991) <i>International Relations: Then and Now</i> | D | 146 (approx.) | 7 (1) (4.79%) | Annette Baker Fox, Adda Bozeman, Jessie Bernard, Sonia Z. Hyman, Elizabeth Fischer Read, Margaret Sprout, Susan Strange (<i>Cynthia Enloe</i>) |
| Knutsen (1992) <i>A History of International Relations Theory</i> (1st edition) | HT | 140 (approx.) | 1 (.7%) | Bertha von Suttner |
| Thompson (1994) <i>Fathers of International Thought: the Legacy of Political Theory</i> | C | 18 | 0% | |
| Williams, Goldstein, and Shafritz (1994) <i>Classic Readings of International Relations</i> (1 st edition) | IR | 57 | 1 (1.72%) | Susan Strange |
| Kauppi and Viotti (1992) <i>The Global Philosophers: World Politics in Western Thought</i> | C | 30 | 0% | |
| Luard (1992) <i>Basic Texts in International Relations: the Evolution of Ideas about International Society</i> | C | 129 | 0% | |
| Williams, Wright, and Evans (1993) <i>A Reader in International Relations and Political Theory</i> | C | 22 | 0% | |
| Long and Wilson (1995) <i>Thinkers of the Twenty Years Crisis</i> | C | 10 | 0% | |
| Vasquez (1995) <i>Classics of International Relations</i> (3 rd edition) | C | 52 | 1 (1) (1.85%) | Margaret Mead (<i>Carol Cohn</i>) |
| Der Derian (1995) <i>International Theory: Critical Investigations</i> | IR | 11 | 0% (2) | (<i>Jean Bethke Elshtain, J. Ann Tickner</i>) |
| Clark and Neumann (1996) <i>Classical Theories in International Relations</i> | C | 11 | 0% | |
| Neumann and Wæver (1997) <i>The Future of International Relations: 'Masters in the Making'?</i> | IR | 11 | 0% (1) | (<i>Jean Bethke Elshtain</i>) |
| Knutsen (1997) <i>A History of International Relations Theory</i> (2 nd edition) | HT | 154 (approx.) | 2 (1) (1.27%) | Rosa Luxemburg, Bertha von Suttner, (<i>Cynthia Weber</i>) |
| Dunne (1998) <i>Inventing International Society: a History of the English School</i> | HT | 24 | 0% (1) | (<i>Cornelia Navari</i>) |

| | | | | |
|---|----|---------------|---------------|---|
| Schmidt (1998) <i>The Political Discourse of Anarchy: a Disciplinary History of International Relations</i> | D | 86 (approx.) | 3 (3.37%) | Deborah Ellen Ellis, Mary Parker Follett, Francis Melian Stawell |
| Griffith's (1999) <i>Fifty Key Thinkers of International Relations</i> (1 st edition) | IR | 46 | 1 (3) (2.2%) | Susan Strange (<i>Jean Bethke Elshtain, Cynthia Enloe, J. Ann Tickner</i>) |
| Linklater (2000) <i>International Relations: Critical Concepts in Political Science</i> | IR | 82 | 0% (6) | <i>Jean Bethke Elshtain, Carole Pateman, Onora O'Neill, Anne Tickner (x2), Anne Sisson Runyan/V. Spike Peterson (co-author)</i> |
| Brown, Nardin, Rengger (2002) <i>International Relations in Political Thought: Texts from the Ancient Greeks to the First World War</i> | C | 50 | 0% | |
| Bauer and Brighi (2003) <i>International Relations at the LSE: A History of 75 years</i> | D | 58 | 4 (2) (7.4%) | Simone de Beauvoir, Coral Bell, Lucy Mair, Susan Strange (<i>Margot Light, Cornelia Navari, Cynthia Weber</i>) |
| Keene (2005) <i>International Political Thought: A Historical Argument</i> | HT | 111 (approx.) | 0% | |
| Long and Schmidt (2005) <i>Imperialism and Internationalism in the Discipline of International Relations</i> | HT | 30 (approx.) | 0% | |
| Williams, et. al. (2005) (3 rd ed.) <i>Classic Readings of International Relations</i> | IR | 58 | 0 (4) (0%) | (<i>Martha Finnemore, Keck/Sikkink (co-author), J. Ann Tickner, M. Elaine Bunn</i>) |
| Jahn (2006) <i>Classical Theory in International Relations</i> | C | 12 | 0% | |
| Jørgensen and Knudsen (2006) <i>International Relations in Europe: Traditions, Perspectives, Destinations</i> | D | 28 | 1 (1) (3.57%) | Adda Bozeman (<i>Marie-Claude Smouts</i>) |
| Ashworth (2007) <i>International Relations and the Labour Party: Intellectuals and Policy Making from 1918-1945</i> | HT | 82 | 8 (9.76%) | Jane Addams, Emily Greene Balch, Dorothy Frances Buxton, Mary Parker Follett, Mary Agnes Hamilton, Susan Lawrence, Helena Swanwick, Mary Elizabeth Sutherland |
| Roache (2008) <i>Critical Theory and International Relations: a Reader</i> | C | 30 | 0 (3) (0%) | (<i>Nancy Fraser, Claire Cutler, Christine Sylvester</i>) |
| Hall and Hill (2009) <i>British International Thinkers from Hobbes to Namier</i> | HT | 12 | 0% | |
| Sylvest (2009) <i>British Liberal Internationalism, 1880-1930</i> | HT | 50 (approx.) | 0% | |
| Griffiths et. al. (2009) <i>Fifty Key Thinkers of International Relations</i> | IR | 46 | 0% | (<i>Jean Bethke Elshtain, Cynthia Enloe, J. Ann Tickner, Christine Sylvester</i>) |
| Edkins and Vaughan-Williams (2009) <i>Critical Theorists and International Relations</i> | C | 27 | 2 (3) (6%) | Hannah Arendt, Simone de Beauvoir (<i>Judith Butler, Julia Kristeva, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak</i>) |
| Moore and Farrands (2010) <i>International Relations Theory and Philosophy</i> | C | 11 | 2 (15%) | Hannah Arendt, Susan Sontag |
| Guilhot (2011) <i>The Invention of International Relations Theory</i> | D | 57 (approx.) | 1 (1.7%) | Dorothy Fosdick |
| Hall (2012) <i>British Intellectuals and World Politics, 1945-1975</i> | HT | 286 (approx.) | 6 (1) (2.09%) | Kathleen Courtney, Agnes Headlam-Morley, Margery Perham, F. Melian Stawell, Susan Strange, Barbara Ward (<i>Cornelia Navari</i>) |
| Hobson (2012) <i>The Eurocentric Conception of World Politics: Western International Theory, 1760-2010</i> | HT | 110 (approx.) | 5 (4.35%) | Rosa Luxemburg, Ellen Churchill Semple, Helene Stöcker, Bertha von Suttner, Margaret Sanger |
| Bliddal et. al. (2013) <i>Classics of International Relations: Essays in Criticism and Appreciation</i> | C | 22 | 1 (1) (4.16%) | Virginia Wolf (<i>Cynthia Enloe</i>) |
| Armitage (2013) <i>Foundations of Modern International Thought</i> | HT | 20 (approx.) | 1 (5%) | Hannah Arendt |
| Ashworth (2014) <i>A History of International Thought</i> | HT | 153 (approx.) | 10 (6.54%) | Jane Addams, Emily Greene Balch, Vera Brittain, Kathleen Courtney, Mary Agnes Hamilton, Susan Lawrence, Ellen Churchill Semple, |

| | | | | |
|--|----|---------------|--------------|--|
| | | | | Susan Strange, Harriet Wanklyn, Helena Swanwick |
| Hood, King, and Peele (2014) <i>Forging a Discipline: A Critical Assessment of Oxford's Development of the Study of Politics and International Relations</i> | D | 84 (approx.) | 6 (7.1%) | Hannah Arendt, Sibyl Crowe, Agnes Headlam-Morley, Margery Perham, Rachel Wall, Beatrice Webb |
| Hall (2015) <i>Radicals and Reactionaries in Twentieth-Century International Thought</i> | HT | 123 (approx.) | 5 (3.9%) | Annie Besant, Susan Lawrence, F. Melian Stawell, Helena Swanwick, Ellen Wilkinson |
| Vitalis (2015) <i>White World Order, Black Power Politics: the Birth of American International Relations</i> | D | 131 | 10 (7.6%) | Ruth Benedict, Nancy Cunard, Lorraine Hansberry, Vera Micheles Dean, Jeane Kirkpatrick, Margaret Mead, Pauli Murray, Essie (Eslanda) Robeson, Merze Tate, Caroline Ware, |
| Leira and Carvalho (2015) <i>Historical International Relations, Vol. II: The History of International Thought</i> | IR | 14 | 1 (6.67%) | Helena Swanwick |
| Lebow et. al. (2016) <i>The Return of the Theorists: Dialogues with Great Thinkers in International Relations</i> | C | 37 | 2 (1) (5.4%) | Hannah Arendt, Susan Strange (<i>Jean Bethke Elshain</i>) |
| Knutsen (2016) <i>A History of International Relations Theory</i> (3 rd edition) | HT | 150 (approx.) | 2 (2) (1.3%) | Rosa Luxemburg, Susan Strange (<i>Ann Tickner, Cynthia Weber</i>) |
| Malchow (2016) <i>History and International Relations: from the Ancient World to the 21st Century</i> | D | 127 (approx.) | 3 (1) (2.7%) | Hannah Arendt, Susan Strange, Barbara Tuchman (<i>Jean Bethke Elshain</i>) |

* These gender identifications refer to discursive and historical constructions rather than biological difference.

Historical Women in Different Genres of International Thought

Given the variety of kinds of works examined it is not surprising that there was some variation across types of text. This section presents and analyzes the genre-specific findings with the aim of beginning the process of remedying historical women's exclusion, which is necessarily different for each sub-genre. The objective is to set out a new research program to remedy historical women's marginalization from the disciplines and settings of international thought; suggest some of the alternative locations in which a diversity of women thought about international politics; and begin to examine the substantive intellectual contributions of specific historical women thinkers.

Table 2. Results by Genre: Historical Women in Sixty Histories of International Thought

| Genre | No of Texts | Cumulative number of historical figures for each genre | Cumulative number of historical women* | % |
|-------------------------|-------------|--|--|--------------|
| Canonical Thinkers | 18 | 584 | 9 | 1.54% |
| History of Int. Thought | 18 | 1952 | 47 | 2.41% |
| IR 'state of the art' | 14 | 698 | 16 | 2.29% |
| Disciplinary History | 10 | 1187 | 58 | 4.88% |
| Overall Total | 60 | 4421 | 130 | 2.94% |

* This gender identification refers to a discursive and historical construction rather than biological difference.

Canonical thinkers

The genre least likely to highlight the intellectual contributions of historical women is that which establishes a canon of intellectual 'greats'. These are collections of readings by or about 'classic' thinkers seen as foundational to the study of IR. In these texts,

authors/editors choose several individuals to showcase, ranging from a relatively small number of persons - about ten to eighteen - to include much larger volumes that include dozens of prominent historical thinkers.

With only two exceptions, none of the fourteen such collections published between 1929 and 2008 included an historical woman (Stawell, 1929; Vasquez, 1995). Across the eighteen of such works examined, a historical woman was profiled on only nine occasions compared to 584 chapters/selections overall: 1.54%. Taking such works as a whole, there are six historical women recognized as 'great thinkers': Arendt, Simone de Beauvoir, Margaret Mead, Susan Strange, Susan Sontag, and Virginia Woolf, and one mention of the biblical figure Ruth. There are no women of color canonized in IR, nor any from outside North America and Europe. The maximum number of historical women included in any one work that aims to establish, or even expand, the 'canon' is two. It is possible to read multiple versions of such texts, which often deal with exactly the same authors, without learning about the thought of a single woman, or even an acknowledgement that their exclusion has taken place. Only from the 2000s, do we find small numbers of historical women consistently included in collections of canonical thinkers, but again never more than two in one text.

How can this be rectified? Many 'canonical' historical women have authored 'big books' and other genres highly relevant to understanding international politics (Smith and Carroll, 2000). Hence, in terms of remedying historical women's marginalization from the canon, the initial task is to identify and analyze the international thought of *already* high-profile women thinkers absent, or only partially recognized, in IR's canon. Retrieving and analyzing these historical women requires textual, contextual and biographical analysis not only of the intellectual substance of their work but also *how* and through what different genres, such as fiction and biography, they thought about international politics. Given the unrivalled influence of European traditions on the Anglo-American discipline and the simultaneous neglect of black intellectuals an initial foray should include European and black diaspora women.

Within this narrow remit, and considering only thinkers from the early to mid-twentieth century, IR's formative decades, we might examine these thinkers in terms of those who could have been included more fully in the key isms/traditions of IR yet were not (Jane Addams, Rosa Luxemburg, Ellen Churchill Semple, Ayn Rand, Bertha von Suttner, Sylvia Pankhurst), those who could not fit (including Anna Julia Cooper, Emma Goldman, Eslanda Robeson, Simone Weil, Rebecca West) and the very few already accorded partial recognition (Hannah Arendt, Virginia Woolf, and Susan Strange). We can expect contributions to the full spectrum of IR theory and that much of the work belatedly introduced to IR was authoritative in its own time; crossed the full ideological spectrum covered by contemporary international theory; and that gender mattered, but not exclusively, to how historical women thought about international politics. Scholars should not assume that historical women were more likely to be 'right' than their more studied male counterparts. However, we should expect that some anticipated cutting-edge work in contemporary IR (Hansen, 2011: 113). The eventual goal must be to expand and transform IR's canon, in a much more historically expansive and globally inclusive reconstruction of the international thought of some of the foremost historical women intellectuals.

Table 3. Bottom Ranked Texts by Relative Absence of Historical Women* in Sixty Histories of International Thought

| | | | |
|--|---|---------------|---|
| 60. Luard (1992) | <i>Basic Texts in International Relations</i> (C) | 129 | 0 |
| 59. Keene (2005) | <i>International Political Thought: a Historical Argument</i> (HT) | 111 (approx.) | 0 |
| 58. Linklater (2000) | <i>International Relations: Critical Concepts in Political Science</i> (IR) | 82 | 0 |
| 57. Brown, Nardin, Rengger (2002) | <i>International Relations in Political Thought: Texts from the Ancient Greeks to the First World War</i> (C) | 50 | 0 |
| 56. Sylvest (2009) | <i>British Liberal Internationalism, 1880-1930</i> (HT) | 50 (approx.) | 0 |
| 55. Morgenthau and Thompson (1950) | <i>Principles and Problems of International Politics: Selected Readings</i> (IR) | 49 | 0 |
| 54. Griffiths et. al. (2009) | <i>Fifty Key Thinkers of International Relations</i> (IR) | 46 | 0 |
| 53. Kauppi and Viotti (1992) | <i>The Global Philosophers: World Politics in Western Thought</i> (C) | 30 | 0 |
| 52. Long and Schmidt (2005) | <i>Imperialism and Internationalism in the Discipline of International Relations</i> (D) | 30 | 0 |
| 51. Williams, Wright, and Evans (1993) | <i>A Reader in International Relations and Political Theory</i> (C) | 22 | 0 |

* This gender identification refers to a discursive and historical construction rather than biological difference.

Disciplinary Histories

The genre in which historical women were most often mentioned, though usually not discussed at length, is IR's disciplinary history, ten of which were examined. These works usually include analysis of far larger numbers of individuals than those focused on canonical thinkers, in one case up to nearly three hundred. However, they can be differentiated from histories of international thought because they are more centrally concerned with the intellectual and institutional origins of the academic discipline. Historical women appear in greater numbers, or are harder to erase, when historians are seeking to offer some version of the actual past, even one that is inevitably flawed and partial. Of the 1187 total cumulative number of historical figures mentioned, there were fifty-eight separate references to historical women across the ten texts: 4.88%. Interestingly, across the texts that include brief references to small numbers of historical women there is often little convergence. This indicates that there is a much larger number of figures that scholars could have studied, especially in those works that claim to be comprehensive.

Compared to the other genres examined, disciplinary history performs relatively well. Nonetheless, despite this comparatively better performance, disciplinary historians have failed to account for women's intellectual and practical contributions to the early science of IR. There are very few substantive discussions of individual historical women. Among the ten disciplinary histories, the only archival work carried out on an historical woman was Vitalis's study of Merze Tate, whose extensive papers were found 'unprocessed... a jumble of papers in a mass of boxes stored off site' (2015: 166). Overall, we should not be surprised that women are more likely to appear, are more difficult to erase, in more historical work focused on telling stories about actual persons in context. However, we should not expect the existing literature to reflect the full range of historical women who have contributed to IR's disciplinary history even in the Anglo-American context, given the highly gendered character of historical writing (Smith, 2000).

Any new research program on women's international thought must include, but not fixate on, the history of the IR 'discipline'. This involves locating the currently unknown

academic women teaching and researching IR and then evaluating their contributions. This should not only include the most well-known centres of IR research, but also women's colleges, which existing disciplinary histories have marginalized.

However, which women can be identified with the emerging 'discipline'? At a minimum, research should encompass what *at the time* were core IR subjects. Given IR's interdisciplinary origins in diplomatic history, colonial administration, and law there is a need to examine the international thought of women working in departments covering these fields. This can be achieved through examining university archives, specifically lecture and faculty lists to identify historical women specialising in international relations, across Political Science, History, Law, and Sociology. We can then examine the scholarship of the historical women discovered and, where available, their personal papers, yielding a more accurate account of historical women's contributions to the early field than found in existing disciplinary histories.

Examining the personal papers of historical women may also allow scholars to shed some light on the processes of exclusion from IR's history. We can then examine how these processes compare to those of other disciplines and histories of thought (Deegan, 1981), though it is much harder to identify how and why historical women have been excluded than to seek to recover and analyze their thought. At the same time, it is not enough to simply increase awareness of elite white women. We have to understand 'white man's IR' (Lake, 2016) and 'white women's IR' as a product of particular sets of imperial, gendered and raced relations, including racially diverse historical women. The next section returns to some of these fundamental themes in the examination one of the first women appointed to a faculty position in IR, specializing in the racial project of colonial administration.

Table 4. Top 10 Texts Ranked by Total Number of Historical Women* in Sixty Histories of International Thought

| | | |
|---------------------------------|---|----|
| 1. Wright (1955) | <i>The Study of International Relations</i> (D) | 15 |
| 2. Ashworth (2014) | <i>A History of International Thought</i> (HT) | 10 |
| 3. Vitalis (2015) | <i>White World Order, Black Power Politics: The Birth of American International Relations</i> (D) | 10 |
| 4. Kirk (1947) | <i>The Study of International Relations in American Colleges and Universities</i> (IR) | 8 |
| 5. Ashworth (2007) | <i>International Relations and the Labour Party: Intellectuals and Policy Making from 1918-1945</i> (HT) | 8 |
| 6. Olson and Groom (1991) | <i>International Relations: Then and Now</i> (D) | 7 |
| 7. Hall (2012) | <i>British Intellectuals and World Politics, 1945-1975</i> (HT) | 6 |
| 8. Hood, King, and Peele (2014) | <i>Forging a Discipline: A Critical Assessment of Oxford's Development of the Study of Politics and International Relations</i> (D) | 6 |
| 9. Hobson (2012) | <i>The Eurocentric Conception of World Politics: Western International Theory, 1760-2010</i> (HT) | 5 |
| 10. Hall (2015) | <i>Radicals and Reactionaries in Twentieth-Century International Thought</i> (HT) | 5 |

* This gender identification refers to discursive and historical construction rather than biological difference.

Histories of international thought

Histories of international thought do not usually single out paradigmatic thinkers as such but survey far larger numbers of historical persons, often setting them in historical and intellectual context. They are usually written by a single author and seek to give a much broader overview of the intellectual history of the field. Such works sometimes focus on a smaller number of scholars in specific national or intellectual locations, but the emphasis

is more on the intellectual context and influences on thought, in addition to the exposition of ideas.

Of the 1952 references to historical figures across the eighteen works of this type, forty-seven were to historical women, representing 2.41%. However, unlike works focusing on canonical thinkers where there is lengthy discussion of a single individual, in broader histories of international thought particular individuals are often mentioned only very briefly. This is certainly the case for historical women. For example, Russell (1936: v) makes brief reference to *The Growth of International Thought*, Melian F. Stawell's (1929) 'suggestive little volume in the Home University Library', but offers no discussion of what, in retrospect, is a trailblazing work. Indeed, there is no sustained discussion of Stawell's book in any later history of the field; very few such works even reference it (Schmidt, 1998: 176; Hall, 2012: 15; 2015: 4). Moreover, in line with the overall pattern in studies of canonical thinkers, no more than two historical women appear in the same study in this genre in the forty years following Parkinson's (1977) work.

As discussed in the previous section, recovering and analyzing the work of early 'IR women' involves making decisions about which historical women should be identified with disciplinary IR, but also with cognate scholarly fields. But how do we address the international thought of historical women at some distance from academe? We already know that many wrote about international relations for wider public and policy audiences, not solely for academics (Gottlieb, 2015: Ch.1). Much more work is required to identify historical women at the margins of academe and in other professions, such as social work, education, and librarianship, who saw themselves as centrally concerned with international relations (see Huber, Pietsch, Rietzler, forthcoming).

The survey of existing works of disciplinary and intellectual history includes a small number of such figures working in a variety of occupational fields and different routes to international thought. They include Ruth Savord (1896-1966), librarian at the Council of Foreign Relations and Vera Micheles Dean (1903-1972), head of research at the Foreign Policy Association, a leading American think tank, and prolific commentator on international affairs. Though not mentioned in any of the texts examined, we could add African-American educator Anna Julia Cooper (1858-1964) and her work on the relations between the French and Haitian Revolutions and colonialism and capitalism (Cooper, 1925/1988). Foreign affairs journalist Elizabeth Wiskemann (1899-1971) eventually entered academe, taking the Montague Burton Chair in IR at Edinburgh University.

Archival and contextual analysis of such figures would likely challenge existing standards of inclusion within histories of international thought, pluralizing IR's understanding of what an archive might look like. Such a study would not only highlight neglected thinkers. Examining historical women working across a variety of occupations shifts our attention away from 'big books' by canonical men to include a greater variety of often highly-gendered subjects, locations and genres. The point is not that historians of international thought have wholly neglected these different sites (Hall, 2012: 8), but that they are absolutely central to the successful retrieval of historical women's international thought.

Table 5. Highest Ranked Texts by Overall Percentage of Historical Women* in Sixty Histories of International Thought

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|-------|
| 1. Moore and Farrands (2010) | <i>International Relations Theory and Philosophy</i> (C) | 15% |
| 2. Ashworth (2007) | <i>International Relations and the Labour Party: Intellectuals and Policy Making from 1918-1945</i> (HT) | 9.76% |
| 3. Kirk (1947) | <i>The Study of International Relations in American Colleges and Universities</i> (IR) | 8% |
| 4. Vitalis (2015) | <i>White World Order, Black Power Politics: The Birth of American International Relations</i> (D) | 7.6% |
| 5. Bauer and Brighi (2003) | <i>International Relations at the LSE: A History of 75 years</i> (D) | 7.4% |
| 6. Hood, King, and Peele (2014) | <i>Forging a Discipline: A Critical Assessment of Oxford's Development of the Study of Politics and International Relations</i> (D) | 7.1% |
| 7. Porter (1972) | <i>The Aberystwyth Papers: International Politics, 1919-1969</i> (D) | 6.7% |
| 8. Ashworth (2014) | <i>A History of International Thought</i> (HT) | 6.54% |
| 9. Edkins and Vaughan-Williams (2009) | <i>Critical Theorists and International Relations</i> (C) | 6% |
| 10. Lebow et. al. (2016). | <i>The Return of the Theorists: Dialogues with Great Thinkers in International Relations</i> (C) | 5.4% |

* These gender identifications refer discursive and historical constructions rather than biological difference.

IR 'State of the Art'

Collections of readings by historical and contemporary IR scholars constitute a *contemporary* canon, a 'state of the art' of the field. These can take the form of either 'key thinkers', or selections of important works by prominent individuals in the history of the discipline or selections of works that illuminate a key theme or issue. Unlike works seeking to establish the canon of so-called 'great' thinkers, which often adopt a wholly circular justification for the selection, these 'state of the art' texts are more likely to represent the IR scholarship undertaken at the time of compilation. As such, we are more likely to find historical women scholars represented, though not to their fullest extent. In 'state of the art' texts, of 698 total selections, sixteen were by or concerned historical women: 2.29%. Only one of these books is among the highest ranked texts by the total number and percentage of historical women (Kirk 1947). However, this text is anomalous in this genre. It is not a collection of works, but a survey of then current IR teaching in the United States. Most of the women named are there by virtue of attending a conference on teaching.

Unsurprisingly, this genre is far more likely to contain work by contemporary women. Only one historical woman regularly appears in this genre to address subjects that are not obviously related to gender: Susan Strange. Since, in recent years it has become difficult for editors to completely exclude women we instead find a form of 'pseudo-inclusion' (Thiele, 1986: 30-34). That is, a small number of usually contemporary women come to represent women 'in general', either as exponents of feminism or to discuss themes often associated with women, such as peace activism or gendered inequalities. One effect of pseudo-inclusion is the exclusion of women appearing to write on anything other than gender. For example, in the first edition of Griffith's (1999) *Fifty Key Thinkers of International Relations*, the only woman not registered under 'Gender and International Relations' (Elshtain, Enloe, and Tickner) is Susan Strange (listed under 'Realism'). Strange was dropped from the second edition, perhaps to make way for the contemporary Christine Sylvester as the fourth woman, the seemingly maximum number, all now appearing under 'Feminism' (Griffiths, et. al., 2009).

In surveys of the current discipline or of canonical thinkers there is a consistently applied upper limit to the total number of women admitted at any one time, usually a maximum of three or four per volume, but never more than a substantive discussion of two historical women. Here we might extend Joanna Russ's analysis of English Literature's

canon in which ‘some unconscious mechanism controls the number of female writers which looks “proper” or “enough” to anthologists and editors’ (1983: 85). This is not merely anecdotal or particular to academe. As Sarah Walker has written, ‘Research suggests that people perceive men and women - whether in zombie movies, panel games, crowd scenes or business meetings - as equally represented when the male-to-female ratio they are looking at actually hovers around 83:17. They start to regard situations as unduly female dominated when women approach 30 percent of those present’ (2017: 4). Across the texts surveyed for this study, the actual ratio is less than 97:3. There is no danger of scholars viewing women as equally represented in histories of international thought. But in recent years editors and authors of IR ‘state of the art’ volumes appear to view women as *adequately* represented when a small number of contemporary feminists are included.

A project seeking to recover and analyze the international thought of historical women is necessarily a feminist project (Tickner, 2014). However, by no means will all the historical women recovered have engaged in explicitly feminist work or expound views that one would wish to support (Owens, 2017). We turn now to look in more detail at one such figure whose work nonetheless touches on and calls for a feminist rereading of the most cutting-edge work in the contemporary historiography of IR.

Table 6. Twenty-Two Most Recognized Historical Women* in Sixty Histories of International Thought

| Name (alphabetical by mention) | Mentions | Main location and field |
|--|----------|--|
| 1. Susan Strange (1923-1998) | 10 | British-based international political economist |
| 2. Hannah Arendt (1906-1975) | 7 | Prussian-born US-based political theorist |
| 3. Rosa Luxemburg (1871-1919) | 5 | Polish-German based philosopher and socialist revolutionary |
| 4. Margaret Sprout (1903-2004) | 4 | US-based independent IR scholar |
| 5. F. Melian Stawell (1869-1936) | 4 | Australian-born British-based classicist |
| 6. Helena Swanwick (1864-1939) | 4 | German-born British-based political writer and feminist |
| 7. Jessie Bernard (1903-1996) | 3 | US-based highly prolific sociologist and feminist scholar |
| 8. Adda B. Bozeman (1908-1994) | 3 | US-based IR scholar |
| 9. Susan Lawrence (1871-1947) | 3 | British-based Labour politician |
| 10. Margaret Mead (1901-1978) | 3 | US-based anthropologist |
| 11. Ellen Churchill Semple (1863-1932) | 3 | US-based geopolitical thinker |
| 12. Bertha von Suttner (1843-1914) | 3 | Austrian-born writer, peace advocate, Nobel Peace Prize winner |
| 13. Jane Addams (1860-1935) | 2 | US-based social worker and philosopher |
| 14. Emily Greene Balch (1867-1961) | 2 | US-based sociologist and leading pacifist |
| 15. Kathleen Courtney (1878-1974) | 2 | British-based political activist, suffragist, internationalist |
| 16. Mary Parker Follett (1868-1933) | 2 | US-based sociologist and organizational theorist |
| 17. Mary Agnes Hamilton (1884-1966) | 2 | British-based Labour Party politician |
| 18. Agnes Headlam-Morley (1902-1986) | 2 | British-based IR scholar |
| 19. Lucy Philip Mair (1901-1986) | 2 | British-based scholar of colonial administration |
| 20. Margery Perham (1895-1982) | 2 | British-based scholar of colonial administration |
| 21. Ruth Savord (1896-1966) | 2 | US-based librarian |
| 22. Barbara Ward (1914-1981) | 2 | British-based development economist |

* This gender identification refers to a discursive and historical construction rather than biological difference.

Lucy Philip Mair: A Case of ‘White Woman’s IR’

Through a series of important interventions during the last two decades, IR scholars have a much better historically-informed sense of the discipline's origins in the study of colonial administration (Long and Schmidt, 2005: 1-21). As one leading IR scholar wrote in 1933, the analysis of colonial administration involves 'the study of various theories of economic policy, both as regards relations between the colonies and the metropolis and as regards the different possible methods of economic development within the territory itself, and of administrative policy in the wide sense of general aims of government and... of the actual functioning of the political machine and the relations between authorities in the colonies and at home' (Mair, 1933: 369-370).

What does asking questions about women contribute to the most significant and far-reaching new historiography in IR? We find that even some of the very best of this work inadvertently reinforces the assumption that historical women played no role in this dubious past. As a step in recovering and analysing the full spectrum of women's international thought we must ask, was IR really just a 'white man's IR' (Lake, 2016: 1112) founded by 'great white fathers' (Vitalis, 2017: 99)? In Table 6, two of the historical women most recognized across the sixty histories of international thought specialized in colonial administration: Margery Perham and Lucy Philip Mair.

A towering figure in the academic, policy, and media field of colonial administration, Perham is already the subject of a book length biography (Faught, 2011). At Oxford, she lectured on 'Problems of Colonial Administration', 'Problems of Race and Government in Africa', 'The Colonial Empire', and 'British Policy towards Native Races'. She also mentored women faculty at Oxford who taught IR or IR-related subjects for decades, including Sibyl Crowe and Mary Proudfoot, suggesting that we also need to examine networks of historical IR women. However, from the perspective of IR's disciplinary history, the more interesting case is Perham's equivalent at the London School of Economics, Lucy Philip Mair.

The existing literature makes two mentions of Mair, Wright's (1955: 181) citation of her 1928 book, *The Protection of Minorities: The Working and Scope of the Minorities Treaties Under the League of Nations* and a brief mention in Bauer and Brighi's (2003) edited collection, *International Relations at the LSE: A History of 75 Years*. In Northedge's (2003: 11) essay in that volume, we learn that Mair 'assisted the Professor generally', the Professor being Philip Noel-Baker, the first Sir Ernest Cassel Professor of IR, later renamed the Montagu Burton Chair.

Lucy Philip Mair was among the first cohort of scholars hired to teach in the new International Studies (later Relations) Department, established in 1927. She had graduated with a first-class degree in Classics from Newnam College, Cambridge in 1923, but as a woman was 'debarred by her sex from competing for University prizes, scholarships, and studentships'. She worked at Gilbert Murray's League of Nations Union for five years as variously Publicity Secretary, Head of the Intelligence Department, Lecturer, and Representative at the Assembly of the League in Geneva.[§] According to Murray, 'There is hardly an aspect of the League's work on which she could not lecture effectively'.^{**} In the 1920s, Mair's academic work focused on the 'minority question' posed by the dismemberment of the Ottoman and Austrian empires, the subject of her first monograph,

[§] Mr. H. Rackham to William Beveridge, n.d. 1927 LSE File Mair, Dr. L. P. 1927-1935 A

^{**} Gilbert Murray to William Beveridge, n.d. 1927 LSE File Mair, Dr. L. P. 1927-1935 A

The Protection of Minorities (1928), still cited nearly three decades later in surveys of important IR works.

In the summer of 1928, Mair delivered a course of twenty lectures on 'Some Aspects of World Politics at the Present Day' at Morley College for Working Men and Women in London, founded by Emma Cons in 1889 and the first to admit men and women on equal terms. During the 1928-29 year, the first in which she appears in the *LSE Calendar*, Mair taught or co-taught seven of the twenty courses listed under International Relations: 'Cultural Contacts between the West and Primitive Peoples', 'Economic Aspects of International Relations'; 'Pacific Methods of Settling International Disputes'; 'Problems of Colonial Government'; 'The Protection of Minorities'; 'The International Labour Organisation'; and 'Review of Current International Events'. Mair's wider interest in mandated territories led her to research the administration of colonial Africa. In 1931, the year she was formally appointed Assistant Lecturer in IR, Mair was awarded a fellowship from the Rockefeller Foundation for field research in East Africa.

From 1927 until 1940, when Mair took leave of absence to undertake wartime work for the British Colonial Office, she lectured extensively on colonial administration, with all courses listed under IR. Mair received another fellowship, from the International African Institute, for a field trip in the mandated territory of North Western Tanganyika for 1936-7, the year she was also approached to work for the Chatham House Africa Research Survey. On the eve of World War II, Mair's IR teaching included 'Possession of Colonial Territory as an International Problem', covering topics all central to British colonial strategy in the context of rival empires and anti-colonial resistance: colonial possessions as a source of international rivalry; current demands for redistribution; attempts at international regulation of administrative standards; League of Nations and International Labour Conventions; and the mandate system. During the following session, she covered the difference between the 'actual and supposed' economic advantages of colonies; non-economic values attached to colonies; colonial development and the interest of native peoples; existing international standards of administration; and proposals for modifications of the status quo of colonialism other than the redistribution of colonial territories to rival powers.

During the war, Mair worked at the British Empire section of the Foreign Research and Press Service at Chatham House and in 1944, the year she published her third book *Welfare in the British Colonies*, she was invited by the Australian government to lecture for twelve months on the colonial administration of New Guinea. She became instructor in Colonial Administration at the Australian Land Headquarters Civil Affairs School, publishing *Australia in New Guinea* in 1948. After the war, Mair's LSE teaching was formally listed under Anthropology. In fact, Mair had indicated her desire to transfer from IRD to Anthropology before the war. During her 1937 research in North Western Tanganyika, Mair wrote to the LSE Director, William Beveridge, who was also her mother's second husband and line manager. The LSE Secretary was Mair's mother, Janet Thomson Beveridge. Lucy Mair proposed that she transfer to Anthropology, 'merely giving lectures on the international aspects of colonies which students taking International Relations could attend'.^{††}

It seems that the primary reason for Mair's departure from IRD was her desire for a coherent teaching/research profile centering on her specialism, rather than any sense of a

^{††} Mair to William Beveridge 28 April 1937. LSE File, Mair, Dr. L. P. 1935-1946, B

fundamental distinction between IR and Colonial Administration *per se*.^{‡‡} Indeed, in the early 1930s, there was discussion of whether IR should be combined with Colonial Administration in one unit at the LSE with a single head of Department. Mair's work was certainly considered core IR. Through the 1930s one of Anglo-American IR's central concerns was 'peaceful change' in world politics and the consequences of the difference 'between have and have-not states'. The 1937 International Studies Conference in Paris focused on this theme, leading to the publication of a book edited by Charles Manning, who held the LSE's Montague Burton Chair from 1930 until 1962. Mair was one of eight contributors, writing on 'Colonial Policy and Peaceful Change'.^{§§}

Needless-to-say, Mair was central to the consolidation of IR at the LSE. In 1934, she wrote an internal memorandum on 'International Relations as a Separate Subject'. 'In its present-day form', she states, 'the study must centre round the problem of the attempt to unite in a collective system a number of communities which are highly organised politically with a view of independent action. This problem is absolutely *sui generis*. It cannot be understood or solved by a process of facile generalization from the history of political development within individual states'.^{***} Significantly, Mair wrote of relations between communities with a high level of political organization, rather than relations between 'states', perhaps reflecting her sense of the political organization of the communities administered by Britain as colonies, with Mair's assistance.

Clearly one of the reasons Mair is neglected in disciplinary histories is that the central focus of her teaching and scholarship was colonial administration, as well as the fact that she was a woman: a double-exclusion. But the process of erasure occurred as early as 1950 by one of her own colleagues, the Montague Burton Chair and South African segregationist, Charles Manning (Suganami, 2001). In an undated memorandum, but after 1949, 'Note on the Nature of International Relations as the province of the Montague Burton Chair', Manning offered this version of the LSE's IR curriculum. In his words,

Flanked, thus, on the one hand by International Law, on the other by International History, and with the economic factor a staple of the curriculum, the subject of International Relations, in its early days at the School, included also a necessary emphasis on international institutions, the technique and procedures of diplomacy, and the geographical factor in international affairs... It has been along these lines that, since the middle of the twenties the subject of International Relations has been pursued at LSE.^{†††}

Manning was certainly aware of Mair's central role and her teaching on colonial administration since they were colleagues for thirteen years and he included her work in an edited volume. Indeed, many years later, in a retrospective speech delivered on his retirement in 1962, Manning briefly mentioned Mair while discussing 'the depletion, replenishment and growth of the staff' at IRD (1962: 350). 'Lucy Mair, moving out from her specialisation in the League mandates, had opted for a future in the teaching of Colonial

^{‡‡} Mair to William Beveridge 28 April 1937. LSE File Mair, Dr. L. P. 1935-1946, B

^{§§} 'Peaceful Change: An International Problem'. 1937. LSE File, LNU/7/36

^{***} Mair, 'International Relations as a Separate Subject', 20th February 1934. LSE\LSE School History\Box 10 Chairs. I am extremely grateful to Sue Donnelley, the LSE Archivist, for tracking down this file.

^{†††} C.A.W Manning, 'Note on the Nature of International Relations as the province of the Montague Burton Chair'. n.d. p.2. LSE\LSE School History\Box 10 Chairs

Administration' (1962: 35). But, of course, there was less a 'moving out' than a natural progression from working on League mandates to analysing the administration of colonies.

Through a combination of his own support for racial-colonial segregation in South Africa and 'defence of the unified and coherent nature of the study of international relations' (Long, 2005: 78), Manning obscured the place of both Mair and Colonial Administration in the history of IR at the LSE, and thus in the field more broadly. Her place was even further buried when Manning explained why the proposal to combine Colonial Administration and IR was rejected. In his words, 'the two subjects were, if anything, cousins rather than twins, the one being concerned with a manifestation of government, the other with the processes and possibilities of diplomacy - man's traditional means of doing his public business on that extra-national level where government has not as yet come to apply'.^{†††} Manning makes no mention of the fact that the suggestion to create a united Department arose because Colonial Administration was central to the IR curriculum, was taught primarily under IR, and was considered as an area for expansion, even in the context of wider budget cuts during the Depression of the 1930s. In contrast, Mair's earlier, subtler notion of relations between 'communities' that are 'highly organised politically' accommodates colonial and inter-state relations.

Based on her world-leading expertise in colonial administration, Lucy Mair was a high-profile figure among both scholars and policymakers over a long period of time. She taught a large percentage of the early students of IR in what at the time was one of its largest academic centres in the world. She is honoured in the academic discipline into which she migrated; her work is the subject of two edited volumes in Anthropology (Davis, 1974; Owusu, 1975). But, in IR, she is unknown for her role in its disciplinary history or contributions to international-colonial thought. We have only the a highly gendered line in Northedge's essay, that she 'assisted the Professor generally' (2003: 11).

Lucy Mair's case suggests that even the most brilliant works of disciplinary history that have undone earlier sanitized versions of IR's past can also inadvertently reproduce the myth of historical women's absence. As historians of IR increasingly dispense with the ahistorical myth of IR as emerging from the 'realist' rejection of 'idealism' (Ashworth, 2014: 261) it will not be surprising if we find a much larger body of work by historical women who forged for themselves a distinctive place within the early field of IR through work on the management of colonial empire. Retrieval and analysis of women's international thought cannot occur in isolation from the most recent cutting-edge work in IR's intellectual and disciplinary history. But such work must also do more to locate and analyze historical women's international thought.

Conclusion: Defining a Research Agenda

Far more research is required to fully capture historical women's contributions to international thought. But the evidence presented in this article suggests that existing intellectual and disciplinary histories in IR are partial and flawed in their understanding of the range, content, and conditions of historical women's international thought and role in disciplinary history. Thus, long-standing efforts to present a 'state of the art' of IR, past or present, can only be partial and flawed due the absence, often erasure, of historical women. The existing assumption that women only seriously began to think and write about

^{†††} Manning, 'Note on the Nature', pp.2-3

international politics towards the end of the twentieth-century is wrong. The case of Lucy Philip Mair suggests that this oversight is, in part, a product of an active erasure of early IR's role in colonial administration. Despite the considerable obstacles they have faced historical women are a part of IR's history. Significant numbers of historical women have written powerfully about international politics, both inside and outside academe, and in and through a variety of disciplinary and institutional settings.

An interdisciplinary research program aimed at recovering and evaluating historical women's international thought is belated to say the least. What would such a program change about the way IR scholars currently write the history of international thought and disciplinary history? First, disciplinary historians would need to ask more questions about the gendered politics of writing disciplinary history. Rather than assuming that historical women's absence represents a void, historians of IR should enquire into concrete practices through which racially and geographically diverse historical women were pushed out of the story of IR's disciplinary history. Understanding such forms of exclusion is highly relevant to the politics of IR's disciplinary formation, including its central focus on intellectual 'schools', 'paradigms', and 'great debates'.

Second, historians of international thought should ask questions about the variety of locations in which historical women engaged in international thought, and what this tells us both about disciplinary formation but also the conditions of intellectual production. We require much more research. However, it is quite likely that historical women working outside or at the edges of academe used different idioms for conceiving international politics, contributing to their marginal position in intellectual history, but also to the distinctiveness of their ideas.

Third, both international political theorists and historians of international thought should ask questions about the content and form of historical women's international thought. The category of 'historical women' should not be understood as a monolithic label and there can be no innate 'women's' view of international politics. Nonetheless, it is highly likely that examination of diverse historical women's intellectual contributions will expand the thematic boundaries and genres of international thought.

The findings presented in this article are highly significant for IR's disciplinary history, the history of international thought, and feminist IR. Since the diverse lives and ideas of historical women are rarely recorded in IR textbooks and curricula retrieving their writing could have enormous pedagogical as well as scholarly value. Historical women's exclusion from the history of international thought and disciplinary history tells us very little about the quantity and quality of women's intellectual work in this domain. It tells us much more about how selective histories are produced and maintained, and how gendered and racial hierarchies shape intellectual organization. Hence, the real question is not, to paraphrase Martin Wight's (1966) famous query, 'why is there no international theory' by historical women? Rather it is what happened to women's international thought?

References

Armitage, David (2013) *Foundations of Modern International Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Ashworth, Lucian M. (2011) 'Feminism, War, and the Prospects for Peace: Helena

- Stanwick (1864-1939) and the Lost Feminists of Interwar International Relations', *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 13(1):25-43
- Ashworth, Lucian M. (2014) *A History of International Thought: From the Origins of the Modern State to Academic International Relations* (London: Routledge)
- Ball, Desmond and Sheryn Lee (2014) *Power and International Relations: Essays in Honour of Coral Bell* (Canberra: ANU Press)
- Bauer, Harry, and Elisabetta Brighi (2003) *International Relations at the LSE: A History of 75 Years* (London: Millennium)
- Bay, Mia, Farah J. Griffin, Martha S. Jones and Barbara D. Savage (eds.) (2015) *Toward an Intellectual History of Black Women* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press)
- Blackwell, Joyce (2004) *No Peace Without Freedom: Race and The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom 1915-1975* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press)
- Bliddal, Henrick, Casper Sylvest, and Peter Wilson (eds.) (2013) *Classics of International Relations: Essays in Criticism and Appreciation* (London: Routledge)
- Broad, Jacqueline, and Green, Karen (2009) *A History of Women's Political Thought in Europe, 1400–1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Brown, Chris, Terry Nardin, and Nicholas Rengger (eds.) (2002) *International Relations in Political Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Butler, Judith (1990) *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (London: Routledge)
- Clark, Ian and Neumann, Iver B. (eds) (1996) *Classical Theories in International Relations* (London: Macmillan)
- Confortini, Catia (2012) *Intelligent Compassion: Feminist Critical Methodology in the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- Cooper, Anna Julia (1925/1988) *Slavery and the French Revolutionists, 1788-1804* (trans. Frances Richardson Keller) (New York: Edwin Mellen)
- Davis, John (ed.) (1974) *Choice and Change: Essays in Honour of Lucy Mair* (London: Athlone)
- Deegan, M.J. (1981) 'Early Women Sociologists and the American Sociological Society: Patterns of Exclusion and Participation', *American Sociologist*, 16:14-24

Der Derian, James (ed.) (1995) *International Theory: Critical Investigations* (New York: New York University Press)

Downs, Laura Lee (2004) *Writing Gender History* (London: Hodder)

Faught, Brad C. (2011) *Into Africa: The Imperial Life of Margery Perham* (London: I.B. Taurus)

Forsyth, M.G., H.M.A. Keens-Soper and P. Savigear (eds.) (1970) *The Theory of International Relations: Selected Texts from Gentili to Treitschke* (London: Routledge)

Germain, Randall (ed.) (2016) *Susan Strange and the Future of Global Political Economy: Power, Control, and Transformation* (London: Routledge)

Gottlieb, Julie V. (2015) *'Guilty Women', Foreign Policy, and Appeasement in Inter-War Britain* (London: Palgrave)

Green, Karen (2014) *A History of Women's Political Thought in Europe, 1700–1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Griffiths, Martin (1999) *Fifty Key Thinkers of International Relations* (London: Routledge)

Griffiths, Martin, Steven C. Roach, M. Scott Solomon (eds.) (2009) *Fifty Key Thinkers of International Relations* (second edition) (London: Routledge)

Hall, Ian (2015) *Radicals and Reactionaries in Twentieth-Century International Thought* (London: Palgrave)

Hall, Ian (2012) *Dilemmas of Decline: British Intellectuals and World Politics, 1945–1975* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press)

Hall, Ian, and Lisa Hill (eds.) (2009) *British International Thinkers from Hobbes to Namier* (London: Palgrave)

Hansen, Lene (2011) 'A Research Agenda on Feminist Texts and the Gendered Constitution of International Politics in Rebecca West's *Black Lamb and Grey Falcon*', *Millennium*, 40(1):109-128

Higashida, Cheryl (2011), *Black International Feminism: Women Writers of the Black Left, 1945-1995* (Illinois: University of Illinois Press)

Hobson, John M. (2012) *The Eurocentric Conception of World Politics: Western International Theory, 1760-2010* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Huber, Valeska, Pietsch, Tamson, Rietzler, Katharina (forthcoming) 'Thinking the Global Through the New Professions: Women and International Political Thought, ca. 1900-1950' (article MS in preparation)

International Studies Quarterly (2017) 'ISQ Guidelines and Policy'. Available at <<http://www.isanet.org/Publications/ISQ/Guidelines-and-Policy>> (accessed September 27, 2017)

Jacobs, Ellen (2007), 'An Organizing Female with a Briefcase': Barbara Wootton, Political Economy and Social Justice, 1920-1950', *Women's History Review*, 16(3):431-446

Jahn, Beate (2006) *Classical Theory in International Relations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Jørgensen Knud Erik and Tonny Bremms Knudsen (2006) *International Relations in Europe: Traditions, Perspectives, Destinations* (London: Routledge)

Kauppi, Mark V. and Viotti, Paul R. (1992) *The Global Philosophers: World Politics in Western Thought* (New York: Lexington)

Keene, Edward (2005) *International Political Thought: A Historical Argument* (Cambridge: Polity)

Kerber, Linda (1997) *Toward an Intellectual History of Women: Essays* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press)

Kinsella, Helen M. (2014) 'Simone Weil: An Introduction' in Felix Roesch (ed.) *Émigré Scholars and the Genesis of American International Relations: a European Discipline in America?* (London: Palgrave)

Knutsen, Torbjørn L. (1992) *A History of International Relations Theory* (first edition) (Manchester: Manchester University Press)

Knutsen, Torbjørn L. (1997) *A History of International Relations Theory* (second edition) (Manchester: Manchester University Press)

Knutsen, Torbjørn L. (2016) *A History of International Relations Theory* (third edition) (Manchester: Manchester University Press)

Lake, David (2016) 'White Man's IR: An Intellectual Confession', *Perspectives on Politics*, 14(4), pp.1112-1122

Lebow, Richard Ned, Peer Schouten, and Hidemi Suganami (eds.) (2016) *The Return of the Theorists: Dialogues with Great Thinkers in International Relations* (London: Palgrave)

- Leira, Halvard, and Benjamin de Carvalho (eds.) (2015) *Historical International Relations, Vol.II: The History of International Thought* (London: Sage)
- Linklater, Andrew (2000) *International Relations: Critical Concepts in Political Science* (London: Routledge)
- Long, David (2005) 'C. A. W. Manning and the Discipline of International Relations', *The Round Table*, 94(378), pp.77-96
- Long, David and Brian Schmidt (2005) *Imperialism and Internationalism in the Discipline of International Relations* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press)
- Long, David, and Peter Wilson (eds.) (1995) *Thinkers of the Twenty Years Crisis: Interwar Idealism Reassessed* (Oxford: Clarendon)
- Luard, Evan (1992) *Basic Texts in International Relations: The Evolution of Ideas about International Society* (London: Macmillan)
- Mair, Lucy Philip (1928) *The Protection of Minorities: The Working and Scope of the Minorities Treaties Under the League of Nations* (London: Christophers)
- Mair, Lucy Philip (1933) 'Colonial Administration as a Science', *Journal of the Royal African Society*, 32(129), pp.366-371
- Malchow, Howard LeRoy (2016) *History and International Relations: from the Ancient World to the 21st Century* (London: Bloombury)
- Manning, Charles (1962) 'Out to Grass - and a Lingering Looking Behind', *International Relations*, 2(6), pp.347-371
- May, Vivienne M. (2007) *Anna Julia Cooper, Visionary Black Feminist: A Critical Introduction* (London: Routledge)
- McDonald, Lynn (1994) *The Women Founders of Social Science* (Ottawa: Carleton University Press)
- Moore, Cerwyn and Chris Farrands (eds.) (2010) *International Relations Theory and Philosophy: Interpretive Dialogues* (London: Routledge)
- Morgenthau, Hans J. and Kenneth W. Thompson (eds.) (1950) *Principles and Problems of International Politics: Selected Readings* (New York: Alfred Knopf)
- Murphy, Craig N. (2017) 'Relocating the point of IR in understanding industrial age problems' in Synne L. Dyvik, Jan Selby, Rorden Wilkinson (ed.) *What's the Point of International Relations?* (London: Routledge), pp.71-82

- Neumann, Iver B., and Ole Wæver (eds.) (1997) *The Future of International Relations: Masters in the Making?* (London: Routledge)
- Owens, Patricia (2007) *Between War and Politics: International Relations and the Thought of Hannah Arendt* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- Owens, Patricia (2017) 'Racism in the Theory Canon: Hannah Arendt and "the one Great Crime in which America was Never Involved"', *Millennium*, 45(33), pp.403-424
- Owusu, Maxwell (ed.) (1975) *Colonialism and Change: Essays Presented to Lucy Mair* (The Hague: Mouton)
- Plastas, M. (2011) *A Band of Noble Women: Racial Politics in the Women's Peace Movement* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press)
- Porter, Brian (ed.) (1972) *The Aberystwyth Papers, 1919-1969* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- Rösch, Felix (2014) (ed.) *Émigré Scholars and the Genesis of American International Relations: a European Discipline in America* (London: Palgrave)
- Rosenboim, Or (2014) 'Barbara Wootton, Friedrich Hayek and the debate on Democratic Federalism in the 1940s', *International History Review*, 36(5)894-918
- Russ, Joanna (1983) *How to Suppress Women's Writing* (London: Women's Press)
- Schmidt, Brian C. (1998) *The Political Discourse of Anarchy: A Disciplinary History of International Relations* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press)
- Scott, Joan W. (1986) 'Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis', *American Historical Review*, 91: 1053-75
- Shaarawi, Huda (1987) *Harem Years: The Memoirs of an Egyptian Feminist, 1879-1924* (trans. ed. Intro by Margot Badran) (New York: Feminist Press)
- Sluga, Glenda (2017) 'Women, Feminisms and Twentieth-Century Internationalisms' in Glenda Sluga and Patricia Clavin (eds.) *Internationalism: A Twentieth-Century History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.61-84
- Sluga, Glenda (2014) 'Turning International: Foundations of Modern International Thought and New Paradigms for Intellectual History', *History of European Ideas*, 41(1):103-115
- Sluga, Glenda (2015) 'Madame de Staël and the Transformation of European Politics, 1812-17', *International History Review*, 37(1):142-166

- Smith, Hilda L. and Bernice A. Carroll (eds.) (2000) *Women's Political and Social Thought: An Anthology* (Bloomington: University of Indiana Press)
- Smith, Bonnie G. (2000) *The Gender of History: Men, Women, and Historical Practice* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press)
- Spender, Dale (1982) *Women of Ideas (and What Men Have Done to Them)* (London: Ark)
- Sylvest, Casper (2009) *British Liberal Internationalism, 1880-1930: Making Progress?* (Manchester: Manchester University Press)
- Sylvester, Christine (2002) *Feminist International Relations: An Unfinished Journey* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Stawell, Francis M. (1929) *The Growth of International Thought* (London: Butterworth)
- Suganami, Hidemi (2001) 'C.A.W. Manning and the Study of International Relations', *Review of International Studies*, 27(1):91-107
- Taylor, Trevor (1978) *Approaches and Theory in International Relations* (London: Longman)
- Thompson, Kenneth W. (1982) *Masters of International Thought* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press)
- Thompson, Kenneth W. (1994) *Fathers of International Thought: The Legacy of Political Theory* (Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press)
- Tickner, J. Ann (2014) *A Feminist Voyage through International Relations* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- Umoren, Imaobong D. (2013) "'This is the Age of Woman': Black Feminism and Black Internationalism in the Works of Una Marson, 1928-1938', *History of Women in the Americas*, 1(1):50-73
- Vasquez, John A (1995) *Classics of International Relations* (3rd edition) (New York: Pearson)
- Vitalis, Robert (2015) *White World Order, Black Power Politics: The Birth of American International Relations* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press)
- Wæver, Ole (1997) 'Figures of International Thought: Introducing Persons instead of Paradigms' in Neumann and Wæver (eds.) *The Future of International Relations: Masters in the Making?* (New York: Routledge), pp.1-40
- Walker, Sarah (2017) 'Letters: The Count', *London Review of Books*, 39(6) (16 March):4

- Ward, Barbara (1972) 'Problems of a Developing World' in Brian Porter (ed.) *The Aberystwyth Papers, 1919-1969* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.264-280
- Weiss, Penny A. (2009) *Canon Fodder: Historical Women Political Thinkers* (University Park: Pennsylvania University Press)
- Wight, Martin (1966) 'Why is there no International Theory?' in Herbert Butterfield and Martin Wight (eds.) *Diplomatic Investigations* (London: Allen & Unwin), pp.17-34
- Williams, Howard, Moorhead Wright, and Tony Evans (eds.) (1993) *A Reader in International Relations and Political Theory* (Buckingham: Open University Press)
- Williams, Marc (1989) *International Relations in the Twentieth Century: A Reader* (New York: New York University Press)
- Williams, Phil, Donald Goldstein, and Jay Shafritz (1994) *Classic Readings of International Relations* (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth)
- Williams, Phil, Donald Goldstein, and Jay Shafritz (1998) *Classic Readings of International Relations* (second edition) (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth)
- Williams, Phil, Donald Goldstein, and Jay Shafritz (2005) *Classic Readings and Contemporary Debates in International Relations* (third edition) (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth)
- Wilson, Peter (2013) 'Attacking Hitler in England: Patriarchy, Class and War in Virginia Woolf's *Three Guineas*' in Bliddal (eds.) *Classics of International Relations* (London: Routledge), pp.36-47
- Wolfers, Arnold and Laurence W. Martin (eds.) (1956) *The Anglo-American Tradition in Foreign Affairs: Readings from Thomas More to Woodrow Wilson* (New Haven: Yale University Press)