A Century of International Relations Feminism: From World War I Women's Peace Pragmatism to the Women, Peace and Security Agenda

J. Ann Tickner and Jacqui True

Monash University

We examine feminism in international relations from the emergence of women's peace pragmatism during WWI to the development of the United Nations (UN) Women, Peace, and Security (WPS) agenda a century later. We argue that feminism did not come late to international relations. Rather, international relations came late to feminism. Moreover, we show how the principles articulated by women peace activists at the 1915 Hague Conference represent distinct contributions to the discipline. These principles reflect a pragmatic approach derived from women's experiences of promoting peace and inclusion. The pragmatism of these principles is echoed by, and further developed in, four pillars of the WPS agenda—as shaped by advocates of women's rights, working through processes of trial and error, to gain state support for advance principles of equal and lasting peace. States may have rejected discussion of women's rights as an appropriate matter for international negotiations in 1915. But with the evolution of women's political rights during the twentieth century, it is now possible to advance a feminist perspective on international peace and security. By recovering neglected aspects of the last century of international relations' feminism, this article helps further an alternative, pragmatist perspective on ways of knowing and doing international relations.

We Don't Know Why We Are Fighting: Can't You Women Help Us?[1]

International relations emerged as an academic discipline in the early twentieth century, around the time of World War I (WWI) (see Hill 1999; Lebow 2014). The devastation of the war drove scholars to try to understand the causes of military conflict, with the aim of making a more peaceful world. In the process, those scholars helped create international relations as a field of study. In more recent years, the field held a series of retrospectives to mark the centennial of the start of the war. Yet, in spite of claims that WWI is the most studied war in history,[2] little discussion of women's peace activities appears in either these retrospectives or the discipline's broader analyses of WWI. Scholarly discussion of an important meeting held in The Hague, Netherlands, in

1915, was completely absent. There, more than fifteen hundred women from twelve nations met to draw up plans for peace following "the war to end all wars" (Balch quoted in Addams et al. 2003, 89).

In *The Political Discourse of Anarchy,* his revisionist history of the discipline, Schmidt (1998, 5) argues that, in order to critically examine contemporary international relations scholarship and help understand its assumptions, it is vital that we revisit its history.[3] Yet, this disciplinary history rarely includes women, or issues of concern to women. Aside from Lynch's (1999) work on interwar peace movements and the realist-idealist debate, histories of the early discipline have paid little attention to women and gender issues. Until quite recently, international relations scholarship was almost exclusively dominated by men and, in consequence, men's concerns. Few women numbered among the leading scholars in the field.[4]

Thus, it should not surprise us that the field has paid no attention to the deliberations of women at The Hague who, like early scholars of world politics, also sought to construct knowledge that could contribute to building a more peaceful postwar world. The Hague women wrote insightfully about the causes of war and possibilities for its prevention. They developed tools for understanding and preventing military conflict. Throughout the twentieth century women activists worked hard to get issues, such as gender-based violence and women's participation in peace processes, on the agenda of states. But women have had a hard time having their voices seen as authentic in matters of international politics, particularly those related to war and national security.

[1] Emily Balch, a delegate to the Hague Conference, reporting on what soldiers, wounded in WWI, said to their nurses (Balch quoted in Addams, Balch, and Hamilton 2003, 89).

[2] In a review article marking the one hundredth anniversary of WW1 (Vasquez 2014), women wrote only eight out of seventy three articles cited, three had women coauthors, and the same woman authored six of the eight.

[3] Claiming that scholars produce unreliable accounts of their field's histories in order to obscure certain issues, Vitalis (2015, 1–8) argues that race and empire were central issues for early international relations scholars and key to understanding the history and development of the field.

[4] The 2011 Teaching, Research and International Policy (TRIP) TRIP survey listed only two women among the twenty most influential international relations scholars around the world.

It took nearly a century for feminist international relations, an approach motivated by some of the same concerns, to enter the field.[5] And many scholars still see feminist concerns as "women's issues" that lack significance for the wider discipline.

While conventional disciplinary histories suggest that feminism came late to international relations, we argue that, the discipline has come late to feminism. International relations has completely neglected the longer tradition of feminist theorizing about international peace and security, as well as its pragmatist approach.[6] We demonstrate this argument by showing the connection between the principles agreed to by women at The Hague and those informing women, peace, and security activism at the United Nations (UN) a century later. Both offer a distinct, feminist form of pragmatism in the context of relations between states that are marked by cooperation as well as war.

We begin by documenting some of the early history of feminist contributions to understanding international politics. While women's writing on these issues precede the twentieth century,[7] we begin our story with women's peace activities during WWI. We focus specifically on the Women's Peace Party (WPP) and the International Congress of Women (ICW) held at The Hague in 1915. We do so because their agendas were similar to that of early international relations. Foreshadowing issues that came much later to the discipline, these women claimed that, in the modern world, principles of gender equality, social justice, and peace were crucially intertwined.[8]

We focus on the writings and activities of Jane Addams since she was president both of the WPP and the ICW, as well as one of the founders of the pragmatist school of philosophy. We show how a feminist form of pragmatism is reflected in principles that emanated from The Hague Women's Congress.

In part two we explore how feminist activists and scholars have debated and researched these same foundational principles over the past thirty years, principles that have contributed to the emergence of the UN Women, Peace and Security (WPS) agenda and to pro-feminist foreign policies. We analyze both continuities and departures from the earlier principles revealing their shared pragmatism. In part three we discuss the similarities between the pragmatism deployed by early feminist peace activists and contemporary feminist knowledge-building. In the conclusion, we propose that feminist international relations and, in particular, its scholarship and activism surrounding WPS both reflects and extends the feminist pragmatist century-long tradition of theorizing for social change.

Women's Peace Movements during World War I: Early Interventions into Feminist International Relations

Women's Peace Party

In the fall of 1914, Rosika Schwimmer of Hungary and Emmeline-Pethick Lawrence of England, both of whom were to play a major role in the ICW, traveled around the United States, soliciting support from American women for ending the war in Europe. In response, Jane Addams convened a meeting of women's peace groups in Washington DC in 1915 out of which the WPP emerged, a party whose platform was very similar to The Hague resolutions.

Since the mid- to late-nineteenth century, women throughout Europe and the United States, had been forming women's peace groups. Swedish feminist Frederika Bremer first promoted the idea of a women-only peace movement in 1854. This idea that was realized in practice in 1868 when a Swiss woman, Marie Geogg, founded the Association Internationale des Femmes (Berkman 1990, 145).[9] Bertha Von Sutter, a Viennese feminist who published an influential book *Lay Down Your Arms* (1889), was an early advocate of arbitration, an important principle of the international peace activism of the late nineteenth century that was, in turn, enshrined in The Hague resolutions.

The linking of peace with economic and social justice, found in many of these early movements, was also an important aspect of The Hague resolutions. And as in these earlier movements, leaders of the WPP claimed that, since women were responsible for the care of children, they best understood the values of preserving life and could therefore better resolve international conflicts without resorting to violence. While the WPP women saw women and men as different, they saw this difference leading to a radically revised society based on sexual equality and peaceful human relations—in other words, the creation of an egalitarian, androgynous society (Schott 1985, 18–20).[10]

The WPP, with Addams as its first president, was formed in response to the pleas of European women in the midst of conflict. Its platform addressed issues related to that war, most of which were later incorporated into resolutions adopted at the ICW. The 1915 platform stated that the term "concert of nations" should supersede "balance of power" and called for the formation of an international police force to replace national militaries. It also urged removal of the economic causes of war and singled out the private manufacture and sale of arms as of special concern. Claiming that women have a vested interest in developing a global consciousness, Addams exhorted the women to protest what she termed "a tribal form of patriotism" (see Addams 1907, 216). International in its orientation from the start, the WPP merged into the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF) in 1919 with Addams as its first president (see Confortini 2012).

---

[5] While women had been writing about international relations for a long time, feminist international relations only entered the discipline in the late 1980s and early 1990s with the publication of works such as Elshtain (1987), Enloe (1989), Tickner (1992), Sylvester (1994b), and True (1995).

[6] International relations feminists have discussed women's peace activism during the early twentieth century (see Confortini 2012; Sluga and James 2016; Ashworth 2011; Lynch 1999).

[7] Although not specifically focused on international politics, some earlier examples of feminist writings include Mary Wollstonecraft's *The Vindication of the Rights of Women* (1792), Harriet Taylor Mill's *The Enfranchisement of Women* (1851), and John Stuart Mill's *The Subjection of Women* (1869).

[8] The Hague women used the term *women's equality*. We use *gender equality* in recognition of the multiple masculinities and femininities explored by contemporary feminists.

[9] Until the outbreak of WWI, the suffrage and peace movements were linked. However, many suffragettes did support the war, and the International Woman Suffrage Alliance did not support The Hague Congress (see Kamester and Vellacott 1987). For a more detailed analysis of women's peace movements in the nineteenth century, see Berkman (1990).

[10] Women peace activists' claims about women's unique perspective on peace need not be based on an account of innate biological differences. See Weldon (2011) and Young (1997, 12–37) for a political theory of women's perspective rather than women's (inherent) "interests."

The International Congress of Women

The days in The Hague gave me an answer to the question which I had asked myself since the outbreak of war in anxious days and weary nights: where are the women?[11]

In April 1915, shortly after the WPP meeting, fifteen hundred women from twelve countries on both sides of the conflict, as well as women from neutral states, traveled to The Hague, Netherlands, to attend a congress. The Congress's aim was to draw up a set of peace proposals and initiate talks to end the war. The women undertook this journey to The Hague, a city chosen because it symbolized internationalism, at considerable personal peril. Traveling in wartime was dangerous, due to the presence of warships and submarines. Some of the women's home countries put prohibitions on their travel; the British government refused permits to 180 women; French women who tried to attend were arrested (*New York Times* 1915a, 4).

While certain newspapers reported fairly on the meeting, most were condemnatory. Alice Hamilton of the US delegation reported that the Dutch press was contemptuous and the English press nasty (Chambers 1991, 57). In an article in *Metropolitan Magazine* of 1915, condemning the United States' reluctance to enter the war, former president Theodore Roosevelt bemoaned America's "lapse from virile manliness." He took aim at the Hague women, describing them as a "shrieking sisterhood of pacifists," "amiable peace prattlers" who uttered silly platitudes of comfort to the enemy (Roosevelt 1915, 12). While the women were condemned for being idealistic and impractical (*New York Times* 1915b, 10; Cavillier 1915),[12] many points in the Congress's resolutions were remarkably forward looking. Elshtain (2002, 225) claims that the resolutions anticipated what was to become the League of Nations. They were also strikingly similar to the eight UN Security Council (UNSC) resolutions adopted between 2000 and 2015, resolutions that comprise today's UNSC's WPS agenda as we discuss in the second section of this article.

The twenty resolutions adopted at The Hague were divided into seven sections, the first of which was called Women and War.[13] Section one challenged the notion that women could be protected in war, noting that, in all wars, women are especially vulnerable to violence.[14] In a speech to the WPP several months earlier, Jane Addams, who was elected president of the Congress, had noted that civilians more generally were dying at a rate of five civilians to one soldier killed on the battlefield. She also argued that giving care to children, the sick, and the elderly had to be sacrificed in times of conflict (Chambers 1991, 55).

Recognizing the rights of self-determination and self-government, sections two and three urged states to begin immediate negotiations for a just peace. These negotiations, the resolutions held, should include arbitration efforts—the implication being that no nation should be required to surrender unconditionally (Elshtain 2002, 224). They also recommended that a conference of neutral nations be cre-

ated to offer continuous mediation and that foreign policies of all states be subject to democratic control. Democracy meant equal political rights and participation for women. In this respect, the women's peace principles were prospective international norms interconnected with, but also predating, the full realization of the international suffrage movement. Section four urged that another Hague conference be convened immediately following the war, as well as the establishment of a permanent International Court of Justice. The Congress advocated that representatives of the people, including women, should also participate in peace negotiations. H.M. Swanwick, a member of the British delegation, noted that it was unacceptable that only the men who made war were permitted seats at the peace table. Recognizing that private profits accruing from arms sales were a great hindrance to abolishing wars, the Congress recommended that states, rather than private industry, should control the manufacture and international sales of arms and munitions.

The final section recommended that the Congress appoint envoys to carry the messages expressed in the resolutions to the rulers of belligerent and neutral nations of Europe. Addams, as ICW president and as a delegate from the United States, a country that was still neutral at the time, participated in all the groups that toured the major European capitals. The delegations found that older men expressed more enthusiasm for war, while the younger men who did the fighting were more pragmatic and more ready to accept that war was an illegitimate method of settling international disputes (Addams et al. 2003, 70–73). Although Addams conceded that they were received cordially, she concluded that militarism is firmly lodged in men's minds. Both Addams and Emily Balch spoke with US President Woodrow Wilson and presented the ICW resolutions to him. While they failed to convince him of their mediation plan, many of the resolutions looked very similar to Wilson's Fourteen Points.[15]

Feminist Pragmatism

Better it is for philosophy to err in active participation in the living struggles and issues of its own age and times, than to maintain an immune monastic impeccability …

John Dewey (in Seigfried 1996, 261)[16]
Life in a settlement … teaches you that education and culture have little to do with real wisdom, the wisdom that comes from life experience.
Alice Hamilton (in Seigfried 1996, 77)

Deegan (2003, 24) claims that The Hague resolutions are clear statements of the theory and practice of feminist pragmatism, the key principles of which are the importance of democracy as a group process in which women's participation is crucial and education as a rational force for social change. Deegan (2003, 29) asserts that much of today's women's peace activism, for instance around the WPS agenda, carries forward ideas articulated in feminist pragmatism a century ago. And the pragmatism, espoused by these thinkers, bears a striking resemblance to contemporary feminist knowledge building articulated in feminist international relations and WPS scholarship today.

---

[11] Lida Gustava Heymann, German delegate to the ICW (quoted in Addams et al. 2003, 118). A century later, Enloe (2014, 6) asked this same question.

[12] In a letter to the *New York Times*, dated April 20, 1915, Louis Cavillier, chairman of the New York Assembly Committee on Military Affairs, described The Hague principles as "silly, base, and hysterical in the extreme."

[13] Content of The Hague resolutions and discussion at the Congress are taken from a report entitled "Towards Permanent Peace" issued by the British Committee of the International Congress, published in June 1915.

[14] Wartime propaganda focused on men "rescuing" women and children (Berkman 1990, 154). The Hague women already articulated the "protection myth," an idea central to contemporary feminism. See Stiehm (1982).

[15] Wilson's Fourteen Points, a statement of principles for world peace, delivered in a speech on January 8, 1918, contained similarities with the Hague principles as Addams pointed out (Elshtain 2002, 225; see also Lynch 1999).

[16] Certain male philosophers, including John Dewey, George Herbert Mead, and William James, were important allies of feminist pragmatists (Addams et al. 2003, 26).

First introduced in a lecture delivered by William James in 1898, American pragmatism holds that people need to question what they think in order to move beyond abstract thought and create useful knowledge for solving everyday problems. James claimed that what makes beliefs true is not their ability to stand up to logical scrutiny but their ability to lead us to more useful relations with the world (Menand 1997, xiv).[17] John Dewey, another noted pragmatist of the period, was also a friend of, and collaborator with, Jane Addams.

Dewey criticized the distinction between mind and matter prevalent in the philosophy of his time, a split that has been foundational for feminist critiques of western knowledge (Lloyd 1984; Harding 1991; Cochran 1999). Dewey attributed the origins of this dualism to classical Greek philosophy that formalized the Greeks' separation of rational and theoretical knowledge, the domain of aristocrats and free citizens (all of whom were men), and practical knowledge, the concern of those tasked with menial labor (women and slaves) (Seigfried 1996, 241). He chastised the formalism of philosophy for withdrawing from the social problems of his time (Cochran 1999, 178). Dewey also wrote about education and founded the Laboratory School, a children's experimental school attached to the University of Chicago. The school adhered to his philosophy of learning by doing, an idea that was adopted, and possibly partly formulated by, Addams. Dewey greatly respected Addams and cited her influence on his own work. He called her first book *Democracy and Social Ethics* "one of the great books of our time" and used it in a course he taught at the University of Chicago (Seigfried 1996, 228). Indeed, Addams made equal contributions to the early formulation of pragmatism, yet later philosophers have never credited or cited her work.[18]

The University of Chicago had been coeducational since its founding in 1892. By 1902, women undergraduates outnumbered men, something that greatly alarmed its president. Fearing the "feminizing" of the university, which he claimed would discourage men from attending, he proposed gender segregation, a move that was never fully instituted in practice (Seigfried 1996, 82). Pragmatist philosophy being contextual, grounded in experience and rejecting the neutral observer, proved especially appealing to women students; it allowed them to trust their own experiences, even when these might run counter to accepted norms. Women pragmatists took pragmatism one step further by claiming that scholars should become members of communities plagued by the problems that their theories aimed to solve (Seigfried 1996, 58). But since women were largely excluded from tenured positions in US philosophy departments, their ideas were not carried forward. Those who did follow the pragmatist tradition worked mainly outside academic institutions (Seigfried 1996, 107).

Whereas Dewey developed his ideas on pragmatism as chair of Chicago's philosophy department, Addams articulated hers through her work at Hull House (Menand 1997, xxiii) where Dewey was a frequent visitor, giving lectures and engaging in philosophical conversations with Addams. Addams implemented her ideas about pragmatist knowledge through the establishment of settlements in the most deprived city neighborhoods where those with more education could live with, and educate, the least privileged in a form of communal (rather than top-down) learning.

Seigfried (1996, 199) claims that it was the Hull House women who pioneered a feminist pragmatist approach to problem solving that put knowledge at the disposal of society's poorest members. Addams defined a settlement as an attempt to express the meaning of life in terms of life itself, in forms of activity. "The settlement stands for application as opposed to research; for emotion as opposed to abstraction; for universality as opposed to specialization" (Daynes and Longo 2004, 78). While specialized knowledge seeks to find clinical material with the motive of analyzing it in a laboratory, universal knowledge aims to discover what knowledge a group may possess. Addams (1997, 275) believed that scholars should become members of communities plagued by the problems their theories were supposed to solve. In other words, knowledge must be useful for solving life's problems. Addams (1997, 283) was deeply critical of the association of knowledge with its monetary value. She castigated scientists' idle thirst for knowledge that lacked any relation to human life. Early feminist pragmatists frequently used the term *sympathetic understanding*. Its meaning is similar to contemporary feminism's emphasis on *empathetic cooperation* as a method of inquiry (Sylvester 1994a; Aggestam and Bergman Rosamond 2016).

By talking about social (public) claims of her settlement work, Addams questioned the gendering of the public sphere for political matters and the private sphere for domestic and personal ones (Knight 2005, 256). She saw women as caught in an oppressive system of power that confined them to the private sphere. Knight (2005, 256) claims that this was one of Addams' most original, if neglected, contributions to social and feminist thought. Addams described the settlement founders as "experimenters," learning from experience and always willing to change their methods as the environment demanded. Contrary to her earlier idealist beliefs, she had come to realize that truth was contingent, not absolute, and must be discovered through experience.[19]

In *Twenty Years at Hull House*, Addams tells how she learned not to assume a patronizing attitude, but to interact sympathetically with her neighbors and come to understand by listening to those with whom she worked, rather than imposing solutions upon them. More recent feminist political theory likewise stresses listening attentively to the voices of others and sees it a political practice crucial to the quality of democracy and as an ethic of responsibility in international relations (Robinson 2011).

Knight (2005, 357) claims that the revelation that truth must be discovered through experience was what started Addams on the path toward becoming a pragmatist philosopher. This path was complete by the time she gave her 1895 speech on the Pullman strike of 1894 in Chicago, which pitted workers against the paternalistic management style of George Pullman. In that speech, Addams elaborated on the parallels she saw between, on the one hand, the power imbalance between workers and management and, on the other hand, the imbalance in the father-daughter relationship, a relationship that severely constrained women's public role (Knight 2005, 357). Published ten years later under the title "A Modern King Lear," the speech compared Pullman to King Lear and his industrial paternalism to domestic paternalism. Addams claimed that the emancipation of

---

[17] This has been a key epistemological debate in international relations theory since the 1950s. Jackson (2011, 188–212) provides an excellent analysis of this debate.

[18] Dewey himself was reluctant to acknowledge his female collaborators (Seigfried 1996, 49). Seigfried (1996, 45) claims that philosophers have relegated Addams to sociology while sociologists describe her as a social worker.

[19] Addams' evolving attitude to truth is consistent with her developing pragmatist philosophy. For a fuller articulation of the contingency of truth claims articulated by early pragmatist philosophers such as Dewey, see Cochran (1999, 178–79).

the worker cannot come about without the emancipation of the employer. Critiquing both the state and the family for their patriarchal structures, she asserted that both are preserved through continuous reconstruction (Seigfried 1996, 229–31).

It is interesting to note that, at the end of the nineteenth century, there was also an emergent school of race theorists. Like feminists, race theorists were attracted to pragmatism because of its illumination of oppressive social and economic hierarchies and its openness to possibilities of ongoing social change. Both Alain Locke and W.E.B. Du Bois were students of William James.[20] Du Bois, who drew on the Hull House model, was the only male pragmatist who made the link between racism and sexism. While explicitly dealing with the oppressions of black women and their relationship to slavery, Du Bois, writing in 1920, claimed that all women were oppressed by their roles in the private sphere. Recognizing that black women worked outside the home in greater numbers than white women, Du Bois noted that their wages fell considerably below those of working males (Seigfried 1996, 106).

Pragmatism Meets Women's Peace Activism

Besides supplying the building blocks for the WPP platform, pragmatism also provided the foundation upon which Addams and other attendees at the ICW built their ideas about peace. Since Addams wrote extensively about her views on peace, combining them with her pragmatist philosophy, we use her ideas as exemplary of feminist pragmatist thinking about peace. Addams, and those around her, had come to their thinking through their experiences at Hull House, working amongst multinational immigrant communities in Chicago. Other WPP members had similar experiences in social reform movements in the United Kingdom and Europe. Residents were learning through their daily interactions with people from different nationalities how to care for, and deal peacefully with, each other. Hull House was a microcosm of the world where people were learning to live together in multicultural and multinational settings; for these women, the local and the global were closely intertwined (Fischer 2006, 3). They viewed democracy, social justice, and international peace as mutually defining concepts that must be achieved through nonviolent means (Fischer 2006, 1–2).

The platforms of the WPP and the ICW were full of maternalist rhetoric that assumed an essentialist logic, associating women with a static conception of motherhood. Contemporary feminists have criticized maternalism for its tendency to relegate women to the private sphere, thereby disqualifying them from participating in the public sphere.[21] Certainly Jane Addams used maternalist rhetoric in her writings on peace. However, Marilyn Fischer claims that Addams was using maternalism, not as an essentialist static concept, but as an example of her pragmatist method of social change. For example, in her book *Newer Ideals of Peace*, Addams described women's (and men's) experiences in city government as *enlarged housekeeping,* to which women could bring the special skills they used working in households. Enlarged housekeeping responded to the needs of the modern city. Advocat-

ing for women in city government signaled that women had much to offer the public sphere (Fischer 2006, 6).

The WPP also sought to break down the dichotomous relationship between reason and emotion in thinking about international relations. In her presidential address to the ICW, Addams suggested that war occurred because appeals to peace had principally been made through appeals to men's reason. Instead, she argued, appeals to peace must also rely on emotion and the "human urgings to foster life" (Addams 2003 [1915], 78). She claimed that these qualities are not peculiar to women (or to mothers) but to broader human desires. Blurring the dichotomy between rational men and emotional women, while emphasizing women's longer experience as nurturers of human life, Addams was able to lessen the distinction that has been used to exclude women from the supposedly rational arena of policy and diplomacy without diminishing women's special responsibility for peace (Fischer 2006, 20).

Many of the early pragmatists were also evolutionists, a theory popular at the end of the nineteenth century. Evolutionary theory claimed that civilization was progressing beyond warfare and that militarism was becoming anachronistic, due to increased international trade and support for international law. In light of her commitment to this evolutionary paradigm, Addams believed that it was time to displace "the juvenile propensities to warfare" propelled by tribal loyalties (Fischer 2006, 4). She claimed that the United States was moving from industrialism to humanitarianism and that people's sympathies would increasingly cross class and national lines, evolving into what she called cosmopolitan humanitarianism (Fischer 2006, 4–5). Although Addams', the WPP's, and the ICW's vision is far from being achieved, in the next section we show how the emergence of a feminist perspective on international relations, practically manifested in and through the WPS agenda, both echoes and further develops this cross-cutting, humanistic approach.

Women, Peace, and Security at the United Nations

It took almost one hundred years for states to make it their prerogative to discuss and address women's rights within and across societies, including women's rights to participate in peace and security decision-making. Significant developments to advance women's rights at the international level occurred during the twentieth century as a result of women's social movement activism (Rupp 1997) and changes in the norms within international society toward the inclusion of gender equality as a key principle of reputable statehood (Towns 2010). These changes presaged the acceptance of women's participation in peace and security processes (for a fuller account see Krook and True 2012). The 1979 Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) and the 1995 Beijing UN Women's Conference Platform for Action were milestones that enabled the subsequent WPS agenda (see Jain 2005; True and Mintrom 2001).

The WPS agenda, forged through eight main UNSC resolutions to date, is the product of women activists' ongoing struggles for peace and human rights.[22] Like the earlier principles that women established at The Hague in 1915, these resolutions reflect a pragmatic attempt on the part of women's rights activists to address the significant violence and inequality that characterizes conflict and war

---

[20] Vitalis (2015, 13) claims that both Locke and Du Bois were early international relations theorists overlooked by the discipline. Both were members of the Howard School that emphasized the importance of race and imperialism as foundations of the discipline.

[21] Elshtain (1987) and Ruddick (1989), two contemporary feminists associated with maternal thinking, both build a sophisticated analysis of maternalism that is careful not to essentialize all women.

[22] The WPS resolutions in order are: UNSCR 1325 (2000), 1820 (2008), 1888 (2009), 1889 (2009), 1960 (2011), 2106 (2013), 2122 (2013), and 2242 (2015).

and that affects women and children disproportionately. This pragmatism has evolved, however, attending to our greater awareness of ostensibly hidden social problems such as gender-based violence. It also recognizes the reality of a multilateral system based on international law and organization in which women have political rights and have become political leaders and diplomats (see Towns 2010). Today, feminist pragmatism is different, in that it advocates both outside and inside the state and through the UN system. It has sought to harness the international security apparatus and to expand the community of inquiry, with greater global diversity of women's voices, to further develop and implement many of the women's rights and peace principles first articulated in 1915. Inevitably, there have been trade-offs associated with this contemporary feminist pragmatism as we discuss.

The UNSC resolution 1325 provided an international framework for applying a gender perspective to international peace operations and security policy that acknowledges women's and men's different needs and experiences of conflict. Resolution 1325 also stresses women's rights to equal participation in peace negotiations, conflict resolution, and prevention. This landmark resolution echoes the 1915 principles and their call to attend to the impact of war on civilians and the lack of care for vulnerable populations during war. The 1915 principles call for democratic control of security and foreign policy, including the political participation of women, the expansion of participation in peace negotiations to include women and civil society groups, an international court of justice to provide redress to victims, and control over the arms industry to remove the economic interests fueling war.

The seven resolutions following the UNSC resolution 1325 that constitute the WPS agenda have reaffirmed most of these commitments by calling for urgent state action and accountability to protect all civilians, including women and children during and after conflict; to end the widespread or systematic use of sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV) as instruments of conflict; for increased women's participation in all peace, security, and post-conflict processes, including in foreign policymaking and peace negotiations; and for national action plans (NAPs) and other institutional mechanisms to address implementation of the agenda. We argue that the WPS agenda represents a significant step toward the practical realization of the principles put forward by the Hague women in 1915. However, the UNSC resolutions and wider gender mainstreaming efforts within UN operations have yet to alter the international reality that men both make wars and negotiate the terms of peace. Yet, a feminist perspective on war and security is both valid and increasingly influential, if continually challenged and not fully realized. Integral to feminist pragmatism today, as in Jane Addams' work, is the recognition that truth is always contingent and that knowledge about how to bring peace and security for those most affected by conflict is always evolving through processes of trial and error.

WPS principles expressed in the UNSC resolution 1325 have evolved into four pillars of prevention, participation, protection, and relief and recovery (see UN Women 2011). Whereas the twenty Hague principles for peace were received as idealistic and impractical,[23] WPS pillars are readily translated (if incompletely) into organizational policies and peace and security operations on the ground.

Prevention

In 1915 women activists called for states to begin peace negotiations immediately and to refer their international disputes to arbitration and/or employ neutral nations to mediate disagreements between them. They prescribed a rules-based international system—prefiguring the establishment of the League of Nations, the UN, and postwar multilateralism. Almost a century later, women peace activists argued that, without women's representation and participation, such a rule-based system, harnessing the tools of diplomacy and mediation as opposed to those of warfare, could not be realized. In UNSCR 1325 (2000, para 1), the UNSC urges member states "to ensure increased representation of women at all decision-making levels in national, regional, and international institutions and mechanisms for the prevention, management, and resolution of conflict." During WWI women advocated for legal mechanisms for the peaceful resolution of conflicts and women's participation in peace talks from outside the system. However, in 2000 the UN argued that, for these legal mechanisms to work, women must be recruited into roles as mediators and negotiators and their local prevention efforts supported (1325 OP8, OP15; 2242 OP1, OP8). The UNSC resolution 1888 (2009) further called for the deployment of women protection advisors, alongside gender advisors, to be deployed in peace operations (followed up in the UNSC resolution 1960). In the UNSC resolution 2242 (2015) the Council mandated the establishment of an Informal Experts Group on Women, Peace, and Security to routinely brief the Security Council on peace operations.

Complete disarmament and state control of the arms industry was a key principle at the 1915 Congress. The roots of the WPS agenda today lie in this basic premise, although disarmament is not expressed in any WPS Security Council resolution (WILPF Manifesto 2015). Today, states as well as corporations profit from the sales of arms and munitions. Contrary to The Hague Congress's recommendation, state control of arms sales, ownership, and regulation has hardly made a difference to this flourishing trade. With the emergence of a post–World War II military-industrial complex, global arms expenditures have grown massively and are on an upward trajectory.[24]

However, the WPS agenda has allowed for greater critical scrutiny of this trade in weapons and the purpose for which weapons are used. The UNSC resolution 2242 (2015, OP15) calls for women's involvement in the prevention of the illicit transfer, accumulation, and misuse of small arms and light weapons and notes their particular impact on women and girls' security. The 2013 Arms Trade Treaty (United Nations 2013) includes groundbreaking language on human rights and gender-based violence. Article 7.4 requires state parties "to prohibit the export if … the arms will be used, *inter alia*, to commit or facilitate a serious violation of international humanitarian or human rights law or … serious acts of gender-based violence or violence against women and children" (United Nations 2013, Article 7.4; see also the UNSC resolution 2217). Implementation of this provision is challenging, given complex supply chains and the illegal weapons trade. Sweden was the first country to do so, when Foreign Minister Margot Wallström legally rescinded a cooperation agreement on arms exports with Saudi Arabia in 2015. While the WPS agenda falls short of the commitment to peace through comprehensive disarmament, as originally

---

[23] In her book *Approaches to the Great Settlement* published in 1918, Emily Balch argued for more ameliorative and less humiliating peace terms than those enacted in 1918, terms that contributed to the rise of Hitler (Addams et al. 2003, 19).

[24] Military spending globally is increasing. In 2015 the world spent $1.7 trillion on arms according to SIPRI (2016), reflecting escalating conflicts and tensions with conflict deaths on the rise since 2014 and now again at Cold War levels.

envisioned by the women activists in 1915 and by advocates of UNSCR 1325, a gender perspective on the use and sale of arms is clearly present in international debate, and the disarmament principle remains integral to ongoing WPS advocacy (Acheson and Butler 2018; Shepherd and True 2014, 16).[25]

As well as recognizing the diversity of women's prevention and conflict-resolution roles from the community level to global diplomacy, the WPS agenda, like the 1915 Congress and Addams' Hull House experiment, shares a pragmatist commitment to building the foundations of *positive peace* on the ground within communities. It rejects the idea of *negative peace*, the mere absence of major war, or the view that conflict is inevitable, a view that predominates in the realist approach to international relations theory.[26]

Participation

The Hague Congress called for women and civilians more generally to participate in peace negotiations and for democratic control over decisions to go to war. This principle resonates with the WPS agenda's attention to the need to significantly increase women's participation in peace processes. Only when women achieved political rights to vote and seek election (itself a century-long process), could they express these rights in demands for greater participation in peace processes and in relief and recovery (Krook and True 2012, 119). However, the record of women's participation and representation in peace talks is extremely poor.

The 2015 fifteen-year review of the UNSC resolution 1325 identified a major implementation gap with respect to the absence of women in peace and transitional decision-making processes and institutions (UN Women 2015a). Since the creation of the UN in 1945, formal peace and mediation processes have lagged behind involving women, whether as parties to a conflict or as members of the teams facilitating and leading peace processes. Between 1990 and 2011, across thirty-one peace processes in which the UN was involved, just 2 percent of chief mediators were women, 4 percent were witnesses and signatories, and 9 percent negotiators at the peace table (Bell 2015). As a result, a number of states have prioritized the recruitment and training of women for international mediation and peacemaking in their WPS NAPs. For example, the African Union has seen the benefits of women mediators in resolving conflicts in the region and is supporting the development of a core network of women experts in conflict resolution ready to be deployed (for example, see UN Women 2015b). Sweden and Norway, countries with a track record in third-party mediation, have also created a professional development network for women peace mediators and negotiators (Aggestam and Bergman Rosamond 2016; Tryggestad and Lorentzen 2014).[27] In this way, the Hague women's ideas during WWI have evolved into pragmatic mechanisms inside states and the UN to change the war system. A century's experience has brought home the lesson that women's calls for peace will not be heeded, nor their expertise included,

unless there are specific concrete mechanisms that provide a normative and operational requirement for institutions to do so.

The lack of women's participation in peace and security has practical implications for international relations not least because, as new evidence demonstrates, women and women's organizations have a positive impact on peace processes. This evidence shows that the presence of women as witnesses, signatories, mediators, and/or negotiators makes it 20 percent more likely that a peace agreement will last at least two years and 35 percent more likely that it will endure (Stone 2015; UN Women 2015a). It also reveals that when women's groups exercise a strong influence on the negotiation process, whether at the peace table or in protest movements, the chance of a peace agreement being both reached and implemented is significantly higher (Paffenholz, Ross, Dixon, Schluchter, and True 2016).

A further Hague Congress principle pertaining to participation calls for the use of an international police force rather than militaries to bring peace. The WPS agenda has taken that principle further by promoting increases in women's representation in the security sector (in defence, policing, disarmament, demobilization, and reintegration) through NAPs and commissioning the establishment of all-female police forces in UN peacekeeping missions (Pruitt 2016; Karim and Beardsley 2017). For example, Australia's NAP (2012–2018) has sought to implement targets to increase women's participation in security sector institutions, especially in frontline and leadership roles in the Australian Defence Force (Lee Koo 2016). Peacekeepers are encouraged to engage in culturally sensitive ways with all community members, not just the leaders. Women police on the ground are conceived as a practical mechanism for increasing this effectiveness and operational engagement with communities in conflict-affected places. This inclusive approach to peacekeeping recalls Addams' pragmatist approach to learning by listening to those in communities in conflict.

Protection

In its efforts to end the war in 1915, The Hague Congress noted the long-lasting effects of conflict and the disproportionate impact on civilian injury and loss life (cf. Ghoborah, Huth, and Russett 2003). We think of civilian casualties and targeting as a feature of today's "new wars," based on civil rather than interstate conflict, but the same was true in WWI. The 1915 Congress's analysis of war's dark shadow of disease, loss, and trauma resembles that of feminist international relations scholars and peace activists today (Enloe 2010; True 2015; Cohn 2013; Sjoberg 2013). They have broadened our analysis of the continuum of violence before, during, and after conflict and what needs to be done. The WPS agenda has put the earlier principle recognizing the effects of war into the institutional, UN-mandated practices of protection. Recent WPS resolutions stress the distinct protection needs and vulnerabilities of female displaced persons, minorities, and victims of SGBV, including LGBTQI persons and people with disabilities. The resolutions recognize that these groups face specific challenges related to health, reproductive health, livelihoods, education, and security that are often ignored in state and humanitarian responses. In particular, the UN Secretary-General's annual report on situations of conflict-related sexual violence calls for attention to the protection of minority women from SGBV, which is frequently used to fuel and escalate conflict.

---

[25] For example, WILPF's (2015) current goal is to move the money from a culture of war to a culture of peace.

[26] Galtung (1964) and Boulding (1978) introduced the term *positive peace* into the peace research literature. Diehl (2016) claimed that the international relations community has been slow to adopt the concept, extending peace beyond the mere absence of war to issues of equity and justice. The 1915 Hague Women's Congress articulated this concept one hundred years before Diehl issued his critique of the discipline's failure to adopt the notion of positive peace.

[27] For more information about the Nordic Women Mediators (NWM), see https://www.prio.org/Projects/Project/?x=1725.

Whereas in 1915, the Hague women knew that women and children were adversely affected by war and conflict, they had little understanding of just how crucial the violence against these groups of civilians is to the dynamics of conflict more generally. Mainstreaming a gender perspective, the WPS agenda has changed the UN's, states', and other actors' approach to protection (Bjorkdahl and Selimovic 2015; Davies, Nwokora, Stamnes, and Teitt 2013). WPS advocacy has forced the UN and member states to address protection failures with respect to the human rights of women and girls, failures that have been shown to perpetuate the cycle of violence (Heathcote 2012; Davies and True 2015). The UN Secretary-General's 2016 conflict-related sexual violence report notes that "misogynistic media propaganda and crackdowns on women's rights and freedoms have presaged the use of sexual violence as a tactic of war, terrorism, and political repression" (2016, OP13). As a result, states, including known perpetrators, have begun to tackle the impunity for SGBV that is linked to women's disempowerment (Jenkins and Goetz 2010; Davies and True 2017).

In 1915 women peace activists called for an International Court of Justice to be convened following the war to address violations of international law with respect to civilians. Similarly, WPS advocates have highlighted the gender-specific experiences of displaced women and girls and their needs for postconflict gender justice. While we now have an International Criminal Court to arbitrate cases of war crimes, crimes against humanity, and crimes of genocide, few international prosecutions or transitional justice processes, established during the last twenty-five years, have addressed violations of women's human rights (Harris-Rimmer 2010; Durbach 2016; Hovil 2013).

Relief and Recovery

Women, peace, and security advocates today challenge the depiction of women and girls as vulnerable, weak, and as victims in need of protection. They argue that women are agents of community resilience and recovery (Faxon, Fulong, and Sabe Phyu 2015; Majidi and Hennion 2014). The Hague women also appreciated women's resilience in everyday life, often in dire conditions. They argued that war was not only men's business because, as men took up arms, it was left to women to take on their jobs. It was on this basis that the women peace activists during WWI argued that women should have the right to participate in postconflict institutions. Such an approach has been advanced in the WPS agenda over the past decade and through NAPs designed to advance practical mechanisms and targets to ensure women's participation in the relief and recovery of their societies at all decision-making levels. To take one example, Nepal, a country recovering from years of devastating Maoist conflict and natural disaster, has adopted a plan that explicitly involves war widows and Dalit women in postconflict decision-making, key groups of women with relevant experiences and knowledge who, historically, have been completely excluded from such processes (Swaine 2010).

Conflict resolution and peace activism entail a long-term process of change where theories of change emerge from learning by listening and doing. Feminist scholars, activists, and policymakers today, working collaboratively and independently, draw on many of the same strategies as the women in 1915. They seek to make rational arguments about how to end conflict, they listen to and engage with conflict-affected women and men, and they bring women's testimonies directly to political leaders at interna-

tional meetings. Though a century apart, women's transnational activism has sought to transform the principles of peace and security by bringing women's experiences into state and international policy and practice and to hold states accountable for putting these principles into practice with the ultimate purpose of ending conflict.[28]

In the next section we explore how women peace activists in the early twentieth century developed a distinctive approach to knowing and researching international relations, prefiguring and also consistent with contemporary international relations feminism. We examine the feminist pragmatist parallels and insights in both traditions, showing that women's peace activism and feminist scholarship are connected, and suggesting a re-reading of the conventional account of feminism as a subfield that came late to international relations.

Striking Parallels: Feminist Pragmatism and Methodology for International Relations

Disputing claims that the international relations discipline is gender-free, feminists have long since claimed that its subject matter has, for the most part, been written by elite, white men, for these men, and about these men. While this has been changing over the last thirty years, this was particularly true in the early days of the discipline that coincided with the time when Addams and other feminist pragmatists were writing and women were organizing transnationally for peace and building their own vision of international relations. But, as feminist historians have claimed, women's "her-stories" have consistently been erased from history. This is especially true of international relations where only elite, white men's stories about the early days of the discipline have survived (see Schmidt 1998; Vitalis 2015). Many scholars and commentators appeared genuinely surprised in 2015, during the centenary of WWI, to learn that women peace activists had convened a conference at The Hague to put an end to WWI and that they had developed key principles for international cooperation that anticipated Woodrow Wilson's Fourteen Points.[29]

Feminist theory and practice has emerged from a deep skepticism about knowledge that claims to be universal and objective but which, in reality, is knowledge based on men's lives. When we construct knowledge only from men's lives, we deny ourselves a complete picture of reality. We also fail to observe the totality of social relations and "the amounts and varieties of power that it takes to form and sustain" existing relations and divisions between and among states (Enloe 1996, 186). Feminists have also claimed that international relations' "scientific" rationalist form of knowledge building, an epistemology that took hold after World War II, is unsuitable for answering the kinds of questions that feminists ask (Tickner 1997). Feminist perspectives redirect our attention "to ask questions that have not fallen within the purview of how the discipline has traditionally defined knowledge" (Ackerly and True 2008, 704). Like Addams and early feminist pragmatists, many later feminists have claimed that knowledge emerges from practice. International relations feminism has generally adopted critical, reflexive forms of

---

[28] Feminist scholars promote critical engagements with the gendered nature of security politics and the tendency to stereotype the protection of women and girls and their peace-building capacities in the UNSC resolutions (Pratt and Richer-Devroe 2013; Shepherd 2011).

[29] See McCarthy (2015). In 2015 WILPF (2016) celebrated a century of activism to stop war and end the arms trade, and connected this to a century of economic, racial, and gender injustice.

knowledge building that starts from ontologies and epistemologies different from those of the conventional discipline (Ackerly, Stern, and True 2006; Wibben 2016). It has developed a research practice that asks researchers to situate themselves within the power dynamics of epistemology, boundaries, and human relations "and to attend to these as a matter of methodology" (Ackerly and True 2008, 698). We demonstrate the evolution of knowledge practices from which both women's peace building in the early twentieth century and the WPS agenda in the twenty-first century emerged, in order to show how and why international relations feminism is pragmatist.

Ontology

In contrast to an ontology that depicts states as individualistic autonomous actors, typical of conventional social science perspectives on international relations, and of liberal thinking more generally, feminist ontologies are grounded in social relations that are constituted by historically unequal political, economic, and social structures. Whereas conventional international relations theory usually starts its analyses at the structural level, seeing a world of states, feminists employ a bottom-up strategy, starting from the lives of individuals and their relationships. Focusing much of its attention on the behavior of great powers, international relations depicts states as like units whose internal behavior is not necessary to understanding their international behavior in an anarchical system. Working from the local to the global, feminists begin from the lives of individuals, examining how they are situated in historically gendered and racialized social and economic structures and how these unequal structures impact their lives. They connect the lives of individuals to international structures and proposals for more just and equal forms of global governance. These proposals were evident in the Hague women's call for an International Court of Justice in 1915; they were present also in WPS advocates' call for an International Criminal Court in the 1990 and a reformed UN today (see Chappell 2016). Rather than seeing states as "like units," feminists see "gendered states," although this gendering manifests in quite different ways, given geopolitical locations and intersecting identities and inequalities (see Parashar, Tickner, and True 2018; Peterson 1992).

Jane Addams' settlement movement reflected this distinct feminist ontology—starting from social relations rather than the system level of relations between states (Waltz 1979). Comprised of immigrants from various countries, Hull House was a cosmopolitan microcosm of the world, where residents learned to live together in spite of their differences. Addams described the settlement founders as "experimenters." However, unlike the scientific approach to conducting natural experiments, where the researcher stands at a distance from the object of study to generate empirically verifiable knowledge, the settlement residents thought of themselves as both the knowers and the known of the experiment. Similar to feminist methodology today, the process of working together to explore new ideas for cross-cultural cooperation was judged as more meaningful than research findings that could withstand falsification. "Truth" in Hull House, in WWI women's peace activism, and in international relations feminism today is always provisional, open to and shaped by human relations and experience.

The settlement movement and women's transnational peace activism of the early twentieth century foreshadowed WPS feminist activism today. Over the past thirty years, dialogues between women from different conflict zones have been brokered by women's International Non-Governmental Organizations (INGOs) that, together with feminist scholars, played such an important role in getting the UNSC to adopt the resolutions that comprise the WPS agenda (Cockburn 1998; Giles and Hyndman 2004). These efforts exemplify the feminist pragmatist method, amplifying the voices of refugee and displaced women and survivors of conflict-related SGBV by bringing them to international fora to share their practical knowledge of how best to protect vulnerable populations and enable their participation. Most recently, solidarity dialogues facilitated by the WILPF and the Swedish women's rights organization, Kvinna til Kvinna, involved bringing together women from Syria and Bosnia, and from Bosnia and Ukraine, to learn from one another's experiences of conflict and postconflict (WILPF 2014; 2015). These dialogues have enabled women activists to analyze and learn from what works in their comparative experiences, in order to plan and implement a human rights and social justice–informed platform to end conflict and build peace. Like many of the WWI peace activists, these activists from conflict zones argue that an egalitarian and lasting peace requires the elimination of gender oppression and injustice. In other examples, women's INGOs, coordinated by the NGO working group on WPS, have brought women activists from conflict zones to brief UNSC members on their analysis of the conflict, their experiences of insecurity, and the peace-building challenges they are confronting on the ground (Cook 2016).[30]

It is significant, however, that, in spite of this ongoing activism inside interstate institutions, highlighting "truths" about conflict from local experiences, the earlier commitment of WWI women's peace activists to complete disarmament and regulating the global arms industry has mostly disappeared from today's WPS agenda. This illustrates a feminist pragmatic choice of what issues can best be pursued through international institutions today. But it also exposes the lack of compatibility between the ontologies of feminist peace and the state system.

In all these examples, feminist knowledge emerges from practice and vice versa, to inform further strategy, advocacy, and theorizing about how to build positive peace. The challenge for international relations scholarship is to make visible and recover this alternative, feminist tradition of knowledge about peace and war. Whose knowledge is remembered and whose is forgotten, and how ideas are put into practice or sustained and built on in the academy, are as much a feature of global power politics as are relations among states. When early feminists were writing, women did not yet have the right to vote and were barred from many institutions of higher learning and research. As a result, Addams and other feminists who were thinking and writing on pragmatist approaches to peace could not directly shape the international relations discipline that emerged after WWI. That task has passed to contemporary feminists to excavate this knowledge as they have developed feminist international relations. Feminists have adopted a similar grounded approach, asking questions about "where are the women in international politics" (Enloe 2014) and forging an ontology of global politics from the personal to the international. Such an approach involves including the experiences of communities most disempowered, such as conflict-affected women and girls, all the way to the structures and institutions of global governance.

---

[30] For instance, in 2016 women from Syria told UNSC members how counterterrorism financing measures had prevented local women's organizations from receiving crucial funding for service delivery in conflict areas.

Epistemology

International relations was born with the goal of advising statesmen about how to bring an end to war or at least to manage international politics to make war less likely. Feminism, however, was borne out of activism, from outside the war system, when women had no institutional channels for voice via the nation-state because they were not citizens with political rights. This different situatedness, as highlighted by feminist reflexivity, leads to different types of knowledge: knowledge for the purpose of the control and management of human subjects that can be empirically proven and validated, versus knowledge for the purpose of social change, which involves uncovering practical knowledge from people's everyday lives to liberate them from oppressive structures.

Advocating the latter form, Jane Addams argued that knowledge should be judged on how applicable it is, rather than whether it can be proven. Similarly, international relations feminist methodologists Ackerly and True (2010, 75) argue that research questions should aim to open windows of possibility for new forms of knowledge that address real world problems rather than fill narrow gaps in existing knowledge. Research questions should emanate from a range of sources and informants, including from practice, from women's experiences and the experiences of individuals and organizations seeking to bring about social change (see Confortini 2012).

Although they were barred from most positions in the academy, many of the feminist pragmatists who studied at the University of Chicago at the turn of the twentieth century were sociologists. With an ontology grounded in human relations, feminist approaches are more compatible with sociological approaches to international relations. International relations feminists generally prefer constructivist rather than rationalist approaches more typical of liberal microeconomics, a model on which conventional international relations theory has built its epistemology (Locher and Prügl 2001). Additionally, feminists claim that knowledge based on the standpoint of women's lives, particularly marginalized women, leads to more robust objectivity, not only because it broadens the base from which we derive knowledge, but also because the perspectives of "outsiders" or marginalized people may reveal aspects of reality obscured by more orthodox approaches to knowledge building (Hill Collins 1991, 36).

Post-positivist international relations methodologies seek to give a full account of the research process as a social and ethical process (Jackson 2011). Critical feminist methodology builds reflexivity into all stages of the research process as a core ethic that improves research practice (Ackerly and True 2010). Feminist methodology aims to be reflexive about the opportunities as well as the blind spots opened up by all social and political inquiry. It seeks to achieve *strong objectivity,* paradoxically by socially situating that knowledge and being conscious of the effects of subjectivities—not just in terms of their potential bias and limitations but rather, in terms of the power of certain "standpoints" and situatedness of researchers to generate critical knowledge (Harding 1991, especially chap. 6).

Critical knowledge is knowledge that is able to scrutinize the origins, sources, and interests associated with dominant forms of knowledge to gain a better and more complete purchase on the social and political world, be it the social forces driving war and conflict or those embracing positive peace. Critical international relations feminism involves being attentive, at all stages of the research process, to the power

of different epistemologies; to boundaries that include, exclude, and marginalize; to all social relationships, including that between the *researcher* and the *researched*; and to situating oneself as a researcher or experimenter in the field. It is the commitment to inclusive inquiry and to building a broad community of inquiry that makes this contemporary research practice pragmatist. In particular, WPS scholarship includes conflict-affected women as knowers who can identify and give meaning to problems of conflict and peace and whose everyday practices prefigure solutions (Bjorkdahl and Selimovic 2015; George 2016).

This feminist approach to building knowledge together with research participants parallels what Addams was doing at Hull House, in the WPP, and in the ICW. Settlement workers were continually adapting ideas to experiences with immigrant members. They were scholar activists typical of women's movements today but without the full access to research institutions of higher learning and to like-minded policymakers in international institutions (see Ackerly 2003; Moghadam 2005; Naples 2003). Feminist scholars today embody a similarly reflexive approach to research and experimentation in contrast to the "scientific" notion of detachment of the so-called neutral observer. Like WWI women pragmatists, for feminist WPS scholar-activists today, greater engagement in, and with, the world of people—both policymaking elites and people affected by war and conflict—remains necessary to generate any useful or meaningful knowledge.

For Addams, as she applied pragmatist epistemology to peace activism, engaging with the young men being conscripted into WWI was crucial to building the interest in, and momentum for, peace. Feminist pragmatism required harnessing both reason and emotion to bring about the peaceful resolution to conflict. Addams and other women peace activists resourcefully drew on their situatedness as mothers and caregivers, those whose role was to bring new life into the world and to manage households, to turn the public's attention to the destructive loss of life and the futility of war. This maternalist approach was counterposed to the objectivist view from nowhere, which was inherently the view of elite statesmen during WWI, removed as they were from realities of combat and human suffering. Critically interrogated by feminists today, the ethics of care deriving from maternalism is judged as more or less practically useful in some contemporary contexts, marking a point of difference with feminist pragmatism during WWI (George 2016; Confortini and Ruane 2014).

Operating in an era well before Keck and Sikkink (1998) developed the concept of *transnational advocacy networks*, and despite the lack of acknowledgement by the discipline, the WWI women peace activists were the actual founders of the transnational networking strategy. They traveled across Europe speaking at community fora about the causes and consequences of war and the necessity of opposing all its forms. Though the "boomerang effect" was not yet working in 1915, the strategy was there. Long before their work was recognized as such, the women peace activists played international relations as, in Putnam's (1988) term, a two-level game. Their pragmatist activism was always transnational—personifying a critique of "tribal nationalism" and committed to linking women's oppression and struggle for political rights to the cause of peace and moving beyond hierarchical and warring nation-states. Territorial spaces do not define international relations feminisms today, nor did they a century ago.

While early feminist pragmatism and peace activism did not consciously connect their movement to that for racial

equality and civil rights, W.E.B. Du Bois and other black male scholars influenced by pragmatists did make this connection. Du Bois, a sociologist and antiwar and civil rights activist, highlighted the experiences of black women as activists, mothers, and workers who labored in factories and as domestic servants. He noted that their conditions were different from those of white women, although their struggles were barely included in the labor and women's movements of the time (Seigfried 1996, 106–7). While there are thriving fields of scholarship on race and gender in the discipline, we infrequently bring these approaches together with analysis of socioeconomic class to reveal a different taxonomy of global power from the dominant, state-centric one. However, the intersectionality of race, gender, class, nationality, and sexuality is crucial to transnational women's activism today and is reflected in the scholarship on women, peace, and security (Pratt and Richter-Devroe 2013; Basu 2016). Black feminist intellectuals invented the concept *intersectionality* to make sense of the world by identifying the reality of diverse standpoints and the need to generate unified coalitions to bring about social and global change (Crenshaw 1989, 1991; Hill Collins 1991).

As we have shown, international relations feminism both parallels and builds on earlier feminist traditions of pragmatism and peace activism, offering an alternative approach to knowing and doing international relations. WPS scholarship exemplifies this pragmatist perspective as it seeks to bridge women's practical knowledge based on experiences of conflict with expert knowledge that is often ignorant of peace and security solutions in local contexts and unaccountable to those most affected by international security policies and peace operations.

Conclusion

A century ago, women's peace movements mobilized to ensure that WWI was "the war to end all wars." These women's movements have largely been forgotten, though they were major advocates for, and shapers of, the League of Nations and, later, the United Nations. There are strong continuities between women's peace activism of that period and feminist activism today. Feminism has a long tradition that was present, if not fully realized, at the end of WWI.

Contemporary feminist international relations remains somewhat on the margins of the discipline. We should not lose its roots, however, and we must ensure that they are not lost to history as was the 1915 story. Nor should we forget women peace activists' distinct pragmatist mode of knowing and learning through the practice of networking domestically and transnationally to change societal norms. The experience of WWI produced a feminist analysis of the inextricability of peace, social justice, and gender equality. It, in turn, generated one hundred years of theorizing, activism, and social change toward, among other things, greater global gender equality.

That feminist pragmatist vision endures in the development of the WPS agenda over the past two decades, where women have politically expressed their distinct and diverse experiences of conflict. Strikingly, though, despite the notable progress in women's political rights and participation, feminist scholars and activists encounter the very same challenges they did a century ago. They face difficulty in getting states and key power brokers to move beyond paying mere lip service to the importance of taking women's security seriously. In some respects, working from outside the system, the WWI women peace activists were far more radical

in their practice of international relations. They identified patriarchal norms as lying at the heart of the war system in ways that many, if not all, WPS scholars and advocates downplay today.

These situated experiences of feminist pragmatism, across a century, have led to an alternative practice of international relations dedicated to building the context-specific conditions for positive peace and international cooperation. The fact that this alternative emerged out of practice among feminist transnational networks rather than national scholarly communities matters for the field of international relations—and how it goes about building its knowledge and relevance in a world mired by massive and growing inequalities and insecurities. International relations theorists can learn from feminist engagements across the academy, the diplomatic community, civil society, and social movements because they start from the standpoint of transnational solidarity to address global problems, rejecting the political basis of national societies and "tribal nationalism" as Addams put it.

Feminists have suggested that changing the positionality of the subject of "international relations" changes its substance; looking from women's perspectives, or from the margins, provides a different view not only of *what* global politics is but also *how* it works and progresses (or not). Feminist *long views* of time and of gender diverse histories help us understand the changes in global political structures and processes and to practice emancipatory alternatives to the contemporary international order. Feminism is the longest revolution, as Mitchell (1966) captured in her 1966 essay. Caught up in the study of current events and politics, however, international relations scholars are often quick to judge the failure of human experiments such as democracy, gender equality, sustainable development, and postconflict peace. But international politics and gender relations alike are the stuff of the *longue durée*; change happens, albeit slower than we would like. This makes it difficult to observe and to explain, which are the most important tasks of the discipline.

As we stated at the beginning of this article, feminism is not a recent development in international relations; rather, it is the field of international relations that has come late to feminism. We aimed to highlight and so redress the loss of an earlier feminist intellectual, pragmatist tradition—one inextricably connected to today's scholarship and activism. Both mainstream and critical approaches to the discipline miss the importance of this tradition in our field. They do so not only for philosophical and methodological reasons, but also likely because they assume that it is confined to women as a lower-status social group, rather than a significant tradition and contribution to solving major problems of international peace and insecurity. The airbrushing out of this tradition from the history of international relations thought is a loss to the entire discipline—not only the feminist subfield—and to the world, as we seek all the inspiration and resources we can marshal to create the conditions for positive and enduring peace.

References

ACHESON, RAY, AND MARIA BUTLER. 2018. "Women, Peace, and Security and the Arms Trade Treaty." In *The Oxford Handbook on Women, Peace, and Security,* edited by Sara E. Davies and Jacqui True. New York: Oxford University Press.

ACKERLY, BROOKE A. 2003. "Women's Human Rights Activists as Cross-Cultural Theorists." *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 3 (3): 311–46.

ACKERLY, BROOKE A., AND JACQUI TRUE. 2008. "An Intersectional Analysis of International Relations." *Politics and Gender* 4 (1): 1–18.

———. 2010. *Doing Feminist Research in Political and Social Sciences.* London: Palgrave.

ACKERLY, BROOKE A., MARIA STERN, AND JACQUI TRUE, eds. 2006. *Feminist Methodologies for International Relations.* Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

ADDAMS, JANE. 1907. "Passing of the War Virtues." In *Newer Ideals of Peace,* chap. 8, 209–38. New York: Macmillan.

———. 1997. "A Function of the Social Settlement." In *Pragmatism: A Reader,* edited by Louis Menand, 273–86. New York: Vintage Books.

ADDAMS, JANE, EMILY G. BALCH, AND ALICE HAMILTON. 2003. *Women at the Hague.* Amherst, MA: Humanity Books.

ADDAMS, JANE. 2003. "Women and War: Presidential Address International Congress of Women at the Hague 1915." In *Writings on Peace,* edited by Jane Addams, Marilyn Fischer and Judy D. Whipps, 75–95. New York: Continuum.

AGGESTAM, KARIN, AND ANNIKA BERGMANN ROSAMUND. 2016. "The Making of Swedish Feminist Foreign Policy." *Ethics and International Affairs* 30 (3): 323–34.

ASHWORTH, LUCIEN. 2011. "Feminism, War, and the Prospects for International Government." *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 13 (1): 24–42.

BASU, SOUMITA. 2016. "The Global South Writes 1325 (too)." *International Political Science Review* 37 (3): 362–74.

BELL, CHRISTINE. 2015. *Text and Context: Evaluating Peace Agreements for their Gender Perspective.* Edinburgh, UK: Political Settlements Research Program.

BERKMAN, JOYCE. 1990. "Feminism, War, and Peace Politics: The Case of World War I." In *Women, Militarism, and War: Essays in History, Politics, and Social Theory,* edited by Jean B. Elshtain and Sheila Tobias, 141–60. Savage, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

BJORKDAHL, ANNIKA, AND JASMINA M. SELIMOVIC. 2015. "Translating UNSCR 1325 from the Global to the National." *Conflict, Security, and Development* 15 (4): 311–35.

BOULDING, KEN. 1978. *Stable Peace.* Austin: University of Texas Press.

CAVILLIER, LOUIS. 1915. "Letter to the Editor." *New York Times,* April 20.

CHAMBERS, JOHN W. 1991. *The Eagle and the Dove: The American Peace Movement and United States Foreign Policy 1900–1922, 2nd ed.* Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

CHAPPELL, LOUISE. 2016. *Gender Justice at the International Criminal Court.* New York: Oxford University Press.

COCHRAN, MOLLY. 1999. *Normative Theory in International Relations: A Pragmatic Approach.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

COCKBURN, CYNTHIA. 1998. *The Space Between Us: Negotiating Gender and National Identities in Conflict.* London: Zed Books.

COHN, CAROL, ed. 2013. *Women and Wars.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

———, CONFORTINI, CATIA. 2012. *Intelligent Compassion: Feminist Critical Methodology in the Women's League for International Peace and Freedom.* New York: Oxford University Press.

CONFORTINI, CATIA, AND ABIGAIL RUANE. 2014. "Sara Ruddick's Maternal Thinking as Weaving Epistemology for Just Peace." *Journal of International Political Theory* 10 (1): 70–93.

COOK, SAMANTHA. 2016. "The 'Women in Conflict' at the UN Security Council." *International Affairs* 92 (2): 353–72.

CRENSHAW, KIMBERLY. 1989. "Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex." *University of Chicago Legal Forum* 8 (1): 139–67.

———. 1991. "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color." *Stanford Law Review* 43 (6): 1241–99.

DAYNES, GARY, AND NICHOLAS V. LONGO. 2004. "Jane Addams and the Origins of Service-Learning Practice in the United States." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 11 (Fall): 5–13.

DAVIES, SARA E., AND JACQUI TRUE. 2015. "Reframing Conflict-Related Sexual and Gender-Based Violence." *Security Dialogue* 46 (6): 495–512.

———. 2017. "Norm Entrepreneurship in Foreign Policy." *Foreign Policy Analysis* 13 (3): 701–21.

DAVIES, SARA E., KIM NWOKORA, ELI STAMNES,, AND SARAH TEITT, eds. 2013. *Responsibility to Protect and Women, Peace, and Security.* Leiden, Netherlands: Martinus Njhoff Publishers.

DEEGAN, MARY JO. 2003. "Introduction". In *Women at The Hague,* edited by Jane Addams, Emily G. Balch, and Alice Hamilton, 11–34. Amherst, NY: Humanity Books.

DIEHL, PAUL. 2016. "Exploring Peace: Looking Beyond War and Negative Peace." *International Studies Quarterly* 60 (1): 1–10.

DURBACH, ANDREA J. 2016. "Towards Reparative Transformation: Revisiting the Impact of Violence against Women in a Post-TRC South Africa." *International Journal of Transitional Justice* 10 (3): 366–87.

ELSHTAIN, JEAN B. 1987. *Women and War.* New York: Basic Books.

———. 2002. *Jane Addams and the Dream of American Democracy.* New York: Basic Books.

ENLOE, CYNTHIA. 1989. *Bananas, Beaches, and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

———. 1996. "Margins, Silences, and Bottom Rungs: How to Overcome the Underestimation of Power in the Study of International Relations." In *International Theory: Positivism and Beyond,* edited by S. Smith, K. Booth, and M. Zalewski, 186–202. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 2010. *Nimo's War, Emma's War: Making Feminist Sense of the Iraq War.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

———. 2014. *Bananas, Beaches, and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics,* 2ed. Berkeley: University of California Press.

FAXON, HILARY, ROISIN FURLONG, AND MAY SABE PHYU. 2015. "Reinvigorating Resilience." *Gender & Development* 23 (3): 463–79.

FISCHER, MARILYN. 2006. Addams' Internationalist Pacifism and the Rhetoric of Maternalism." *NWSA Journal* 18 (3): 1–19.

GALTUNG, JOHAN. 1964. "An Editorial." *Journal of Peace Research* 1 (1): 1–4.

GEORGE, NICOLE. 2016. "Light, Heat, and Shadows: Women's Reflections on Peacebuilding." *Peacebuilding* 4 (2): 166–79.

GHOBORAH, HAZEM A., PAUL HUTH, AND BRUCE RUSSETT. 2003. "Civil Wars Kill and Maim People Long After the Shooting Stops." *American Political Science Review* 97 (2): 189–202.

GILES, WENONA, AND JO HYNDMAN, eds. 2004. *Sites of Violence: Gender and Conflict Zones.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

HARDING, SANDRA. 1991. *Whose Science? Whose Knowledge? Thinking from Women's Lives.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

HARRIS-RIMMER, SUSAN. 2010. *Gender and Transitional Justice.* New York: Routledge.

HEATHCOTE, GINA. 2012. "Naming and Shaming: Human Rights Accountability in Security Council Resolution 1960 (2010)." *Journal of Human Rights Practice* 4 (1): 82–105.

HILL, CHRISTOPHER. 1999. "Where Are We Going? International Relations, the Voice from Below." *Review of International Studies* 25 (1): 107–22.

HILL-COLLINS, PATRICIA. 1991. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment.* New York: Routledge

LUCY, LUCY. 2013. "The Nexus between Displacement and Transitional Justice." New York: International Center for Transitional Justice.

JACKSON, PATRICK. T. 2011. *The Conduct of Inquiry in International Relations.* New York: Routledge.

JAIN, DEVAKI. 2005. *Women, Development, and the United Nations.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

JENKINS, ROB, AND ANNE-MARIE GOETZ. 2010. "Addressing Sexual Violence in Internationally Mediated Peace Negotiations." *International Peacekeeping* 17 (2): 261–77.

KAMESTER, MARGARET, AND JO VELLACOTT, eds. 1987. *Militarism versus Feminism.* London: Virago.

KARIM, SABRINA, AND KYLE BEARDSLEY. 2017. *Equal Opportunity Peacekeeping.* New York: Oxford University Press.

KECK, MARGARET, AND KATHRYN SIKKINK. 1998. *Activists Beyond Borders: Transnational Advocacy Networks.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

KNIGHT, LOUISE. W. 2005. *Citizen: Jane Addams and the Struggle for Democracy,* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

KROOK, MONA LENA, AND JACQUI TRUE. 2012. "Rethinking the Life Cycles of International Norms." *European Journal of International Relations* 18 (1): 103–27.

LEBOW, RICHARD NED. 2014. "What Can International Relations Theory Learn from the Origins of World War I?" *International Relations* 28 (4): 387–410.

LEE-KOO, KATRINA. 2016. "Engaging UNSCR 1325 through Australia's National Action Plan." *International Political Science Review* 37 (3): 336–49.

LLOYD, GENEVIEVE. 1984. *Man of Reason: "Male" and "Female" in Western Philosophy.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

LOCHER, BIRGIT, AND ELISABETH PRÜGL. 2001. "Feminism and Constructivism: Worlds Apart or Sharing the Middle Ground?" *International Studies Quarterly* 45 (1): 11–129.

LYNCH, CECILIA. 1999. *Beyond Appeasement: Interpreting Interwar Peace Movements in World Politics.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

MAJIDI, NASSIM, AND HENNION CAMILLE. 2014. "Resilience in Displacement?" *Journal of Internal Displacement* 4 (1): 78–91.

MCCARTHY, HELEN. 2015. "The Forgotten Link Between World War I and Women's Rights." *Time Magazine and History Today,* April 2. Accessed December 17, 2017. http://time.com/3766960/1915-womens-congress/.

MENAND, LOUIS, ed. 1997. *Pragmatism: A Reader.* New York: Vintage Books.

MITCHELL, JULIET. 1966. "Women: The Longest Revolution." *New Left Review* 40 (1): 11–37.

MOGHADAM, VALENTINE. M. 2005. *Globalizing Women: Transnational Feminist Networks.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

NAPLES, NANCY. A, ed. 2003. *Feminism and Method.* New York: Routledge.

New York Times. 1915a. "Jail Women Pacifists." *April* 11: 4.

———. 1915b. "Peacetalk Causes Suffrage Schism." *April* 25: 10.

PAFFENHOLZ, THANIA, NICHOLAS ROSS, STEPHEN DIXON, ANNA-LENA SCHLUCHTER, AND JACQUI TRUE. 2016. *Making Women Count—Not Just Counting Women.* New York: Inclusive Peace and Transition Initiative and UN Women.

PARASHAR, SWATI, J. ANN. TICKNER, AND JACQUI TRUE, eds. 2018. *Revisiting Gendered States.* New York: Oxford University Press.

PETERSON, V. SPIKE, ed. 1992 *Gendered States: Revisioning International Relations Theory.* Boulder: Lynne Rienner.

PRATT, NICOLA. 2013. "Reconceptualising Gender, Reinscribing Racial–Sexual Boundaries in International Security." *International Studies Quarterly* 57 (4): 772–53.

PRATT, NICOLA, AND SOPHIE RICHTER-DEVROE. 2013. "Introduction." In *Gender, Governance, and International Security,* edited by Nicola Pratt and Sophie Richter-Devroe, 1–15. New York,: Routledge.

PRUITT, LESLEY J. 2016. *The Women in Blue Helmets: Gender, Policing, and the UN's First All-Female Peacekeeping Unit.* Oakland: University of California Press.

PUTNAM, ROBERT. D. 1988. "Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games." *International Organization* 42 (3): 427–60.

ROBINSON, FIONA. 2011. "Stop Talking and Listen: Discourse Ethics and Feminist Care Ethics in International Political Theory." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 39 (3): 845–60.

ROOSEVELT, THEODORE. 1915. "Peace Assurance Against War by Preparedness." *Metropolitan Magazine.* Accessed December 17, 2017. http://www.theodore-roosevelt.com/images/research/treditorials/m27.pdf.

RUDDICK, SARA. 1989. *Maternal Thinking: Toward a Politics of Peace.* New York: Ballantine Books.

RUPP, LEILA J. 1997. *Worlds of Women: The Making of an International Women's Movement.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

SCHMIDT, BRIAN. C. 1998. *The Political Discourse of Anarchy: A Disciplinary History of International Relations.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

SCHOTT, LOUISE. 1985. "The Women's Peace Party and the Moral Basis for Women's Pacifism. *Frontiers: A Journal of Women's Studies* 8 (2): 18–24.

SEIGFRIED, CHARLENE H. 1996. *Pragmatism and Feminism.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

SHEPHERD, LAURA J. 2011. "Sex, Security, and Superhero(in)es." *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 13 (4): 504–21.

SHEPHERD, LAURA. J., AND JACQUI TRUE. 2014. "The Women, Peace, and Security Agenda and Australian Leadership in the World" *Australian Journal of International Affairs* 67 (3): 257–84.

SIPRI. 2016. *SIPRI Yearbook 2016.* Stockholm, Sweden: Stockholm International Peace Research Institute. Accessed December 12, 2017. https://www.sipri.org/yearbook/2016.

SJOBERG, LAURA. 2013. *Gendering Global Conflict.* New York: Colombia University Press.

SLUGA, GLENDA, AND CAROLYN JAMES, eds. 2016. *Women, Diplomacy and International Politics Since 1500.* New York: Routledge.

STIEHM, JUDITH. 1982. "The Protected, the Protector, the Defender." *Women's Studies International Forum* 5 (3–4): 367–76.

STONE, LAUREL. 2015. "Quantitative Analysis of Women's participation in Peace Processes." In *Reimagining Peacemaking: Women's Roles in Peace Processes,* edited by Marie O'Reilly, Andrea Ó Súilleabháin, and Thania Paffenholz, 34. Washington, DC: Institute for International Peace.

SWAINE, AISLING. 2010 "Assessing the Potential of NAPs to Advance Implementation of UNSCR 1325." *Yearbook of International Humanitarian Law* 12 (1): 403–33.

SYLVESTER, CHRISTINE. 1994a. "Empathetic Cooperation: A Feminist Method for IR." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 23 (2): 315–32.

———. 1994b. *Feminist Theory and International Relations in a Postmodern Era.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

TEACHING, RESEARCH AND INTERNATIONAL POLICY (TRIP). 2011. *Faculty Survey. William and Mary College.* Williamsburg, VA, www.wm.edu/offices/itpir/_documents/trip/trip_around_the_world_2011.pdf.

TICKNER, J. ANN. 1992. *Gender in International Relations.* New York: Columbia University Press.

———. 1997. "You Just Don't Understand: Troubled Engagements Between Feminists and IR Theorists." *International Studies Quarterly* 41 (4): 611–32.

TOWNS, ANN. E. 2010. *Women and States: Norms and Hierarchies in International Society.* Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

TRUE, JACQUI. 1995. "Feminism." In *Theories of International Relations,* 1st ed, edited by Scott Burchill, Andrew Linklater, Richard Devetak, Matthew Paterson, and Jacqui True. Basingstoke, UK: Macmillan.

———. 2015. "Winning the Battle but Losing the War on Violence." *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 17 (4): 554–72.

TRUE, J, AND MINTROM, M. 2001 "Transnational Networks and Policy Diffusion: The Case of Gender Mainstreaming." *International Studies Quarterly* 45 (1): 27–57.

TRYGGESTAD, TORUNN L., AND JENNY K. LORENTZEN. 2014. "The Role and Relevance of Gender in Peace Mediation." *PRIO Gender, Peace, and Security Update.* Oslo, Norway: PRIO.

UNITED NATIONS. 2013. " Arms Trade Treaty." Accessed December 12, 2017. http://www.un.org/disarmament/ATT/.

UN WOMEN. 2011. " Strategic Results Framework on Women, Peace, and Security, 2011–2020." Accessed August 22, 2017. http://www.un.org/womenwatch/ianwge/taskforces/wps/Strategic_Framework_2011-2020.pdf.

———. 2015a. *Preventing Conflict, Transforming Justice, Securing the Peace: A Global Study on the Implementation of United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325.* New York: United Nations.

———. 2015b. "Equipping Women to Become Stronger Mediators for Peace in Africa." Accessed December 12, 2017. http://www.unwomen.org/en/news/stories/2015/6/women-mediators-in-africa.

VASQUEZ, JOHN. 2014. "The First World War and International Relations Theory." *International Studies Review* 16 (4): 623–44

VITALIS, ROBERT. 2015. *White World Order, Black Power Politics: The Birth of American International Relations.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

WALTZ, KENNETH. 1979. *Theory of International Relations,* Reading, MA: Addison Wesley.

WELDON, LAUREL. 2011. "Perspectives Against Interests." *Politics & Gender* 7 (4): 441–46.

WIBBEN, ANNICK, ed. 2016. *Researching War with Feminist Methods, Ethics, and Politics.* New York: Routledge.

WILFP. 2014. "*Report from the Conference, Women Organising for Change in Syria and Bosnia.*" Geneva: Women's International League for Peace and Freedom. Accessed December 12, 2017. http://wilpf.org/what-we-do/women-organising-for-change-in-bosnia-and-syria/.

———. 2015. "WILPF Manifesto." Last modified April 27, 2015, accessed December 12, 2017. http://www.peacewomen.org/node/91871.

———. 2016. "New #Movethemoney initiative to Boost Funding for Women, Peace and Security." Accessed September 6, 2017. https://wilpf.org/wilpfs-movethemoney-initiative-to-boost-funding-for-women-peace-and-security/.

YOUNG, IRIS MARION. 1997. *Intersecting Voices: Dilemmas of Gender, Political Philosophy, and Policy.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.