

## Women and the history of international thought

Article (Accepted Version)

Owens, Patricia (2018) Women and the history of international thought. *International Studies Quarterly*, 62 (3). pp. 467-481. ISSN 0020-8833

This version is available from Sussex Research Online: <http://sro.sussex.ac.uk/id/eprint/72429/>

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies and may differ from the published version or from the version of record. If you wish to cite this item you are advised to consult the publisher's version. Please see the URL above for details on accessing the published version.

### **Copyright and reuse:**

Sussex Research Online is a digital repository of the research output of the University.

Copyright and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable, the material made available in SRO has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full text items generally can be reproduced, displayed or performed and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

## **Towards an Intellectual History of Women's International Thought**

Professor Patricia Owens  
University of Sussex

Conditional accept (after first reviews) at *International Studies Quarterly*

Did few, if any, historical women think very deeply about international relations? Were there simply no women in the earliest years of the academic discipline of International Relations (IR)? Existing surveys and anthologies of the field convey just this impression; women in the past did not think seriously about international politics. This article provides evidence of the scale of historical women's exclusion in IR's intellectual and disciplinary histories, presenting and analyzing the findings of a study of sixty texts in the history of international thought and disciplinary history, from 1929 until the present. It also presents, for the first time, a comprehensive list of those historical women with at least partial recognition and begins the process of remedying historical women's exclusion through a detailed case study of one of the figures identified through the survey, the influential scholar of colonial administration, Lucy Philip Mair. The findings are highly significant for IR theory, disciplinary history, and the history of international thought.

---

Recent years have witnessed an exciting and cross-disciplinary revival of scholarship on the history of international thought and discipline of International Relations (IR) (Armitage, 2013; Leira and Carvalho, 2015). Yet there are currently no histories of women in the early years of IR, nor a substantial body of scholarship challenging the neglect of women in the 'canon' of international thought. Survey texts and anthologies continue to be published as if women in the past did not think seriously about international politics, as if the term 'international thought' is not traced to Florence M. Stawell's *The Growth of International Thought* (1929). What explains the neglect of historical women? It might be assumed that there simply were no women in the earliest years of the new science that emerged at the end of the nineteenth-century (Schmidt, 1998: 123). Perhaps few, if any, women in the past thought very deeply about relations between peoples, empires, and states. If this were so, then women's absence from the relevant histories would not require much further examination. The more urgent task would be to decrease the citation gap that disadvantages contemporary women, people of color, and scholars from the Global South, as suggested in the author guidelines for this journal (ISQ, 2017). But what if a diverse array of *historical* women, that is women writing before the late twentieth-century, had thought deeply about international relations? Recent efforts to address the citation gap for contemporary scholars can do little to recover and analyze historical work that remains unknown. There may even be a persistent connection between the absence of a recognized and respected history of women's thought on international politics and their status in the field today. Robert Vitalis (2015) has recently argued that this is the case for African-American women and men.

For some time, scholars in History, Political Theory, Philosophy, Sociology, and English Literature have identified the processes of women's exclusion from disciplinary canons and begun the difficult work of transforming the institutional and intellectual histories of these fields (Deegan, 1981; Platt, 2003; Hagemann and Quataert, 2007; Weiss, 2009). Indeed, a small but rapidly growing literature on women's international thought has begun to emerge, largely outside IR. Historians have drawn attention to women's

pioneering contributions to liberal, socialist, conservative, and black internationalisms (Sluga, 2015; Gottlieb, 2015; May, 2007). Preliminary studies indicate that women wrote many textbooks and model syllabi for the new science of IR (Sluga, 2014; 2017). Often women thought and wrote about international relations from outside the academy, as social workers, journalists, and members of the anti-colonial, pan-African, pan-Arab, and women's suffrage movements (Shaarawi, 1987; Higashida, 2011; Umoren, 2013). There is an extensive literature on the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (Blackwell, 2004; Plastas, 2011; Confortini, 2012). Historians have written on Germaine de Staël (Sluga, 2015), Emily Greene Balch (Jacobs, 2007) and Barbara Wootton (Rosenboim, 2014). Within IR, there is one canonical woman whose international thought is the subject of a monograph, the German-American political theorist, Hannah Arendt (Owens, 2007). Craig Murphy (2017) has identified, but not yet fully analyzed, a women-led tradition of 'radical' IR in American women's colleges in the 1910s and 1920s, including Emily Balch, Ellen Hayes, and Jessie Hughan. And there are a few episodic studies of Helena Swanwick, Rebecca West, Virginia Woolf, Simone Weil, Merze Tate, and Coral Bell (Ashworth, 2011; Hansen, 2011; Wilson, 2013; Kinsella, 2014; Vitalis, 2015; Ball and Lee, 2014). Despite these initial and often recent forays there is no body of scholarship systematically documenting and analysing the full diversity and complexity of women's international thought. Intellectual and disciplinary historians currently have no sense of whether historical women's international thought constitutes one or many intellectual traditions, or could be put into conversation across time and space. Recovering and analyzing women's intellectual work in this domain is long overdue.

This article argues that women's absence from histories of international thought is not based on a lack of women's thinking about international politics or contribution to the early science of IR. A diverse array of historical women thought deeply about international relations and significant numbers were present in the early years of IR, especially in the first decades of the twentieth-century. However, the intellectual contributions of these historical women have been obscured, on occasion even actively erased. This claim is based on the findings of a near exhaustive survey of sixty texts in the history of international thought and disciplinary history from 1929 until the present, and original archival research. The article presents and analyzes an original dataset to measure and challenge the scale of women's exclusion *and partial inclusion* in the relevant intellectual and disciplinary histories. The purpose was to establish the number, proportion, and identity of historical women included in such works. The methodology for determining the figures for each volume varied depended on which of the four genres was examined. However, with some variation across genre, the findings are broadly consistent. Across all sixty texts, of 4420 references to historical figures women comprised less than 3%. The purpose of undertaking this analysis was three-fold, to provide evidence of the *scale* of historical women's absence in IR's intellectual and disciplinary history; to assess whether *different genres* and approaches vary in the degree of women's inclusion/exclusion; and to begin to *remedy* the neglect of historical women's thought. This article brings together, for the first time, a comprehensive list of those historical women with at least partial recognition in IR's intellectual and disciplinary history. The one hundred and twenty-eight references to historical women yielded eighty individual persons. We found little coincidence of which historical women were referenced, indicating that larger numbers may be completely hidden from view. This points to the need for a much wider research

agenda of recovery and analysis. As a step in this direction, we selected one of the historical women identified through the survey to illustrate in more detail what can be gained from taking historical women seriously as contributors to international thought. Some of the most recent and cutting-edge research in this history has pointed to IR's emergence out of the field of colonial administration (Schmidt, 1998: Ch.4). Hence, we followed up on a brief reference to one historical woman scholar whose IR research on colonial administration was cited in one of the sixty texts (Wright, 1955: 181): Lucy Philip Mair. We found that Mair's subsequent neglect is founded on at least one identifiable act of dual-erasure, of her own IR scholarship and her field of colonial administration.

Based on similar studies in other fields, we can expect the eighty historical women identified in this study to be the tip of the iceberg of those who in different ways are part of the history of international thought (Deegan, 1981). But what is this thing, historical *women's* international thought? Does enquiring about women's thought mean adopting an essentialist or monolithic account of sex/gender identity, or assume that women's exclusion is the most fundamental and important axis of exclusion? On the contrary, to investigate how the sex/gender binary has shaped the history of international thought is not to assume that sex and gender map neatly onto each other (that there are biological/anatomical males and biological/anatomical females). Nor does it assume that women's marginal position in histories of international thought is more significant than the exclusion of non-Western and/or people of color from international intellectual history (Messari, Tickner, and Ling, forthcoming). Rather it means asking how the operations of the sex/gender binary contributed to the exclusion of groups defined as women and the celebration of groups defined as (white) male. This study does not assume that 'women' are dichotomous from 'men'; that there are stable and coherent gender and racial identities; or that there is some necessary content to the categories of 'women', 'white women', or 'women of color'. In this study, the category of 'historical women' is not understood as a monolithic label and there can be no innate 'women's' view of international politics. The concept of *historical* is just as important as that of women, and has two meanings in this study. It indicates those figures whose major contributions to international thought and/or disciplinary history were *before* the late twentieth-century, but also that the concept of 'women' has a past and therefore a politics (Downs, 2004: Ch.7). As Patricia Hill Collins (1998: 327) has put it, 'Race, gender, social class, age, and sexuality are not descriptive categories of identity applied to individuals. Instead, these elements of social structure emerge as fundamental devices that foster inequality resulting in groups'. Thus, rather than assume the stability of the category or 'women's' international thought, we understand this identity as produced through and intersecting with other identities and positions, including international encounters. However, for the purposes of this initial study only, the investigation assumes that some constructed and intersectional gender identities are partially visible, while also acknowledging that the intelligibility of such seemingly obvious markers of identity as names and gendered pronouns are highly problematic.

The article proceeds in three steps. The first part presents the findings of the study of sixty texts of international thought and disciplinary history, encompassing eighteen historical surveys of international thought; eighteen anthologies of canonical 'great thinkers'; fourteen 'state of the art' surveys of IR research; and ten histories of the IR discipline. We find that 2.97% of references to historical persons were to historical women, only one hundred and twenty-eight overall, and eighty specific individual persons. The

genre least likely to highlight the intellectual contributions of historical women are anthologies of canonical 'great thinkers', following and almost certainly derived from a comparable pattern in Political Theory (Weiss, 2009: Ch.1). In contrast, the highest numbers and proportion of historical women are found in works of disciplinary history, though the absolute numbers remain incredibly small. The second part of the article begins the process of rectifying women's exclusion, mapping a new agenda for research on the history of women's international thought appropriate for each sub-genre, with implications for intellectual and disciplinary historians, international theory, and feminist IR. The third part illustrates what can be gained by systematically pursuing such a research agenda, revealing an almost totally neglected but at the time extremely important figure in what could be called 'white women's IR': Lucy Philip Mair, scholar of Colonial Administration in the pre-World War II International Relations Department at the London School of Economics, one of the earliest and largest such departments. This is a case study of a high-profile historical woman, a prolific writer, teacher, and advisor of governments on one of the centrally important IR questions of her day, written out of disciplinary history. The article concludes that taking women seriously as producers of international thought has the potential to be not merely an add-on to existing intellectual and disciplinary histories. It may fundamentally transform what it means to have played a foundational role in the gendered and raced domains of international thought and disciplinary history.

### **Historical Women in Histories of International Thought**

There can be little doubt that historical women have been marginalized in intellectual and disciplinary histories of IR. And yet, paradoxically, a close examination of the relevant histories of the field can form part of the process of remedying this neglect. The sixty representative texts selected for this study cover the discipline as a whole, rather than specialist subjects, subfields, or works of international theory as such. They also cover the range of approaches to the study of international politics, both 'mainstream' and 'critical', and were of four broad kinds: anthologies of canonical 'great thinkers'; histories of the IR discipline; historical surveys of international thought; and 'state of the art' surveys of IR research. The methodology for determining the number and proportion of historical women included in such works varied depending on the type of text being examined. Two different genre-appropriate methodologies were used. The method for determining the number and proportion of historical women in studies of international thought and disciplinary histories involved a close reading of the texts, crosschecked against those named in the index. The index was used to confirm the approximate overall number of historical thinkers. For anthologies of canonical thinkers and for works aiming to provide a 'state of the art' of the discipline the number and proportion of historical women was determined by a relatively simple process: identifying them by name as authors or subjects on the table of contents. For a small number of 'state of the art' surveys, the calculation was more complicated because editors chose more than one reading from the same author (Sprout and Sprout, 1945). In those cases, the calculation reflects the number of historical women authors included, rather than the number of their works selected. Of course, in some cases, there is a great deal of overlap between different genres. For example, Wright's (1955) *The Study of International Relations* includes a history of international thought and a summary of the 'state of the art' in the period. However, as a monograph focused primarily on the academic

discipline of IR, rather than a collection of readings, it is categorized as a work of disciplinary history.

By ‘historical women’ we mean those figures whose major contributions to international thought and/or disciplinary history were *before* the late twentieth-century. This excludes those currently active in the field or whose major contributions date from the late twentieth-century. For example, Olsen and Groom (1991) include seven women among over one hundred and fifty historical figures. However, one of these, Cynthia Enloe (1938-), is coded as a ‘contemporary’ IR scholar because her work appeared in the late twentieth- and early twenty-first century. In contrast, the late international political economist Susan Strange (1923-1998) is coded as an historical figure. She began teaching international relations in 1949, making major intellectual contributions in the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s, as well as the 1980s. The most difficult, borderline figure, potentially coded as either ‘historical’ or ‘contemporary’, is the late political theorist, Jean Bethke Elshtain (1941-2013). Though she was born three years after Enloe, Elshtain could sensibly be regarded as a ‘historical’ figure because she is deceased. However, she is coded ‘contemporary’ because her major works were produced from the 1980s onwards. An intellectual history of Elshtain could certainly be written. For our purpose, she is a late twentieth- early-twenty-first century thinker and thus not included in this study. The late twentieth-century is an important threshold. This is the period of the return of feminist IR, return because it was one of the most prominent sources of international thought in the early twentieth-century (Ashworth, 2011: 26). Since the 1980s, IR feminism’s influence on the field has grown exponentially. From this period, we begin to see some contemporary IR feminists included in some surveys and disciplinary histories. However, to count the feminists sometimes included - specifically, Cynthia Enloe, but also Carol Cohn, Nancy Fraser, Carole Pateman, J. Ann Tickner, Christine Sylvester, and Cynthia Weber - would give a distorted picture. The point is not to *exclude* feminist IR scholars. Far from it. Rather to include *late twentieth-century* IR feminists, or any late twentieth-century figures, would lead to a misrepresentation of the inclusion/exclusion of *historical* women.

The results of the study are summarized in Table 1, ‘Historical Women in Sixty Histories of International Thought’. Across all texts, of 4420 cumulative references to historical figures 128 were to historical women: 2.97%. As a point of comparison and interest, both historical and contemporary women are named in the table but contemporary women are not included in any of the figures. To include them would also distort the findings because the overall numbers do not include contemporary men. Even if we were to include late twentieth-century women, calculating the references to all women across the texts would amount to 164: 3.71%. But this significantly overstates women’s total representation since the overall figure does not include the large number of contemporary men included in many of the texts. Since the vast majority of the references to historical women are brief mentions and are often citations with little extended discussion, the figure of 2.97% probably overstates historical women’s presence within the texts. Nonetheless, these are important findings. Locating these 128 references has yielded the names of eighty historical women. Yet of these, only twenty-two individuals are mentioned more than once across the sixty texts, nearly half of these twenty-two mentioned only twice. These twenty-two are listed in Table 6, including their dates, primarily location, and intellectual specialisms. Only two women of color are among the eighty, the African-Americans Merze Tate (1905-1996) and Eslanda Robeson (1895-1965). The only contemporary woman of

color is Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. No women working outside the US, UK, or Europe is included among those mentioned more than once, reflecting the well-known Anglo-American bias in IR historiography and the profound intellectual influence of continental European thinkers (Rösch, 2014). The historical woman most recognized was Susan Strange. But in second and third place are Prussian-born Hannah Arendt and Polish-born Rosa Luxemburg. We expect that this number of eighty, drawn only from highly gendered histories of international thought, represents just a fraction of historical women's intellectual labors *even* in Europe and North America. In lieu of a much larger research project on global historical women's international thought, these eighty are a tolerable basis on which to begin what must be a much larger and globally inclusive process of reconstructing historical women's international thought.

**Table 1. Historical Women in Sixty Histories of International Thought**

Publication in chronological order	Type of Text	No. of historical men*	Number and percentage of historical women*	Name of historical women* (contemporary women* in italics and brackets)
Stawell (1929) <i>The Growth of International Thought</i>	Canonical Thinkers (C)	67 (approx.)	1 (1.47%)	Ruth (biblical)
Russell (1936) <i>Theories of International Relations</i>	History of International Thought (HT)	181 (approx.)	1 (.5%)	Frances Melian Stawell
Sprout and Sprout (1945) <i>Foundations of National Power</i> <sup>1</sup>	IR 'state of the art' (IR)	81	4 (4.7%)	Helen Mears, Harriet Moore, Marthe Rajchman, Margaret Sprout
Kirk (1947) <i>The Study of International Relations in American Colleges and Universities</i>	IR	100 (approx.)	8 (8%)	M. Margaret Ball, Gwendolen M. Carter, Ruth C. Lawson, D. Beatrice McCown, Elizabeth L. Fackl, Ellen J. Hammer, Edith Ware, Ruth Savord
Morgenthau and Thompson (eds.) <i>Principles and Problems of International Politics: Selected Readings</i> (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1950)	IR	49	0%	
Wright (1955) <i>The Study of International Relations</i>	Disciplinary History (D)	297 (approx.)	15 (5%)	Ruth Nanda Anshen, Jessie Bernard, Dorothy Blumenstock, Margaret E. Burton, Dorothy Arden Dean, Eleanor Dennison, Anna Freud, Gertrude Himmelfarb, Suzanne K. Langer, L.P. Mair, Ruth D. Masters, Margaret Mead, Mrs. Charles E. B. Russell (Lillian M Rigby), Ruth Savord, Margaret Sprout
Wolfers and Martin (1956) <i>The Anglo-American Tradition in Foreign Affairs: Readings from Thomas More to Woodrow Wilson</i>	C	22	0%	
Hoffmann (1964) <i>Contemporary Theory in International Relations</i>	IR	94 (approx.)	1 (1.05%)	Jessie Bernard
Forsyth et. al. (eds.) (1970) <i>The Theory of International Relations: Selected Texts from Gentili to Treitschke</i>	C	9	0%	
Porter (1972) <i>The Aberystwyth Papers: International Politics, 1919-1969</i>	D	118 (approx.)	8 (6.7%)	Gwendoline Davies, Margaret Davies, Margaret Gowing, Nina Heathcote, Margaret Sprout, Susan Strange, Lilian Vranek (Friedlander) Barbara Ward

<sup>1</sup> Contains 151 readings from eight-five authors or co-authors across 769 pages. There are ten extracts by four historical women.

Parkinson (1977) <i>The Philosophy of International Relations: A Study in the History of Thought</i>	HT	136	2 (1.47%)	Hannah Arendt, Rosa Luxemburg
Taylor (1978) <i>Approaches and Theory in International Relations</i>	IR	13	0%	
Beitz (1979) <i>Political Theory and International Relations</i>	HT	70	2 (2.78%)	Adda Bozeman, Rosa Luxemburg
Thompson (1982) <i>Masters of International Thought</i>	C	16	0%	
Parker (1985) <i>Western Geopolitical Thought in the Twentieth Century</i>	HT	72 (approx.)	2 (2.7%)	Martha Haushofer, Ellen Churchill Semple
Williams (1989) <i>IR in the Twentieth Century: a Reader</i>	IR	20	0%	
Olson and Groom (1991) <i>International Relations: Then and Now</i>	D	146 (approx.)	7 (1) (4.79%)	Annette Baker Fox, Adda Bozeman, Jessie Bernard, Sonia Z. Hyman, Elizabeth Fischer Read, Margaret Sprout, Susan Strange ( <i>Cynthia Enloe</i> )
Knutsen (1992) <i>A History of International Relations Theory</i> (1st edition)	HT	140 (approx.)	1 (.7%)	Bertha von Suttner
Thompson (1994) <i>Fathers of International Thought: the Legacy of Political Theory</i>	C	18	0%	
Williams, Goldstein, and Shafritz (1994) <i>Classic Readings of International Relations</i> (1 <sup>st</sup> edition)	IR	57	1 (1.72%)	Susan Strange
Kauppi and Viotti (1992) <i>The Global Philosophers: World Politics in Western Thought</i>	C	30	0%	
Luard (1992) <i>Basic Texts in International Relations: the Evolution of Ideas about International Society</i>	C	129	0%	
Williams, Wright, and Evans (1993) <i>A Reader in International Relations and Political Theory</i>	C	22	0%	
Long and Wilson (1995) <i>Thinkers of the Twenty Years Crisis</i>	C	10	0%	
Vasquez (1995) <i>Classics of International Relations</i> (3 <sup>rd</sup> edition)	C	52	1 (1) (1.85%)	Margaret Mead ( <i>Carol Cohn</i> )
Der Derian (1995) <i>International Theory: Critical Investigations</i>	IR	11	0% (2)	( <i>Jean Bethke Elshtain, J. Ann Tickner</i> )
Clark and Neumann (1996) <i>Classical Theories in International Relations</i>	C	11	0%	
Neumann and Wæver (1997) <i>The Future of International Relations: 'Masters in the Making'?</i>	IR	11	0% (1)	( <i>Jean Bethke Elshtain</i> )
Knutsen (1997) <i>A History of International Relations Theory</i> (2 <sup>nd</sup> edition)	HT	154 (approx.)	2 (1) (1.27%)	Rosa Luxemburg, Bertha von Suttner, ( <i>Cynthia Weber</i> )
Dunne (1998) <i>Inventing International Society: a History of the English School</i>	HT	24	0% (1)	( <i>Cornelia Navari</i> )
Schmidt (1998) <i>The Political Discourse of Anarchy: a Disciplinary History of International Relations</i>	D	86 (approx.)	3 (3.37%)	Deborah Ellen Ellis, Mary Parker Follett, Francis Melian Stawell
Griffith's (1999) <i>Fifty Key Thinkers of International Relations</i> (1 <sup>st</sup> edition)	IR	46	1 (3) (2.2%)	Susan Strange ( <i>Jean Bethke Elshtain, Cynthia Enloe, J. Ann Tickner</i> )
Linklater (2000) <i>International Relations: Critical Concepts in Political Science</i>	IR	82	0% (6)	<i>Jean Bethke Elshtain, Carole Pateman. Onora O'Neill, Anne Tickner (x2), Anne Sisson Runyan/V. Spike Peterson (co-author)</i>
Brown, Nardin, Rengger (2002) <i>International Relations in Political Thought: Texts from the Ancient Greeks to the First World War</i>	C	50	0%	
Bauer and Brighi (2003) <i>International Relations at the LSE: A History of 75 years</i>	D	58	4 (2) (7.4%)	Simone de Beauvoir, Coral Bell, Lucy Mair, Susan Strange ( <i>Margot Light, Cornelia Navari, Cynthia Weber</i> )
Keene (2005) <i>International Political Thought: A Historical Argument</i>	HT	111 (approx.)	0%	



Long and Schmidt (2005) <i>Imperialism and Internationalism in the Discipline of International Relations</i>	HT	30 (approx.)	0%	
Williams, et. al. (2005) (3 <sup>rd</sup> ed.) <i>Classic Readings of International Relations</i>	IR	58	0 (4) (0%)	(Martha Finnemore, Keck/Sikkink (co-author), J. Ann Tickner, M. Elaine Bunn)
Jahn (2006) <i>Classical Theory in International Relations</i>	C	12	0%	
Jørgensen and Knudsen (2006) <i>International Relations in Europe: Traditions, Perspectives, Destinations</i>	D	28	1 (1) (3.57%)	Adda Bozeman (Marie-Claude Smouts)
Ashworth (2007) <i>International Relations and the Labour Party: Intellectuals and Policy Making from 1918-1945</i>	HT	82	8 (9.76%)	Jane Addams, Emily Greene Balch, Dorothy Frances Buxton, Mary Parker Follett, Mary Agnes Hamilton, Susan Lawrence, Helena Swanwick, Mary Elizabeth Sutherland
Roache (2008) <i>Critical Theory and International Relations: a Reader</i>	C	30	0 (3) (0%)	(Nancy Fraser, Claire Cutler, Christine Sylvester)
Hall and Hill (2009) <i>British International Thinkers from Hobbes to Namier</i>	HT	12	0%	
Sylvest (2009) <i>British Liberal Internationalism, 1880-1930</i>	HT	50 (approx.)	0%	
Griffiths et. al. (2009) <i>Fifty Key Thinkers of International Relations</i>	IR	46	0%	(Jean Bethke Elshtain, Cynthia Enloe, J. Ann Tickner, Christine Sylvester)
Edkins and Vaughan-Williams (2009) <i>Critical Theorists and International Relations</i>	C	27	2 (3) (6%)	Hannah Arendt, Simone de Beauvoir (Judith Butler, Julia Kristeva, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak)
Moore and Farrands (2010) <i>International Relations Theory and Philosophy</i>	C	11	2 (15%)	Hannah Arendt, Susan Sontag
Guilhot (2011) <i>The Invention of International Relations Theory</i>	D	57 (approx.)	1 (1.7%)	Dorothy Fosdick
Hall (2012) <i>British Intellectuals and World Politics, 1945-1975</i>	HT	286 (approx.)	6 (1) (2.09%)	Kathleen Courtney, Agnes Headlam-Morley, Margery Perham, F. Melian Stawell, Susan Strange, Barbara Ward (Cornelia Navari)
Hobson (2012) <i>The Eurocentric Conception of World Politics: Western International Theory, 1760-2010</i>	HT	110 (approx.)	5 (4.35%)	Rosa Luxemburg, Ellen Churchill Semple, Helene Stöcker, Bertha von Suttner, Margaret Sanger
Bliddal et. al. (2013) <i>Classics of International Relations: Essays in Criticism and Appreciation</i>	C	22	1 (1) (4.16%)	Virginia Wolf (Cynthia Enloe)
Armitage (2013) <i>Foundations of Modern International Thought</i>	HT	20 (approx.)	1 (5%)	Hannah Arendt
Ashworth (2014) <i>A History of International Thought</i>	HT	153 (approx.)	10 (6.54%)	Jane Addams, Emily Greene Balch, Vera Brittain, Kathleen Courtney, Mary Agnes Hamilton, Susan Lawrence, Ellen Churchill Semple, Susan Strange, Harriet Wanklyn, Helena Swanwick
Hood, King, and Peele (2014) <i>Forging a Discipline: A Critical Assessment of Oxford's Development of the Study of Politics and International Relations</i>	D	84 (approx.)	6 (7.1%)	Hannah Arendt, Sibyl Crowe, Agnes Headlam-Morley, Margery Perham, Rachel Wall, Beatrice Webb
Hall (2015) <i>Radicals and Reactionaries in Twentieth-Century International Thought</i>	HT	123 (approx.)	5 (3.9%)	Annie Besant, Susan Lawrence, F. Melian Stawell, Helena Swanwick, Ellen Wilkinson
Vitalis (2015) <i>White World Order, Black Power Politics: the Birth of American International Relations</i>	D	130	9 (6.9%)	Ruth Benedict, Nancy Cunard, Lorraine Hansberry, Vera Micheles Dean, Jeane Kirkpatrick, Margaret Mead, Essie (Eslanda) Robeson, Merze Tate, Caroline Ware
Leira and Carvalho (2015) <i>Historical International Relations, Vol. II: The History of International Thought</i>	IR	14	1 (6.67%)	Helena Swanwick
Lebow et. al. (2016) <i>The Return of the Theorists: Dialogues with Great Thinkers in International Relations</i>	C	37	2 (1) (5.4%)	Hannah Arendt, Susan Strange (Jean Bethke Elshtain)

Knutsen (2016) <i>A History of International Relations Theory</i> (3 <sup>rd</sup> edition)	HT	150 (approx.)	2 (2) (1.3%)	Rosa Luxemburg, Susan Strange ( <i>Ann Tickner, Cynthia Weber</i> )
Malchow (2016) <i>History and International Relations: from the Ancient World to the 21<sup>st</sup> Century</i>	D	127 (approx.)	3 (1) (2.7%)	Hannah Arendt, Susan Strange, Barbara Tuchman ( <i>Jean Bethke Elshtain</i> )

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

## Historical Women in Different Genres of International Thought

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

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

Genre	No of Texts	Cumulative number of historical figures for each genre	Cumulative number of historical women*	%
Canonical Thinkers	18	584	9	1.54%
History of Int. Thought	18	1952	47	2.41%
IR 'state of the art'	14	698	16	2.29%
Disciplinary History	10	1186	60	5.06%
<b>Overall Total</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>4420</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>2.97%</b>

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

### *Canonical thinkers*

The genre least likely to highlight the intellectual contributions of historical women thinkers is that which establishes a catalog of intellectual 'greats'. These are collections of readings by or about 'classic' thinkers seen as foundational to the study of IR. This is the 'canon', which all those seeking advanced knowledge of a field are expected to be broadly familiar. In these texts, authors/editors choose several individuals to showcase, ranging from a relatively small number of persons - about ten to eighteen - to include much larger volumes that include dozens of prominent historical thinkers. With only two exceptions, none of the fourteen such collections published between 1929 and 2008 included an historical woman (Stawell, 1929; Vasquez, 1995). Across the eighteen of works examined, there were only nine occasions when a historical woman was profiled compared to 584 chapters/selections overall: 1.54%. Taking such works as a whole, there are six historical women recognized as 'great thinkers': Arendt, Simone de Beauvoir, Margaret Mead, Susan Strange, Susan Sontag, and Virginia Woolf, and one mention of the biblical figure of Ruth. There are no women of color canonized in IR, nor any from outside North America and Europe. The maximum number of historical women included in any one work that aims to establish, or even expand, the 'canon' is two. Only from the 2000s, do we find small

numbers of historical women consistently included in collections of canonical thinkers, but again never more than two in one text. However, given the genre-appropriate methodology for calculating the relative proportion of women included, one such text is ranked number one overall. Of the thirteen philosophers examined in Moore and Farrands (2010) there are two historical women, Arendt and Sontag, placing the text number one overall for the proportion of historical women (15%). Nonetheless, taken as a whole, the genre that singles out ‘great’ paradigmatic thinkers performed worst in terms of the percentage of historical women, with four out of the ten works in Table 3 of the bottom ranked by their relative absence. Further research is required to establish exactly how and why IR’s collections of canonical thinkers were formed in this manner and how they have changed over time (but see Ashworth, 2014). However, we also know from comparable studies in other fields that there is a highly gendered politics to the formation of discipline-specific canons (Weiss, 2009; Deegan 1981). It is possible to read multiple versions of such texts in IR, which often deal with exactly the same authors, without learning about the thought of a single woman, or even an acknowledgement that their exclusion has taken place. On the rare occasion when historical women’s absence/exclusion has been acknowledged it is quickly passed over (Brown, et. al., 2002: 3) or editors engage in self-praise for including a single (contemporary) woman when others similar volumes included none (Wæver, 1997: 4).

How can this be rectified? Many ‘canonical’ historical women have authored ‘big books’ and other genres highly relevant to understanding international politics (Smith and Carroll, 2000). Hence, in terms of remedying historical women’s marginalization from the canon, the initial task is to identify and analyze the international thought of *already* high-profile women thinkers absent, or only partially recognized, in IR’s canon. Retrieving and analyzing these historical women requires textual, contextual and biographical analysis not only of the intellectual substance of their work but also *how* they thought about international politics. Given the unrivalled influence of European traditions on the largely Anglo-American discipline and the simultaneous neglect of black intellectuals an initial foray should include European and black diaspora women. Considering only thinkers from the early to mid-twentieth century, IR’s formative decades, scholars might examine these thinkers in terms of those who could have been included more fully in the key isms/traditions of IR yet were not (Jane Addams, Rosa Luxemburg, Ellen Churchill Semple, Ayn Rand, Bertha von Suttner, Sylvia Pankhurst), those who could not fit (including Anna Julia Cooper, Emma Goldman, Eslanda Robeson, Simone Weil, Rebecca West) and the very few already accorded partial recognition (Hannah Arendt, Virginia Woolf). We can expect contributions to the full spectrum of IR theory and that much of the work belatedly introduced to IR was authoritative in its own time; crossed the full ideological spectrum covered by contemporary international theory; and that gender mattered, but not exclusively, to how historical women thought about international politics. It should not be assumed that historical women were more likely to be ‘right’ than their more studied male counterparts. However, we should expect that some anticipated cutting-edge work in contemporary IR (Hansen, 2011: 113). The eventual goal must be to expand and transform IR’s canon, in a much more historically expansive and globally inclusive reconstruction of the international thought of some of the foremost historical women intellectuals.

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

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

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

### *Disciplinary Histories*

The genre in which women were most likely to be mentioned, though not often discussed at length, is IR's disciplinary history. These works usually include analysis of far larger numbers of individuals than those focused on canonical thinkers. However, they can be differentiated from histories of international thought because they are more centrally concerned with the intellectual and institutional origins of the academic discipline. It is the nature of these texts, ten of which were examined, to discuss large numbers of individuals, in one case up to nearly three hundred. Again, historical women appear in greater numbers, or are harder to erase, when historians are seeking to offer some version of the actual past, even one that is inevitably flawed and partial. Of the 1158 total cumulative number of historical figures mentioned, there were sixty separate references to historical women across the ten texts: 5.06%. Indeed, Wright (1955) names fifteen historical women out of a total of just over three hundred, and thus ranks first in terms of the overall number of mentions. However, given the extremely large number of individuals included in the book it is not in the top ten for overall percentage. Disciplinary history is also the only genre in which two 'non-white' historical women are included (Vitalis, 2015: 12-19, 92). Interestingly, across the texts that do include very brief references to small numbers of historical women there is often little convergence, indicating that there is a much larger number of figures that could have been studied, especially in those works that claim to be comprehensive.

Compared to the other genres examined, disciplinary history performs relatively well, with four texts in the top ten for both overall number (Table 4) and percentage (Table 5) of historical women. Only one work of disciplinary history is included among the bottom ten in terms of relative absence (Table 3) (Long and Schmidt, 2005). Nonetheless, despite this comparatively better performance, disciplinary historians have failed to account for women's intellectual and practical contributions to the early science of IR. There are very few substantive discussions of individual women's contributions. Among the ten works of disciplinary history, the only archival work carried out on an historical woman was Vitalis's study of Merze Tate, whose extensive papers were found to be 'unprocessed... a

jumble of papers in a mass of boxes stored off site' (2015: 166; also see Hall's (2014) brief essay on Coral Bell). Overall, we should not be surprised that women are more likely to appear, are more difficult to erase, in more historical work focused on telling stories about actual persons in context. However, we should not expect the existing literature to reflect the full range of women who have contributed to IR's disciplinary history even in the Anglo-American context, given the highly gendered character of historical writing. As Bonnie Smith (2000) argued in her influential book *The Gender of History*, the late-nineteenth and early twentieth-century professionalization of History was a process of masculinization defined precisely in opposition to amateur women practitioners of historical writing and women as significant historical figures in their own right (also see Scott, 1986).

Any new research program on women's international thought must include, but not fixate on, the history of the IR 'discipline'. This involves locating the currently unknown academic women teaching and researching IR and then evaluating their contributions. This should not only include the most well-known centres of IR research, but also women's colleges, which have been marginalized in disciplinary histories. However, which women can be identified with the emerging 'discipline'? At a minimum, research should encompass what *at the time* were core IR subjects, including colonial administration. Given IR's interdisciplinary origins in diplomatic history, colonial administration, and law there is a need to examine the international thought of women working in departments covering these fields. This can be achieved through examining university archives, specifically lecture and faculty lists to identify historical women specialising in international relations, across Political Science, History, Law, and Sociology. We can then examine the scholarship of the historical women discovered and, where available, their personal papers. This will not only yield a more accurate account of historical women's contributions to the early field than found in existing disciplinary histories. While in many ways it is much harder to identify how and why historical women have been excluded than to seek to recover and analyze their thought, examining the personal papers of historical women may also allow scholars to shed some light on the processes of exclusion from IR's history. We can then examine how these processes compare to those of other disciplines and histories of thought (Deegan, 1981). At the same time, it is not enough to simply increase awareness of elite white women. We have to understand 'white man's IR' (Lake, 2016) *and* 'white women's IR' as a product of particular sets of imperial, gendered and raced relations, including racially diverse historical women. We will briefly return to some of these fundamental themes in the next section where we examine one of the first women to be appointed to a faculty position in IR, specializing in colonial administration.

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

1. Wright (1955)	<i>The Study of International Relations</i> (D)	15
2. Ashworth (2014)	<i>A History of International Thought</i> (HT)	10
3. Vitalis (2015)	<i>White World Order, Black Power Politics: The Birth of American International Relations</i> (D)	9
4. Kirk (1947)	<i>The Study of International Relations in American Colleges and Universities</i> (IR)	8
5. Ashworth (2007)	<i>International Relations and the Labour Party: Intellectuals and Policy Making from 1918-1945</i> (HT)	8
6. Olson and Groom (1991)	<i>International Relations: Then and Now</i> (D)	7
7. Hall (2012)	<i>British Intellectuals and World Politics, 1945-1975</i> (HT)	6

8. Hood, King, and Peele (2014)	<i>Forging a Discipline: A Critical Assessment of Oxford's Development of the Study of Politics and International Relations</i> (D)	6
9. Hobson (2012)	<i>The Eurocentric Conception of World Politics: Western International Theory, 1760-2010</i> (HT)	5
10. Hall (2015)	<i>Radicals and Reactionaries in Twentieth-Century International Thought</i> (HT)	5

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

### *Histories of international thought*

Histories of international thought do not usually single out paradigmatic thinkers as such but survey far larger numbers of historical persons, often setting them in historical and intellectual context. They are usually written by a single author and seek to give a much broader overview of the intellectual history of the field. Such works sometimes focus on a smaller number of scholars in specific national or intellectual locations, but the emphasis is more on the intellectual context and influences on thought, in addition to the exposition of ideas. These are often works of intellectual history, sometimes written by professional historians or those working at the intersection of history and IR. Of the 1952 references to historical figures across the eighteen works of this type, forty-seven were to historical women, representing 2.41%. This is almost double the proportion included in works on ‘canonical’ thinkers. However, since much larger numbers of historical figures are discussed overall, the actual percentage is only slightly higher. Moreover, unlike works focusing on canonical thinkers where there is lengthy discussion of a single individual, in broader histories of international thought, particular individuals are often mentioned only very briefly. This is certainly the case for historical women. Russell (1936: v) makes brief reference to *The Growth of International Thought*, Melian F. Stawell’s (1929) ‘suggestive little volume in the Home University Library’, but offers no discussion of what, in retrospect, is a trailblazing work. No other women’s scholarship is mentioned among the approximately sixty-seven other thinkers discussed. Indeed, there is no sustained discussion of Stawell’s book in any later history of the field; very few such works even reference it (Schmidt, 1998: 176; Hall, 2012: 15; 2015: 4). Moreover, in line with the overall pattern in studies of canonical thinkers, no more than two historical women appear in the same study in this genre in the forty years following Parkinson’s (1977) *The Philosophy of International Relations: A Study in the History of Thought*.

As discussed in the previous section, recovering and analyzing the work of early ‘IR women’ involves making decisions about which women should be identified with disciplinary IR, but also with cognate scholarly fields. But how do we address the international thought of historical women at some distance from academe? We already know that many wrote about international relations for wider public and policy audiences, not solely for academics (Gottlieb, 2015: Ch.1). Much more work needs to be done to identify historical women at the margins of academe and in other professions, such as social work, education, and librarianship, who saw themselves as centrally concerned with international relations (see Huber, Pietsch, Rietzler, forthcoming). Our study of existing works of disciplinary and intellectual history includes a small number of such figures working in a variety of occupational fields and less obvious pathways to international thought. They include Ruth Savord (1896-1966), librarian at the Council of Foreign Relations and author of *Directory of American Agencies Concerned with the Study of International Relations* (1931) and Vera Micheles Dean (1903-1972), head of research at the Foreign Policy Association, a leading American think tank, and prolific commentator

on international affairs. Though not mentioned in any of the texts examined, we could add African-American educator Anna Julia Cooper (1858-1964) and her work on the relations between the French and Haitian Revolutions and colonialism and capitalism (Cooper, 1925/1988). Foreign affairs journalist Elizabeth Wiskemann (1899-1971) eventually entered academe, taking the Montague Burton Chair in IR at Edinburgh University. Archival and contextual analysis of such figures would likely challenge existing standards of inclusion within histories of international thought, pluralizing IR's understanding of what an archive might look like (el-Malik and Kamola, 2017). Such a study would not only highlight neglected thinkers. Examining historical women working across a variety of occupations shifts our attention away from 'big books' by canonical men to include a greater variety of often highly-gendered subjects, locations and genres. The point is not that historians of international thought have wholly neglected these different sites (Hall, 2012: 8), but that they are absolutely central to the successful retrieval of historical women's international thought.

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

1. Moore and Farrands (2010)	<i>International Relations Theory and Philosophy</i> (C)	15%
2. Ashworth (2007)	<i>International Relations and the Labour Party: Intellectuals and Policy Making from 1918-1945</i> (HT)	9.76%
3. Kirk (1947)	<i>The Study of International Relations in American Colleges and Universities</i> (IR)	8%
4. Bauer and Brighi (2003)	<i>International Relations at the LSE: A History of 75 years</i> (D)	7.4%
5. Hood, King, and Peele (2014)	<i>Forging a Discipline: A Critical Assessment of Oxford's Development of the Study of Politics and International Relations</i> (D)	7.1%
6. Vitalis (2015)	<i>White World Order, Black Power Politics: The Birth of American International Relations</i> (D)	6.9%
7. Porter (1972)	<i>The Aberystwyth Papers: International Politics, 1919-1969</i> (D)	6.7%
8. Ashworth (2014)	<i>A History of International Thought</i> (HT)	6.54%
9. Edkins and Vaughan-Williams (2009)	<i>Critical Theorists and International Relations</i> (C)	6%
10. Lebow et. al. (2016).	<i>The Return of the Theorists: Dialogues with Great Thinkers in International Relations</i> (C)	5.4%

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

### *IR 'State of the Art'*

Collections of readings by historical and contemporary IR scholars constitute a *contemporary* canon, a 'state of the art' of the field. These can take the form of either 'key thinkers', or selections of important works by prominent individuals in the history of the discipline or selections of works that illuminate a key theme or issue. Unlike works seeking to establish the canon of so-called 'great' thinkers, which often adopt a wholly circular justification for the selection, these 'state of the art' texts are more likely to represent the IR scholarship undertaken at the time of compilation. As such, we are more likely to find historical women scholars represented in this genre, though not to their fullest extent. In 'state of the art' texts, of 698 total selections, sixteen were by or concerned historical women: 2.29%. This is double the proportion in the 'classical' canon, but still represents an extremely small figure. When IR feminism reestablished a strong foothold during the 1990s, a small group of women, almost all contemporary scholars, began to appear in anthologies and basic texts. Yet, only one of these 'state of the art' books is included in Tables 4 and 5 of the top texts ranked by the total number and percentage of historical women (Kirk 1947). However, this text is anomalous in this genre. It is not a collection of

works, but a survey of then current IR teaching in the United States. Most of the women named are there by virtue of attending a conference on IR teaching. At the same time, there are only two texts in this genre in Table 3 of the bottom ranked texts (Morgenthau and Thompson, 1950; Linklater, 2000).

Unsurprisingly, this genre is far more likely to contain work by contemporary women. Indeed, Linklater's (2000) collection contains six works, all of them by well-known late-twentieth-century or contemporary feminists. Only one historical woman thinker regularly appears in this genre to address subjects that are not obviously related to gender: Susan Strange. Since, in recent years it has become difficult for editors to completely exclude women we instead find a form of 'pseudo-inclusion' (Thiele, 1986: 30-34). That is, a small number of usually contemporary women come to represent women 'in general', either as exponents of feminism or to discuss themes often associated with women, such as peace activism or gendered inequalities. One effect of these gendered forms of pseudo-inclusion is the exclusion of women appearing to write on anything other than gender. This is clear in Linklater (2000) and Der Derian (1995). Indeed, in the first edition of Griffith's (1999) *Fifty Key Thinkers of International Relations*, the only woman not registered under 'Gender and International Relations' (Elshtain, Enloe, and Tickner) is Susan Strange (listed under 'Realism'). Strange was dropped from the second edition, perhaps to make way for the contemporary Christine Sylvester as the fourth woman, the seemingly maximum number, all now appearing under 'Feminism' (Griffiths, et. al., 2009).

In surveys of the current discipline or of canonical thinkers there appears to be a consistently applied upper limit to the total number of women that can be admitted at any one time, usually a maximum of three or four per volume, but never more than a substantive discussion of two historical women. Here we might extend Joanna Russ's analysis of English Literature's canon in which 'some unconscious mechanism controls the number of female [sic] writers which looks "proper" or "enough" to anthologists and editors' (1983: 85). This is not merely anecdotal or particular to academe. As Sarah Walker has written, 'Research suggests that people perceive men and women - whether in zombie movies, panel games, crowd scenes or business meetings - as equally represented when the male-to-female ratio they are looking at actually hovers around 83:17. They start to regard situations as unduly female dominated when women approach 30 percent of those present' (2017: 4). Across the texts surveyed for this study, the actual ratio is less than 97:3. There is no danger of women being viewed as equally represented in histories of international thought. But in recent years editors and authors of IR 'state of the art' volumes appear to view women as *adequately* represented when a small number of contemporary feminists are included.

In our view, a project seeking to recover and analyze the international thought of historical women is necessarily a feminist project (Tickner, 2014). However, by no means will all the historical women recovered have engaged in explicitly feminist work. We turn now to look in more detail at one such figure whose work nonetheless touches on and calls for a feminist rereading of the most cutting-edge work in the contemporary historiography of IR (for one brief engagement see Sylvester, 2002: 11).

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

Name (alphabetical by mention)	Mentions	Main location and field
--------------------------------	----------	-------------------------



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

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

## A Case of ‘White Woman’s IR’

Through a series of important interventions during the last two decades, IR scholars have a much better historically-informed sense of the discipline’s origins in the study of colonial administration (Long and Schmidt, 2005: 1-21). What does asking questions about women contribute to the most significant and far-reaching new historiography in IR? We find that even some of the very best of this work inadvertently reinforces the assumption that historical women played no role in this dubious past. As a step in recovering and analysing the full spectrum of women’s international thought we must ask, was IR really just a ‘white man’s IR’ (Lake, 2016: 1112) founded by ‘great white fathers’ (Vitalis, 2017: 99)? One clue is in Table 6, where two of the historical women most recognized across the sixty histories of international thought specialized in colonial administration: Margery Perham and Lucy Philip Mair. A towering figure in the academic, policy, and media field of colonial administration, Perham is already the subject of a book length biography (Faught, 2011). At Oxford, she lectured on topics such as ‘Problems of Colonial Administration’, ‘Problems of Race and Government in Africa’, ‘The Colonial Empire’, and ‘British Policy towards Native Races’. She also mentored women faculty at Oxford who taught IR or IR-related subjects for decades, including Sibyl Crowe and Mary Proudfoot, suggesting that we also need to examine networks of historical IR women. However, from the perspective of IR’s disciplinary history, the more interesting case is Perham’s equivalent at the London School of Economics, Lucy Philip Mair. The existing literature makes two mentions of Mair, Wright’s (1955: 181) citation of her 1928 book, *The Protection of Minorities: The Working and Scope of the Minorities Treaties Under the League of Nations* and a brief mention in Bauer and Brighi’s (2003) edited collection, *International Relations at the LSE: A History of 75 Years*. In Northedge’s (2003: 11) essay in that volume, Mair is said to have

‘assisted the Professor generally’, the Professor being Philip Noel-Baker, the first Sir Ernest Cassel Professor of International Relations.

Lucy Philip Mair was among the first scholars hired to teach in the new International Studies (later Relations) Department, established in 1927. With a first class degree in Classics from Newnam College, Cambridge, but ‘debarred by her sex from competing for University prizes, scholarships, and studentships’, she had previously worked for five years at Gilbert Murray’s League of Nations Union as variously Publicity Secretary, Head of the Intelligence Department, Lecturer, and Representative at the Assembly of the League in Geneva.<sup>2</sup> According to Murray, ‘There is hardly an aspect of the League’s work on which she could not lecture effectively’.<sup>3</sup> In the summer of 1928, she delivered a course of twenty lectures on ‘Some Aspects of World Politics at the Present Day’ at Morley College for Working Men and Women in London, founded by Emma Cons in 1889 and the first to admit men and women on equal terms. In the 1920s, Mair’s academic work focused on the ‘minority question’ posed by the dismemberment of the Ottoman and Austrian empires, the subject of her first monograph, *The Protection of Minorities* (1928), still cited nearly three decades later in surveys of important IR works. During the 1928-29 year, the first in which she appears in the *LSE Calendar*, Mair taught or co-taught seven of the twenty courses listed under International Relations: ‘Cultural Contacts between the West and Primitive Peoples’, ‘Economic Aspects of International Relations’, ‘Pacific Methods of Settling International Disputes’, ‘Problems of Colonial Government’, ‘The Protection of Minorities’, ‘The International Labour Organisation’, and ‘Review of Current International Events’. Mair’s wider interest in mandated territories led her to research the administration of colonial Africa. In 1931, the year she was formally appointed Assistant Lecturer in IR, Mair was awarded a fellowship from the Rockefeller Foundation for field research in East Africa.

From 1927 until 1940, when Mair took leave of absence to undertake wartime work for the British Colonial Office, she lectured extensively on colonial administration, with all courses listed under IR. Mair received another fellowship, from the International African Institute, for a field trip in North Western Tanganyika for 1936-7, the year she was also approached to work for the Chatham House Africa Research Survey. On the eve of World War II, Mair’s IR teaching included ‘Possession of Colonial Territory as an International Problem’, covering topics all central to British colonial strategy in the context of rival empires and anti-colonial resistance: colonial possessions as a source of international rivalry; current demands for redistribution; attempts at international regulation of administrative standards; League of Nations and International Labour Conventions; and the mandate system. During the following session, she covered the difference between the ‘actual and supposed’ economic advantages of colonies; non-economic values attached to colonies; colonial development and the interest of native peoples; existing international standards of administration; and proposals for modifications of the status quo of colonialism other than the redistribution of colonial territories to rival powers. During the war, Mair worked at the British Empire section of the Foreign Research and Press Service at Chatham House and in 1944, the year she published her third book *Welfare in the British Colonies*, she was invited by the Australian government to lecture for twelve months on the administration of New Guinea. She became instructor in Colonial

<sup>2</sup> Mr. H. Rackman to William Beveridge, n.d. 1927 LSE File Mair, Dr. L. P. 1927-1935 A

<sup>3</sup> Gilbert Murray to William Beveridge, n.d. 1927 LSE File Mair, Dr. L. P. 1927-1935 A

Administration at the Australian Land Headquarters Civil Affairs School, publishing *Australia in New Guinea* in 1948. After the war, Mair's LSE teaching was formally listed under Anthropology. In fact, Mair had indicated her desire to transfer from IRD to Anthropology before the war. During her 1937 research in North Western Tanganyika, Mair wrote to the LSE Director proposing that she transfer to Anthropology, 'merely giving lectures on the international aspects of colonies which students taking International Relations could attend'.<sup>4</sup>

The primary reason for Mair's departure from IRD appears to be her desire for a coherent teaching/research profile centering on her specialism, rather than any sense of a fundamental distinction between IR and Colonial Administration *per se*.<sup>5</sup> Indeed, in the early 1930s, there was discussion of whether IR should be combined with Colonial Administration in one unit at the LSE with a single head of Department. Mair's work was certainly considered core IR. Through the 1930s one of Anglo-American IR's central concerns was 'peaceful change' in world politics and the consequences of the difference 'between have and have-not states'. The 1937 International Studies Conference in Paris focused on this theme, leading to the publication of a book edited by Charles Manning, who held the LSE's prestigious Montague Burton Chair from 1930 until 1962. Mair was one of eight contributors, writing on 'Colonial Policy and Peaceful Change'.<sup>6</sup> Needless-to-say, Mair was central to the consolidation of IR at the LSE. In 1934, she wrote an internal memorandum on 'International Relations as a Separate Subject'. 'In its present-day form', she states, 'the study must centre round the problem of the attempt to unite in a collective system a number of communities which are highly organised politically with a view of independent action. This problem is absolutely *sui generis*. It cannot be understood or solved by a process of facile generalization from the history of political development within individual states'.<sup>7</sup> It is significant that Mair wrote of relations between communities with a high level of political organization, rather than relations between 'states', perhaps reflecting her sense of the political organization of the communities being administered by Britain as colonies, with Mair's assistance.

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

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

<sup>4</sup> Mair to William Beveridge 28 April 1937. LSE File, Mair, Dr. L. P. 1935-1946, B

<sup>5</sup> Mair to William Beveridge 28 April 1937. LSE File Mair, Dr. L. P. 1935-1946, B

<sup>6</sup> 'Peaceful Change: An International Problem'. 1937. LSE File, LNU/7/36

<sup>7</sup> Mair, 'International Relations as a Separate Subject', 20<sup>th</sup> February 1934. LSE\LSE School History\Box 10 Chairs.

pursued at LSE.<sup>8</sup>

Though he was aware of Mair's central role, having been her colleague for thirteen years, Manning erased both her and Colonial Administration from the history of IR at the LSE, and thus in the field more broadly. Her place was even further obscured when Manning explained why the proposal to combine Colonial Administration and IR was rejected. In his words, 'the two subjects were, if anything, cousins rather than twins, the one being concerned with a manifestation of government, the other with the processes and possibilities of diplomacy - man's traditional means of doing his public business on that extra-national level where government has not as yet come to apply'.<sup>9</sup> Manning makes no mention of the fact that the suggestion to create a united Department arose because Colonial Administration was central to the IR curriculum, was taught primarily under IR, and was considered as an area for expansion, even in the context of wider budget cuts during the Depression of the 1930s. In contrast, Mair's earlier, subtler notion of relations between 'communities' that are 'highly organised politically' accommodates colonial and inter-state relations.

Based on her world-leading expertise in colonial administration, Lucy Mair was a high-profile figure among both scholars and policymakers over a long period of time. She taught a large percentage of the early students of IR in what at the time was one of its largest academic centres in the world. She is honoured in the academic discipline into which she migrated; her work is the subject of two edited volumes in Anthropology (Davis, 1974; Owusu, 1975). But, in IR, she is unknown for her role in its disciplinary history or contributions to international-colonial thought. Mair's case suggests that even the most brilliant works of disciplinary history that have undone earlier, sanitized versions of IR's past can also inadvertently reproduce the myth of women's absence. As historians of IR increasingly dispense with the ahistorical myth of IR as emerging from the 'realist' rejection of 'idealism' (Ashworth, 2014: 261) it will not be surprising if we find a much larger body of work by historical women who forged for themselves a distinctive place within the early field of IR through work on the management and justification of colonial empire. Retrieval and analysis of women's international thought cannot occur in isolation from the most recent cutting-edge work in IR's intellectual and disciplinary history. But such work must also do more to locate and analyze historical women's international thought.

## Conclusion

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

<sup>8</sup> C.A.W Manning, 'Note on the Nature of International Relations as the province of the Montague Burton Chair'. n.d.

p.2. LSE\LSE School History\Box 10 Chairs

<sup>9</sup> Manning, 'Note on the Nature', pp.2-3

international politics towards the end of the twentieth-century is wrong. The case of Lucy Philip Mair suggests that this oversight is, in part, a product of an active erasure of early IR's role in colonial administration. Despite the considerable obstacles they have faced historical women are a part of IR's intellectual and disciplinary history. Significant numbers of historical women have written powerfully about international politics, both inside and outside academe, and in and through a variety of disciplinary and institutional settings. Yet, to date, the relevant histories of these fields have largely failed to understand historical women as producers of international thought or as co-founders of the IR discipline. The argument is not that authors and editors have consciously sought to exclude historical women. Many were probably not even always aware that exclusion had occurred. To write or compile such collections in this manner only requires scholars to act in the customary way.

An interdisciplinary research program aimed at recovering and evaluating historical women's international thought is belated to say the least. What should this research program look like? What would it change about the way IR scholars currently write the history of international thought and disciplinary history? IR could do worse than build on and extend to international thought the already vibrant traditions of women's intellectual history that emerged out of the field of women's and gender history more broadly (Kerber, 1997; Bay et. al., 2015). This earlier research suggests that an intellectual history of women's international thought should not be envisaged as a straightforward process of including some women in the pre-existing canon or narratives of disciplinary history. Taking historical women seriously as producers of international thought and as disciplinary founders has the promise to not simply expand the size of the current 'canon'. It potentially involves rewriting the history of international thought itself, transforming what is taken to be its accepted practices, genres, and locations. It would lead to an expansion of what we understand by 'founding' in the deeply gendered and raced domains of international thought and disciplinary history and raise fundamental questions about the sex/gender categories that are used in the process of rewriting intellectual and disciplinary history. It would also involve moving beyond the customary way in which we search out international thinkers, including by expanding the sources and archives to consult. Much more research is required. However, it is quite likely that historical women working outside or at the edges of academe used different idioms for conceiving international politics, contributing to their marginal position in intellectual history, but also to the distinctiveness of their ideas.

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

## References

- Armitage, David (2013) *Foundations of Modern International Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Ashworth, Lucian M. (2011) 'Feminism, War, and the Prospects for Peace: Helena Stanwick (1864-1939) and the Lost Feminists of Interwar International Relations', *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 13(1):25-43
- Ashworth, Lucian M. (2014) *A History of International Thought: From the Origins of the Modern State to Academic International Relations* (New York: Routledge)
- Ball, Desmond and Sheryn Lee (2014) *Power and International Relations: Essays in Honour of Coral Bell* (Canberra: ANU Press)
- Bauer, Harry, and Elisabetta Brighi (2003) *International Relations at the LSE: A History of 75 Years* (London: Millennium Publishing)
- Bay, Mia, Farah J. Griffin, Martha S. Jones and Barbara D. Savage (eds.) (2015) *Toward an Intellectual History of Black Women* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press)
- Blackwell, Joyce (2004) *No Peace Without Freedom: Race and The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom 1915-1975* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press)
- Bliddal, Henrick, Casper Sylvest, and Peter Wilson (eds.) (2013) *Classics of International Relations: Essays in Criticism and Appreciation* (New York: Routledge)
- Brown, Chris, Terry Nardin, and Nicholas Rengger (eds.) (2002) *International Relations in Political Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Clark, Ian and Neumann, Iver B. (eds) (1996) *Classical Theories in International Relations* (London: Macmillan)
- Confortini, Catia (2012) *Intelligent Compassion: Feminist Critical Methodology in the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- Cooper, Anna Julia (1925/1988) *Slavery and the French Revolutionists, 1788-1804* (trans. Frances Richardson Keller) (New York: Edwin Mellen)
- Davis, John (ed.) (1974) *Choice and Change: Essays in Honour of Lucy Mair* (London: Athlone)
- Deegan, M.J. (1981) 'Early Women Sociologists and the American Sociological Society:

Patterns of Exclusion and Participation', *American Sociologist*, 16:14-24

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

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

el-Malik, Shiera, and Issac A. Kamola (eds.) (2017) *Politics of African Anticolonial Archive* (New York: Rowman and Littlefield)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Hall, Ian (2014) 'The Interpretation of Power Politics: Coral Bell's International Thought' in Desmond Ball and Sheryn Lee (eds.) *Power and International Relations: Essays in Honour of Coral Bell* (Canberra: ANU Press), pp.45-56

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

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

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

Higashida, Cheryl (2011), *Black International Feminism: Women Writers of the Black*

*Left, 1945-1995* (Illinois: University of Illinois Press)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Lake, David (2016) 'White Man's IR: an Intellectual Confession', *Perspectives on*



*Politics*, 14(4):1112-1122

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

Leira, Halvard, and Benjamin de Carvalho (eds.) (2015) *Historical International Relations, Vol.II: The History of International Thought* (London: Sage)

Linklater, Andrew (2000) *International Relations: Critical Concepts in Political Science* (New York: Routledge)

Long, David and Brian Schmidt (2005) *Imperialism and Internationalism in the Discipline of International Relations* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press)

Long, David, and Peter Wilson (eds.) (1995) *Thinkers of the Twenty Years Crisis: Interwar Idealism Reassessed* (Oxford: Clarendon)

Luard, Evan (1992) *Basic Texts in International Relations: The Evolution of Ideas about International Society* (London: Macmillan)

Mair, Lucy Philip (1928) *The Protection of Minorities: The Working and Scope of the Minorities Treaties Under the League of Nations* (London: Christophers)

Malchow, Howard LeRoy (2016) *History and International Relations: from the Ancient World to the 21<sup>st</sup> Century* (London: Bloombury)

May, Vivienne M. (2007) *Anna Julia Cooper, Visionary Black Feminist: A Critical Introduction* (London: Routledge)

Messari, Nizar, Arlene B. Tickner, and L.H.M. Ling (forthcoming) (eds.) *Theorizing International Relations from the Global South: A World of Difference* (New York: Routledge)

Moore, Cerwyn and Chris Farrands (eds.) (2010) *International Relations Theory and Philosophy: Interpretive Dialogues* (New York: Routledge)

Morgenthau, Hans J. and Kenneth W. Thompson (eds.) (1950) *Principles and Problems of International Politics: Selected Readings* (New York: Alfred Knopf)

Murphy, Craig N. (2017) 'Relocating the point of IR in understanding industrial age problems' in Synne L. Dyvik, Jan Selby, Rorden Wilkinson (ed.) *What's the Point of International Relations?* (New York: Routledge), pp.71-82

Neumann, Iver B., and Ole Wæver (eds.) (1997) *The Future of International Relations: Masters in the Making?* (London: Routledge)

- Owens, Patricia (2007) *Between War and Politics: International Relations and the Thought of Hannah Arendt* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- Owusu, Maxwell (ed.) (1975) *Colonialism and change: essays presented to Lucy Mair* (The Hague: Mouton)
- Plastas, M. (2011) *A Band of Noble Women: Racial Politics in the Women's Peace Movement* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press)
- Porter, Brian (ed.) (1972) *The Aberystwyth Papers, 1919-1969* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- Rösch, Felix (2014) (ed.) *Émigré Scholars and the Genesis of American International Relations: a European Discipline in America* (London: Palgrave)
- Rosenboim, Or (2014) 'Barbara Wootton, Friedrich Hayek and the debate on Democratic Federalism in the 1940s', *International History Review*, 36(5)894-918
- Russ, Joanna (1983) *How to Suppress Women's Writing* (London: Women's Press)
- Savord, Ruth (1931) *Directory of American Agencies Concerned with the Study of International Relations* (New York: Council on Foreign Relations)
- Schmidt, Brian C. (1998) *The Political Discourse of Anarchy: A Disciplinary History of International Relations* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press)
- Scott, Joan W. (1986) 'Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis', *American Historical Review*, 91: 1053-75
- Shaarawi, Huda (1987) *Harem Years: The Memoirs of an Egyptian Feminist, 1879-1924* (trans. ed. Intro by Margot Badran) (New York: Feminist Press)
- Sluga, Glenda (2017) 'Women, Feminisms and Twentieth-Century Internationalisms' in Glenda Sluga and Patricia Clavin (eds.) *Internationalism: A Twentieth-Century History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.61-84
- Sluga, Glenda (2014) 'Turning International: Foundations of Modern International Thought and New Paradigms for Intellectual History', *History of European Ideas*, 41(1):103-115
- Sluga, Glenda (2015) 'Madame de Staël and the Transformation of European Politics, 1812-17', *International History Review*, 37(1):142-166
- Smith, Hilda L. and Bernice A. Carroll (eds.) (2000) *Women's Political and Social Thought: An Anthology* (Bloomington: University of Indiana Press)

Smith, Bonnie G. (2000) *The Gender of History: Men, Women, and Historical Practice* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press)

Sylvest, Casper (2009) *British Liberal Internationalism, 1880-1930: Making Progress?* (Manchester: Manchester University Press)

Sylvester, Christine (2002) *Feminist International Relations: An Unfinished Journey* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Stawell, Francis M. (1929) *The Growth of International Thought* (London: Butterworth)

Suganami, Hidemi (2001) 'C.A.W. Manning and the Study of International Relations', *Review of International Studies*, Vol.27:91-107

Taylor, Trevor (1978) *Approaches and Theory in International Relations* (London: Longman)

Thompson, Kenneth W. (1982) *Masters of International Thought* (Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press)

Thompson, Kenneth W. (1994) *Fathers of International Thought: The Legacy of Political Theory* (Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press)

Tickner, J. Ann (2014) *A Feminist Voyage through International Relations* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Umoren, Imaobong D. (2013) "'This is the Age of Woman": Black Feminism and Black Internationalism in the Works of Una Marson, 1928-1938', *History of Women in the Americas*, 1(1):50-73

Vasquez, John A (1995) *Classics of International Relations* (3<sup>rd</sup> edition) (New York: Pearson)

Vitalis, Robert (2015) *White World Order, Black Power Politics: The Birth of American International Relations* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press)

Wæver, Ole (1997) 'Figures of International Thought: Introducing Persons instead of Paradigms' in Neumann and Wæver (eds.) *The Future of International Relations: Masters in the Making?* (New York: Routledge), pp.1-40

Walker, Sarah (2017) 'Letters: The Count', *London Review of Books*, 39(6) (16 March):4

Ward, Barbara (1972) 'Problems of a Developing World' in Brian Porter (ed.) *The Aberystwyth Papers, 1919-1969* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.264-280

Weiss, Penny A. (2009) *Canon Fodder: Historical Women Political Thinkers* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania University Press)

Wight, Martin (1966) 'Why is there no International Theory?' in Herbert Butterfield and Martin Wight (eds.) *Diplomatic Investigations* (London: Allen & Unwin), pp.17-34

Williams, Howard, Moorhead Wright, and Tony Evans (eds.) (1993) *A Reader in International Relations and Political Theory* (Buckingham: Open University Press)

Williams, Marc (1989) *International Relations in the Twentieth Century: A Reader* (New York: New York University Press)

Williams, Phil, Donald Goldstein, and Jay Shafritz (1994) *Classic Readings of International Relations* (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth)

Williams, Phil, Donald Goldstein, and Jay Shafritz (1998) *Classic Readings of International Relations* (second edition) (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth)

Williams, Phil, Donald Goldstein, and Jay Shafritz (2005) *Classic Readings and Contemporary Debates in International Relations* (third edition) (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth)

Wilson, Peter (2013) 'Attacking Hitler in England: Patriarchy, Class and War in Virginia Woolf's *Three Guineas*' in Bliddal (eds.) *Classics of International Relations* (London: Routledge), pp.36-47

Wolfers, Arnold and Laurence W. Martin (eds.) (1956) *The Anglo-American Tradition in Foreign Affairs: Readings from Thomas More to Woodrow Wilson* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press)