

## Introduction: Toward a History of Women's International Thought

*Patricia Owens and Katharina Rietzler*

In the early 1970s, historian Linda K. Kerber observed that “when women are absent from the narrative history of ideas, it is not because they are truly absent, but because the historian did not seek energetically enough to find them.”<sup>1</sup> What was true of the historical profession in the early 1970s is even more so now for cross-disciplinary work on the history of international thought. Intellectual history as a subfield has long marginalized gender.<sup>2</sup> While *international* intellectual history and the history of the academic discipline of International Relations (IR) are flourishing, there is a serious lack of engagement with historical women by both historians and IR scholars.<sup>3</sup> Neither have investigated women's foundational role in the emerging intellectual field of international relations in the early twentieth century or the later post-World War II academic discipline of IR. Even scholarship within social and political theory dedicated to retrieving and evaluating women's thought has

<sup>1</sup> Linda K. Kerber, *Toward an Intellectual History of Women: Essays* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997), 19.

<sup>2</sup> See Richard Whatmore, *What is Intellectual History?* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2015). Cf. Hilda L. Smith, “Women's History as Intellectual History: A Perspective on the *Journal of Women's History*,” *Journal of Women's History* 20.1 (2008): 26–32; Rachel Foxley, “Gender and Intellectual History,” in Richard Whatmore and Brian Young (eds.), *Palgrave Advances in Intellectual History* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), 189–209.

<sup>3</sup> David Armitage, “The International Turn in Intellectual History,” in D. M. McMahon and S. Moyn (eds.), *Rethinking Modern European Intellectual History* (Oxford University Press, 2014), 232–52; Samuel Moyn and Andrew Sartori (eds.), *Global Intellectual History* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2013); Robert Vitalis, *White World Order, Black Power Politics: The Birth of American International Relations* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2015); Ian Hall, “The History of International Thought and International Relations Theory: From Context to Interpretation,” *International Relations* 31.3 (2017): 241–60; Duncan Bell, “Writing the World (Remix),” in Brian C. Schmidt and Nicolas Guillhot (eds.), *Historiographical Investigations in International Relations* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019), 15–50. In addition to this book, we point readers to the anthology Patricia Owens, Katharina Rietzler, Kimberly Hutchings, and Sarah C. Dunstan (eds.), *Women's International Thought: Towards a New Canon* (Cambridge University Press, forthcoming).

neglected distinctly international questions. Although gender studies and feminism are well established in IR, there is no substantial body of scholarship remedying women's erasure from IR's canon of intellectual "greats" or its disciplinary history.<sup>4</sup>

The erasure of women from existing histories of international thought is striking. This is obviously not due to the lack of women as "leaders of world thought," to use Amy Ashwood Garvey's term.<sup>5</sup> The very use of the term "international thought" can be traced to the 1929 publication of Florence Melian Stawell's *The Growth of International Thought*, but the first close reading of this work appears only now, in an essay for this volume.<sup>6</sup> Especially from the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, women were central to and often defined emerging discourses about international relations. They were acute observers of the first truly "global" international order in multiple locations both inside and outside academe. Public intellectuals, thinker-practitioners, and "street-scholars" thought deeply about world politics in and through a variety of genres. Inside academe, women founded or co-founded some of the earliest teaching and research centres dedicated to the study of international relations and were among the first cohort of scholars appointed in the earliest academic departments specializing in this subject. They wrote some of the first and most influential textbooks on and surveys of international relations.<sup>7</sup>

Women defined and transformed the study of international relations, generating a multiplicity of forms of international thought. There is a stark contrast between the central presence of historical women in the multiple forms and sites of international thought and their erasure from the relevant intellectual and disciplinary histories. How can we think systematically about this important but forgotten history? What assumptions about these categories – women, international, and thought – should we make? It is high time to begin confronting these questions, retrieving and analyzing women's international thinking, and broadening

<sup>4</sup> We do not believe that this constitutes a "failure" of feminist IR, as some have claimed. Jan Stöckmann, "Women, Wars, and World Affairs: Recovering Feminist International Relations, 1915–39," *Review of International Studies* 44.2 (2018), 2. It was the task of IR's disciplinary and intellectual historians to produce histories capable of reading and challenging the obviously gendered politics of their subject. See Kimberly Hutchings and Patricia Owens, "Women Thinkers and the Canon of International Thought," *American Political Science Review*, forthcoming.

<sup>5</sup> Rhoda Reddock, "The First Mrs Garvey: Pan-Africanism and Feminism in the Early 20th Century British Colonial Caribbean," *Feminist Africa* 19 (2014): 58–77.

<sup>6</sup> F. Melian Stawell, *The Growth of International Thought* (London: Butterworth, 1929).

<sup>7</sup> Glenda Sluga, "Add Women and Stir": Gender and the History of International Politics," *Humanities Australia* 5 (2014): 65–72.

and deepening the currently accepted practices and locations of international thought.

A first, initial step in writing a new history of international thought has been suggested by historian Glenda Sluga: to engage in “recovery history,” unearthing the foundational role of historical women who are missing from existing scholarship on the history of international thought. Such essential work, writes Sluga, “requires not merely the rereading of well-read texts, but the recovery of those texts, alongside others lost to their own time because of the bias against women publishing in ‘masculine’ genres, and the formulation of a context by virtue of which these recovered texts might be read into the larger story of an internationalised intellectual history – a sizeable task.”<sup>8</sup> Our goal with this volume is to do more than “add women” to the existing record of international thought and its received historical and theoretical categories. But their omission makes it necessary in the first instance to bring together existing forays even as we ultimately seek to unsettle conventional assumptions.

We are certainly not the first to notice the absence and erasure of women in international intellectual and disciplinary history.<sup>9</sup> There is a small but growing number of journal articles and chapters on individual figures in both History and IR, though generally outside the mainstream of these fields.<sup>10</sup> There is also a literature on women and the practices of

<sup>8</sup> Glenda Sluga, “Turning International: *Foundations of Modern International Thought and New Paradigms for Intellectual History*,” *History of European Ideas* 41.1 (2015), 112. There is a long tradition of “recovery work,” for example, Dale Spender, *Women of Ideas (and What Men Have Done to Them)* (London: Ark, 1982). For an early and powerful analysis on the meanings of sexual difference beyond the recovery of forgotten women see several of the essays in Joan Wallach Scott (ed.), *Feminism and History* (Oxford University Press, 1996).

<sup>9</sup> Christine Sylvester, *Feminist International Relations: An Unfinished Journey* (Cambridge University Press, 2002), 11; Sluga, “Turning International”; Patricia Owens, “Women and the History of International Thought,” *International Studies Quarterly* 62.3 (2018): 467–81; Valeska Huber, Tamson Pietsch, and Katharina Rietzler, “Women’s International Thought and the New Professions, 1900–1940,” *Modern Intellectual History*, First View (2019): 1–25.

<sup>10</sup> In History see Robert Shaffer, “Women and International Relations: Pearl S. Buck’s Critique of the Cold War,” *Journal of Women’s History* 11.3 (1999): 151–75; Linda Schott, *Reconstructing Women’s Thoughts: The Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom before World War II* (Stanford University Press, 1997); Kristen E. Gwinn, *Emily Greene Balch: The Long Road to Internationalism* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2010); Or Rosenboim, “Barbara Wootton, Friedrich Hayek and the Debate on Democratic Federalism in the 1940s,” *The International History Review* 36.5 (2014): 894–918; Barbara Savage, “Professor Merze Tate: Diplomatic Historian, Cosmopolitan Woman,” in Mia Bay, Farah J. Griffin, Martha S. Jones, and Barbara D. Savage (eds.), *Toward an Intellectual History of Black Women* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2015), 252–69. In IR see Patricia Owens, *Between War and Politics: International Relations and the Thought of Hannah Arendt* (Oxford University Press, 2007); Lucian M. Ashworth, “Feminism, War, and the Prospects for Peace:

international relations and diplomacy.<sup>11</sup> We build on this important work. However, we ask not only where are women in histories of international thought. We also ask which women are already where and why this is so. This allows us to both acknowledge the importance of the relatively few existing studies, but to not content ourselves with increasing the number of works on elite white women, the subjects of almost all the existing secondary literature. As discussed in more detail below, “women” is a deeply contested category which emerges through intersection with other identities and positions.<sup>12</sup>

Hence, there is an urgent need to put histories of international thought into conversation with the flourishing literature on Black women’s intellectual history.<sup>13</sup> Given the systematic marginalization of Black scholars from the Anglo-American academic discipline of IR, but also its entanglements with European traditions of international thought, we focus on a selection of Black as well as white Anglophone and white European figures. We recognize the inadvisability of assuming a universal experience of raced positionality, and the contested nature of racial and ethnic categorizations. Thus, we have left it to the authors in this volume to determine the most appropriate terminology and they adopt a variety of terms, including white, black, Black, African American, and Jewish. To partially mitigate the near complete absence of people of color in existing histories of international thought we draw on Bay, Griffin, Jones, and Savage’s “intellectual history ‘black women style,’” which

Helena Swanwick (1864–1939) and the Lost Feminists of Interwar International Relations,” *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 13.1 (2011): 25–43; Lene Hansen, “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 (2011): 109–28; Helen M. Kinsella, “Simone Weil: An Introduction,” in Felix Rösch (ed.), *Émigré Scholars and the Genesis of American International Relations: A European Discipline in America?* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), 176–97.

<sup>11</sup> Special Issue, “Women and International Relations,” *Millennium: Journal of International Relations* 17.3 (1988); Craig Murphy, “Seeing Women, Recognizing Gender, Recasting International Relations,” *International Organization* 50.3 (1996): 513–38; Ann E. Towns, *Women and States: Norms and Hierarchies in International Society* (Cambridge University Press, 2010); Glenda Sluga and Carolyn James (eds.), *Women, Diplomacy and International Politics since 1500* (London: Routledge, 2016); Karen Garner, *Women and Gender in International History* (London: Bloomsbury, 2018).

<sup>12</sup> Cynthia Enloe, *Bananas, Beaches and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics* (London: Pandora Books, 1989); Anne McClintock, *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender, and Sexuality in the Colonial Conquest* (New York: Routledge, 1995).

<sup>13</sup> Melinda Plastas, *A Band of Noble Women: Racial Politics in the Women’s Peace Movement* (Syracuse University Press, 2011); Keisha N. Blain, *Set the World on Fire: Black Nationalist Women and the Global Struggle for Freedom* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2018); Imaobong Umoren, *Race Women Internationalists: Activist-Intellectuals and Global Freedom Struggles* (Oakland: University of California Press, 2018).

emphasizes ideas in the context of lived experience “and always inflected by the social facts of race, class, and gender.”<sup>14</sup> In the context of international relations, we consider nation, citizenship, and empire as additional factors that structured intellectual production.<sup>15</sup>

Inspired by this important earlier work, we seek to return to the foundational questions of which kinds of subjects and what kind of thinking constitutes international thought, which we define broadly as reflection on the relations between peoples, empires, and states. Our definition of *thought* is also, by necessity, capacious. Despite facing multiple axes of structural exclusion and discrimination, each of our subjects had the audacity to self-consciously make sense of international politics in a deep and sustained way. If we had adopted a narrow understanding of “thought” as dense theoretical treatise, disconnected from positionality, and excluded policy formulation, practice, and activism, then we could not have assembled this collection of essays.<sup>16</sup> Several of our subjects produced dense theoretical treatises, making explicit and obvious contributions to theorizing, conventionally understood. However, we do not subsume thought into theory. Bearing in mind the gendered and racialized manner in which conventional genres of theorizing were formed, we see theory in a wide range of genres and forms, and we invite readers to adopt a broader understanding of what it means to produce thought and theory than is often the case in intellectual history and contemporary IR. Of course, a capacious understanding of what constitutes “thought” has costs as well as benefits. A few of our figures received only scant recognition as thought leaders in their lifetime, and identifying their distinct intellectual contributions requires a high level of contextualization.

Together, the essays examine the substantive intellectual contributions of eighteen thinkers from the late nineteenth to the mid-twentieth century. We selected this period for two reasons. First, this was a

<sup>14</sup> Mia Bay, Farah J. Griffin, Martha S. Jones, and Barbara D. Savage, “Introduction: Toward an Intellectual History of Black Women,” in Bay et al. (eds), *Toward an Intellectual History of Black Women*, 4. In a survey of sixty texts on the history of international thought, only four women of color are among the seventy-nine historical women identified: the African Americans Merze Tate (1905–96), Eslanda Robeson (1895–1965), Lorraine Hansberry (1930–65), and Pauli Murray (1910–85). All four were mentioned in a single text that focuses on IR’s racist past. Vitalis, *White World Order*; Owens, “Women and the History of International Thought,” 470.

<sup>15</sup> Blain, *Set the World on Fire*; Umoren, *Race Women Internationalists*.

<sup>16</sup> As Foxley has put it, “attention to gender may challenge some of our beliefs about the ‘right’ way to do intellectual history.” “Gender and Intellectual History,” 18. Also see the broad understanding of intellectual history practiced at the blog of the *Journal of the History of Ideas* (<https://jhiblog.org/>) (accessed June 24, 2019) and, on “vehicles” of thought, Bay et al., “Introduction,” 5.

fundamental moment in the imagining of international relations as a distinct sphere but it was also deeply entangled with imperialism and the continuing aftermaths of slavery, world wars and genocides, stark racialized, class, and gendered conflicts, the emergence of new international organizations and conceptualizations of international law, decolonizing movements, and calls for global social democracy. Through the nineteenth century, Anglophone thinkers often engaged with empire, as imperialist discourse enabled elite white women to carve out positions of power in a domain structured by notions of racial superiority.<sup>17</sup> Intellectuals were beginning to imagine imperial *and* international relations as spheres that remained necessarily entangled and not always clearly distinguished. New international organizations such as the League of Nations consolidated, rather than undermined, the European empires.<sup>18</sup> In common with British liberal internationalist thought in the interwar years, race and empire were the foundation of Stawell's *The Growth of International Thought*, a Euro- and Christian-centric account of, among other things, the dilemmas of accessing natural resources in world regions "nominally in the possession of savage ... races."<sup>19</sup> Several other figures examined wrote extensively on both international relations and imperialism from a variety of political positions. Indeed, we suggest that their focus on imperial relations is one of the reasons why so many women were subsequently marginalized in many later accounts of IR's intellectual and disciplinary history which erased imperialism and "race relations" from the history of the field.<sup>20</sup>

Second, we focus on the late nineteenth to early mid-twentieth century because these were formative years in the emergence of international relations as a distinct interdisciplinary field drawing on methods and approaches from History, Classics, Anthropology and Colonial Administration, Law, Economics, and Political Science. Thus we do not endorse IR's conventional periodization, either of itself or of international history. The multiple intellectual, racialized, class, and gendered conflicts

<sup>17</sup> Deirdre David, *Rule Britannia: Women, Empire, and Victorian Writing* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1995); Allison L. Sneider, *Suffragists in an Imperial Age: U.S. Expansion and the Woman Question, 1870–1929* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008); Melinda Plasatas, "A Different Burden: Race and the Social Thought of Emily Greene Balch," *Peace & Change* 33.4 (2008): 469–506 (478–79, 497).

<sup>18</sup> Susan Pedersen, *The Guardians: The League of Nations and the Crisis of Empire* (Oxford University Press, 2015); Daniel Gorman, *The Emergence of International Society in the 1920s* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012).

<sup>19</sup> Stawell, *Growth of International Thought*, 173–74; Jeanne Morefield, *Covenants without Swords: Idealist Liberalism and the Spirit of Empire* (Princeton University Press, 2005).

<sup>20</sup> For an analysis of the case of Lucy Philip Mair see Owens, "Women and the History of International Thought."

defining the late nineteenth to early mid-twentieth centuries have rarely been central to the telling of IR's intellectual and interdisciplinary history. In the decades after World War II, scholars in both Britain and the United States sought to define a new intellectual program for a separate and distinct academic discipline, which developed as a subdiscipline of Political Science in the United States from the 1950s and from the 1970s in Britain. In this process, the earlier interdisciplinary field of international relations debate and scholarship was widely presented as emerging out of the desire to understand the causes of World War I and the conditions of peace, a seemingly noble lineage.<sup>21</sup> This retrospective version of disciplinary history, eventually framed around a mythical series of gladiatorial "great debates" between different "isms" and ahistorical "traditions", erased earlier women intellectuals and scholars of international relations. To counter some aspects of this flawed conventional narrative, more recent studies have rightly focused on early twentieth-century imperialism, colonial administration, and "race development" as central to the establishment of academic IR as "white man's IR."<sup>22</sup> IR was not unique among academic disciplines in marginalizing women. Yet IR still lacks an account of both the early years of "white women's IR";<sup>23</sup> an awareness of the myriad ways in which Black and other women of color responded to and wrote about the international politics of this era; and how the much later and gradual carving out of a distinct IR "discipline" and, more widely, a tradition of "international thought" was itself highly gendered as well as racialized, a process that has been obscured by the existing historiography.

The disciplinary history of academic IR is not the sole, or even primary, focus of this volume and the gendered history of the discipline is the subject of ongoing research. Here we are less interested in bringing our subjects into the mainstream of contemporary IR or assimilating them into disciplinary history or ways of organizing IR theory. This would be naïve about the effects of advocating for "inclusion." But we

<sup>21</sup> Brian Porter (ed.), *The Aberystwyth Papers, 1919–1969* (Oxford University Press, 1972); William C. Olson and A. J. R. Groom, *International Relations Then and Now: Origins and Trends in Interpretation* (London: Unwin Hyman, 1991). For a summary and critique see Lucian Ashworth, *A History of International Thought: From the Origins of the Modern State to Academic International Relations* (London: Routledge, 2014).

<sup>22</sup> David Lake, "White Man's IR: An Intellectual Confession," *Perspectives on Politics* 14.4 (2016): 1112–22; Brian C. Schmidt, *The Political Discourse of Anarchy: A Disciplinary History of International Relations* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1998), 123–49; David Long and Brian Schmidt (eds.), *Imperialism and Internationalism in the Discipline of International Relations* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2005); Vitalis, *White World Order*.

<sup>23</sup> Owens, "Women and the History of International Thought," 467.

do seek to initiate and contribute to further revisionist accounts which pay due attention to racism, colonialism, class, *and* gender in the writing of disciplinary and intellectual history. For example, women's focus on imperialism is not the only source of their later exclusion from IR historiography. The *historical* character of much women's scholarship contributed to their marginalization in a post-World War II discipline in which the previously central role of diplomatic history was weakened and caricatured in order to attain the coveted status of a policy "science" and abstract "theory" of the international "system." In contrast, some men who produced historical scholarship, such as Arnold Toynbee or Felix Gilbert, suffered no such disadvantage when articulating historicist visions for IR realism.<sup>24</sup>

Recent accounts of the relatively late emergence of "IR theory" do not mention, let alone center, gender. However, the search for an abstract theory of IR can be seen, in part, as a reaction not just to traditional forms of diplomatic history or behavioral social science but also against genres of international thought in which women excelled.<sup>25</sup> A great deal of early to mid-twentieth-century international relations scholarship centered on the problem of mass democracy, whether and how foreign policy ought to be responsive to "the people," and how knowledge on international politics should be popularized. Much of this work was written in the genre of popular writing, for instance in the Foreign Policy Association's *Headline* series. IR's disciplinary and often intellectual insecurity, including the ongoing debate on whether IR can be more than commentary on current affairs, can be read in this context. Similarly, feminists, Black and white, were among the earliest and, at the time, central protagonists in early twentieth-century Anglo-American debates about the problems and possibilities of international order.<sup>26</sup> As Ashworth explains in this volume, as a result, erstwhile intellectual "insiders" became post-hoc "outsiders" in a discipline that conventionally dates the advent of feminist IR to the 1980s.

<sup>24</sup> Nicolas Guilhot, "Portrait of the Realist as a Historian: On Anti-Whiggism in the History of International Relations," *European Journal of International Relations* 21.1 (2015): 3–26.

<sup>25</sup> Nicolas Guilhot (ed.), *The Invention of International Relations Theory: Realism, the Rockefeller Foundation, and the 1954 Conference on Theory* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2011).

<sup>26</sup> Helen McCarthy, *The British People and the League of Nations: Democracy, Citizenship and Internationalism, c.1918–45* (Manchester University Press, 2011), 182–211; Julie Gottlieb, 'Guilty Women': *Foreign Policy, and Appeasement in Inter-War Britain* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015); J. Ann Tickner and Jacqui True, "A Century of International Relations Feminism: From World War One Women's Peace Pragmatism to the Women, Peace and Security Agenda," *International Studies Quarterly* 62.2 (2018): 221–33; Stöckmann, "Women, Wars, and World Affairs."



Analyzing women's international thought raises new questions about the timing, location, and politics of the belated privileging of "theory," at least in certain, very narrow forms, in the history of academic IR.<sup>27</sup> It also raises questions about which fields and which approaches have been considered as relevant to the formation of a separate IR discipline, and the gendered politics of these inclusions and exclusions. Enormous investments appear to have been made to preserve the white and homosocial character of international thought and disciplinary history, that is, as a conversation "between men."<sup>28</sup> Thus in addition to recovery and analysis of women thinkers we are interested in the politics of IR's "not knowing," of "patterned forms" or "epistemologies of ignorance."<sup>29</sup> IR's willful and unconscious/patterned ignorance of women's intellectual labors is as significant and complex as what the field claims to know about its own intellectual genealogy. Thus, some contributors to this volume examine a number of the practices that led to historical women's constitutive exclusion, ranging from sexist and patriarchal discourses and ideologies, to everyday practices of sexism and racism in their relations with academic mentors, the production and politics of multiple forms of ignorance, and the gendered politics of disciplinary formation.

Examining the intellectual biographies of the scholars and thinkers in this volume and the patterns of inclusion/exclusion therein, is a first step in the intellectual project of writing a new history of international thought. A second, interconnected step is not essentializing or romanticizing women as a category of analysis. Certainly, one of the most obvious ways in which the gender binary has shaped intellectual production is through the reception of work understood to be carried out by "women." Indeed, one of the mechanisms in which women have been excluded is through a form of "pseudo-inclusion," when a small number

<sup>27</sup> IR has long viewed itself as dominated by "theory," conceived in terms of "isms." A recent account is Richard Devetak, *Critical International Theory: An Intellectual History* (Oxford University Press, 2018), which contains very little on the gendered and raced manner in which "the critical intellectual persona" is produced.

<sup>28</sup> Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1985).

<sup>29</sup> Paul Gilroy, "Race and Racism in 'The Age of Obama,'" The Tenth Annual Eccles Centre for American Studies Plenary Lecture given at the British Association for American Studies Annual Conference, 2013 ([www.bl.uk/britishlibrary/-/media/bl/global/eccles%20centre/ec%20plenaries/baas-2013-gilroy.pdf](http://www.bl.uk/britishlibrary/-/media/bl/global/eccles%20centre/ec%20plenaries/baas-2013-gilroy.pdf)) (accessed June 26, 2019); Shannon Sullivan and Nancy Tuana (eds.), *Race and Epistemologies of Ignorance* (State University of New York Press, 2007); Priya Satia, "Inter-War Agnotology: Empire, Democracy and the Production of Ignorance," in Laura Beers and Geraint Thomas (eds.), *Brave New World: Imperial and Democratic Nation-Building in Britain between the Wars* (London: Institute of Historical Research, 2011), 209–25. Thanks to Paul Kirby for suggesting the relevance of this concept.

of feminists come to represent all women and women's intellectual interests are limited to a focus on gender narrowly understood.<sup>30</sup> However, our analysis does not assume the stability of the category of "women" and we reject the intellectual closures that shut out non-normative gender identities. To investigate historical women's international thought we need only assume that the operations of gender, the discursive organization and interpretation of sexual difference, shaped the conditions, content, and reception of international thought.<sup>31</sup> The historical construct of the gender binary produced the identities of women and men, which profoundly shaped the intellectual production we wish to investigate. Hence, we adopt the category of *historical* women to indicate the discursive and produced character of our main object of study and to acknowledge the manifold ways in which historical actors have strategically deployed, professed indifference to, or indeed rejected prevailing gender norms. At least one of the figures in this volume, Simone Weil, was gender non-conforming.<sup>32</sup>

We can take seriously both the mutually constitutive relationship between gender and intellectual history but also the ideas and experiences of historical women. Despite or indeed because of the historical construct of gendered and racialized identities we are nonetheless able to examine the international thought and imaginaries of these subjects and assess whether they developed recognizably distinctive ways of conceiving international relations. However, to take seriously this international thought is not to endorse or necessarily evaluate as positive all that these newly recovered figures thought or did. As to be expected, there are logical inconsistencies and errors of judgment in some of the thought analyzed in his volume, and there is a fine balance between critique, appreciation, and the open-mindedness that is necessary for the work of recovery. For some of our authors this is a question of historical justice given their subject's exclusion from intellectual canons and privileged sites of knowledge production. The authors assembled have taken different positions in this regard; we view this diversity as a strength, fit for a

<sup>30</sup> Beverly Thiele, "Vanishing Acts in Social and Political Thought: Tricks of the Trade," in Carol Pateman and Elizabeth Gross (eds.), *Feminist Challenges: Social and Political Theory* (Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press, 1986), 30–34.

<sup>31</sup> Joan Wallach Scott, *Gender and the Politics of History* (revised edition) (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999).

<sup>32</sup> Weil's gendered understanding of war and conflict is worthy of further exploration, for instance her idea of a nurses' unit in World War II, charged with "mothering" soldiers in the battlefield. Weil insisted that none of these nurses should have children themselves. Simone Pétrement, *Simone Weil: A Life* (New York: Schocken, 1976), 27–29, 476; Simone Weil to Maurice Schumann, July 30, 1942, encl., in Richard Rees (ed.), *Simone Weil: Seventy Letters* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2015), 145–53.