Introduction

Women defined and transformed the substance and practice of international relations as it emerged as a separate intellectual field examining the relations between peoples, empires, and states at the turn of the twentieth century. They engaged the international politics of their time in the context of diverse colonial and anticolonial struggles, interimperial wars and superpower rivalry, and nationalist, ideological, and political conflict. They addressed war, racial hierarchy and immigration, labor organization and world economy, colonial administration, foreign policy and diplomacy, international law and organization, religion and ethics, technological transformation, and environmental destruction. This wide-ranging work took many forms and genres and was produced in a variety of professional and intellectual contexts. It was well known and influential in its time. And, yet, examining the contemporary field of international relations, its history and scholars, it is as if this past had never existed, as if women had hardly lived, thought, and practiced as scholars, as advisors and policy makers, as journalists, and as public intellectuals.[1] This anthology proves this conventional version of international relations history wrong.

This is the first anthology of women's international thought, focusing on Anglo-American locations from the late nineteenth century to the long mid-twentieth century. That this is the first such volume reflects two things: first, the centrality of women to early international relations discourses and, second, the erasure and exclusion of women from its history and conceptualization. Partly due to the novelty of the subject matter, the fluidity of its intellectual boundaries, and its co-emergence with the expansion of women's higher education at the turn of the twentieth century, large numbers of women scholars and teachers were formative in the intellectual and institutional development of the study of international relations. Women founded or co-founded some of its

[1] Patricia Owens and Katharina Rietzler (eds.), *Women's International Thought: A New History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021).

earliest teaching and research centers, including the Harvard/Radcliffe Bureau of International Research and the Geneva School of International Studies. They worked in and moved between foreign affairs think tanks or in other institutional locations such as women's colleges. Others wrote on international relations from parallel professional contexts outside academe, such as journalism, activism, social work, and teaching.[2] International relations was crucial to the work of many canonical women intellectuals. Indeed, these women helped to produce the very notion of international relations during the twentieth century.

Nonetheless, this vast store of ideas and contexts is almost completely absent from existing international intellectual histories and even from histories of the academic discipline of International Relations (IR). Contemporary historians and scholars of international relations are aware of how major global developments are produced in and through the terms of gender, race, and class.[3] Yet international intellectual and disciplinary histories have lagged. It is as if there is something unthinkable about historical women's thought on international relations, something distinctive about the strictures imposed on these thinkers and responses to their work. Indeed, there is: a structural and disciplinary production of women as incapable of and incidental to knowledge about international relations except in highly specific ways or at certain moments in time. We see this in current surveys and anthologies of international thinkers, which imply that women in the past never engaged intellectually with world politics until the 1980s and the re-emergence of feminist IR.[4]

[2] Valeska Huber, Tamson Pietsch, and Katharina Rietzler, "Women's International Thought and the New Professions, 1900–1940," *Modern Intellectual History*, 18:1 (2021): 121–145; Katharina Rietzler, "U.S. Foreign Policy Think Tanks and Women's Intellectual Labor, 1920–1950," *Diplomatic History*, 46:3 (2022, in press).

[3] Cynthia Enloe, *Bananas, Beaches and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1990); Ann Towns, *Women and States: Norms and Hierarchies in International Society* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010); Helen M. Kinsella, *The Image before the Weapon: A Critical History of the Distinction between Combatant and Civilian* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2011); Julie V. Gottlieb, *"Guilty Women," Foreign Policy, and Appeasement in Inter-War Britain* (London: Palgrave, 2015); Glenda Sluga and Patricia Clavin (eds.), *Internationalisms: A Twentieth-Century History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017).

[4] Patricia Owens, "Women and the History of International Thought," *International Studies Quarterly*, 62:3 (2018): 467–481. Some IR scholars have focused on historical women thinkers, usually feminist work. See Lucian M. Ashworth, "Feminism, War and the Prospects for International Government: Helena Swanwick (1864–1939) and the Lost Feminists of Interwar International Relations," *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 13:1 (2011): 24–42; Catia Confortini, *Intelligent Compassion: Feminist Critical Methodology in the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012); Molly Cochran, "The 'Newer Ideals' of Jane Addams's Progressivism: A Realistic Utopia of Cosmopolitan Justice," in Molly Cochran and Cornelia Navari (eds.), *Progressivism and US Foreign Policy between the World Wars* (New York: Palgrave

Despite women being at the forefront of international thought throughout the twentieth century, their ideas were often stolen and, if not, then ignored. The very use of the English term "international thought" can be traced to Florence Melian Stawell's *The Growth of International Thought*, published in 1929. Her work is the first of a highly distinctive genre: surveys of canonical "international" thinkers, a genre from which, ironically, she and all women and people of color were later omitted.[5] Indicating so much of the fate and contingency of women's international thinking, Stawell's idea to write the book came from her mentor, liberal internationalist Gilbert Murray, after he reviewed Stawell's proposal for a different book on the League of Nations. Murray appropriated Stawell's idea for himself and proposed that she write a history of international thought instead.[6] In republishing an extract from Stawell's book, we are retrieving and honoring the unintended effect of an intellectual theft at the origin of twentieth-century Anglophone histories of "international thought."[7] More broadly, this volume reveals a major distortion in current understandings of histories of this interdisciplinary field, of how international relations was conceived, and does so, in part, by expanding its archives to include a wide variety of genres, and professional and intellectual contexts.[8]

Much of this important and wide-ranging work is little known, difficult to access, or out of print, further contributing to the marginalization of

Macmillan, 2017), 143–165; 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): 221–233; Jan Stöckmann, "Women, Wars, and World Affairs: Recovering Feminist International Relations, 1915–39," *Review of International Studies*, 44:2 (2018): 215–235.

[5] Kimberly Hutchings and Patricia Owens, "Women Thinkers and the Canon of International Thought: Recovery, Rejection and Reconstitution," *American Political Science Review*, 115:2 (2021): 347–359.

[6] Glenda Sluga, "From F. Melian Stawell to E. Greene Balch: International and *Internationalist* Thinking at the Gender Margins, 1919–1947," in Patricia Owens and Katharina Rietzler (eds.), *Women's International Thought: A New History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021), 223–243.

[7] For a wider study of such phenomena see Dale Spender, *Women of Ideas and What Men Have Done to Them: From Aphra Behn to Adrienne Rich* (London: Ark Paperbacks, 1983).

[8] There is also a wider historical literature on women's formative role in international organizations, networks, and diplomacy. For a selection see Linda Schott, *Reconstructing Women's Thoughts: The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom before World War II* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1997); Christine von Oertzen, *Science, Gender, and Internationalism: Women's Academic Networks, 1917–1955* (London: Palgrave, 2012); Helen McCarthy, *Women of the World: The Rise of the Female Diplomat* (London: Bloomsbury, 2014); Karen Garner, *Women and Gender in International History* (London: Bloomsbury, 2018).

women's international thought. Some of it can be found only in institutional or other archives and took many forms, including speeches, journalism, letters, novels, lectures, radio broadcasts, internal memoranda, funding bids, book reviews, poems, and memoirs, a selection of which appears in this volume, alongside scholarly monographs and articles. The use of different genres reflects not just opportunity or its absence, but also intellectual and political choice. Rosa Luxemburg, Amy Jacques Garvey, and Amy Ashwood Garvey, among others, formulated their analyses of world order in pamphlets and newspapers to quickly and inexpensively circulate their ideas to the audiences they wished to reach and mobilize. Una Marson and Jane Vialle used poetry and short-form essays to lay bare the cultural as well as political workings of empire in a way that other genres could not.[9] Retrieving and analyzing this work prompts deeper reflection on the dynamics of knowledge production in histories of international thought, a field that always existed at the interstices of theory and practice.

This intellectual production and its practical applications were recognized in its own time, both outside and inside academe, and often centrally so in fields that either pre-dated or were adjacent to the academic discipline of IR. In making selections of this work available in anthology form, some of it for the first time, we begin the necessary and basic work of recovery, reconstruction, and analysis of these international intellectual histories without being defined by the history and current terms of reference within the discipline of IR. In so doing, we model a different approach to histories of international thought, international theory, and pedagogy.[10] Gendered, racialized, sexual, and class hierarchies have been a fundamental enabling and disabling condition for the production and reception of all knowledge about international relations. Hence the exclusion of historical women from histories of international thought does not only concern the past of international thinking or only "women." It has shaped *all* international thought and is implicated in a range of academic practices today, from teaching methods and syllabus

[9] On the potential of poetic knowledge as political thought see Gary Wilder, *Freedom Time: Negritude, Decolonization and the Future of the World* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2015), 1–16.

[10] Recent works in histories of international thought include Edward Keene, *International Political Thought: A Historical Introduction* (Cambridge: Polity, 2005); David Armitage, *Foundations of International Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013); Lucian Ashworth, *A History of International Thought: From the Origins of the Modern State to Academic IR* (London: Routledge, 2014); Duncan Bell, *Reordering the World: Essays on Liberalism and Empire* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2016); Or Rosenboim, *The Emergence of Globalism: Visions of World Order in Britain and the United States, 1939–1950* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2017).

design to citation practices. Like canon formation, anthologizing is fundamentally pedagogical and often conservative, but not without radical potential.[11]

At the turn of the twentieth century, the study of international relations was a wide-ranging field drawing on methods and approaches from History, Classics, Colonial Administration and Anthropology, Economics, Law, and Political Science. IR developed as a separate subdiscipline of Political Science in the United States during the 1950s and from the 1970s in Britain.[12] Recognizing the scholarly and popular circulation of women's writings in their time, both as a broad interdisciplinary field and then later as a separate academic discipline, raises serious questions about the politics of IR's disciplinary formation and the appropriation and/or erasure of this large body of international thought.[13]

Canons are formed to establish and legitimize new academic disciplines or intellectual fields, outlining their central questions and providing for their pedagogical reproduction. Heavily influenced by Political Theory's canon, the proliferation of works seeking to establish the legitimacy of disciplinary IR from the 1950s focused on a number of all-male "Fathers" of international thought.[14] This is nowhere more evident than in the subsequent proliferation of eponymous "schools" of international theory, Hobbesian, Lockean, Kantian, Marxian, Foucauldian, and so on. The existing canon of "great" thinkers and texts was constructed as a conversation by, for, and between white men. These homosocial

[11] See, for example, Nancy Cunard (ed.), *Negro: An Anthology* (London: Wishart, 1934), discussed later in this volume. Also see Peggy McIntosh, *Interactive Phases of Curricular RE-Vision: A Feminist Perspective*. Working Paper No. 124 (Wellesley, MA: Wellesley College Center for Research on Women, 1983); Joan Wallach Scott, *Gender and the Politics of History*, revised ed. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999).

[12] There is much contestation around the periodization. Nonetheless, we draw a fundamental distinction between histories of the wider field of international relations and the academic discipline of IR as well as wider histories of international thought by figures who had no, or very little, relationship to IR inside the academy. The selections in this volume encompass each domain, as well as thinkers who worked across both. See the discussion between Robert Vitalis and Nicolas Guilhot in "H-Diplo/ISSF Roundtable Review on Nicolas Guilhot (ed.). *The Invention of International Relations Theory: Realism, the Rockefeller Foundation, and the 1954 Conference on Theory*." Available at http://h-diplo.org/ISSF/PDF/ISSF-Roundtable-3-5.pdf.

[13] Owens and Rietzler (eds.), *Women's International Thought*.

[14] Kenneth W. Thompson, *Fathers of International Thought: The Legacy of Political Theory* (Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 1994). See also Hans J. Morgenthau and Kenneth W. Thompson (eds.), *Principles and Problems of International Politics: Selected Readings* (New York: Knopf, 1950); Stanley Hoffman, *Contemporary Theory in International Relations* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1964); M. G. Forsyth, H. M. A. Keens-Soper, and P. Savigear (eds.), *The Theory of International Relations: Selected Texts from Gentili to Treitschke* (London: Routledge, 1970).

relationships may not have been sexual, though they often involved intellectual crushes.[15] They took a fraternal and mentoring form, and always involved the acknowledgment of "forefathers," even if the intention was patricidal.[16]

This process of IR's canon formation erased women and people of color, leading to an inaccurate and deficient account of the history of international thought.[17] This is no surprise. As feminist historians and theorists have long shown, canon formation is not a neutral exercise in which only the worthiest thinkers and genres are singled out. Expectations about intellectual greatness are highly gendered, racialized, and classed such that even the mediocre work of white men can be celebrated and canonized and the exceptional work of those gendered female and racialized as non-white can be ignored, appropriated, and/or maligned. Thinking with individual intellectuals and evaluating their work is necessary to understanding the history of international ideas. But it is not sufficient if it is premised on a narrow swath of individuals and scholarship and if it is retrospectively bounded by the received histories and contemporary assumptions of the contemporary academic discipline of IR. Rather, we need to recognize the diverse scholars and practitioners of international relations who, in turn, were grounded in distinct genres of writing, arrays of publications, actions, identities, and subject positions as fundamental to the histories of international thought.[18]

[15] Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1985).

[16] Berenice A. Carroll, "The Politics of 'Originality': Women and the Class System of the Intellect," *Journal of Women's History*, 2:2 (1990): 147. So-called critical international theory also assumes a patrilineal history of international thought where inquiry into the IR canon is "generational in nature – and perhaps patricidal in execution." James Der Derian, "Introduction: Critical Investigations," in James Der Derian (ed.), *International Theory: Critical Investigations* (New York: New York University Press, 1995), 3.

[17] Hutchings and Owens, "Women Thinkers"; for analysis of the comparable process in History and Sociology see Gerda Lerner, "How the Historical Profession Became a Male Preserve," *Journal of Women's History*, 11:2 (1999): 221–223; Mary-Jo Deegan, "Early Women Sociologists and the American Sociological Society: Patterns of Exclusion and Participation," *American Sociologist*, 16 (1981): 14–24.

[18] Studies of Black women's international thought are by far the most advanced in this regard. See Barbara Ransby, *Eslanda: The Large and Unconventional Life of Mrs. Paul Robeson* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2003); Gerald Horne, *Race Woman: The Lives of Mrs. Shirley Graham Du Bois* (New York: New York University Press, 2002); Carol Boyce Davies, *Left of Karl Marx: The Political Life of Black Communist Claudia Jones* (Durham, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2007); Gregg Andrews, *Thyra J. Edwards: Black Activist in the Global Freedom Struggle* (Columbia, MI: University of Missouri Press, 2011); Keisha N. Blain, *Set the World on Fire: Black Nationalist Women and the Global Struggle for Freedom* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2018); Keisha N. Blain and Tiffany M. Gill (eds.), *To Turn the Whole World Over: Black Women and Internationalism* (Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2019).

This volume builds on and extends to histories of international thought work in the fields of women's and gender history and feminist theory, particularly Black feminist intellectual history and feminist political theory.[19] For some time, scholars in these fields have shown that it is not enough to simply add a few notable, almost always elite white or Ashkenazi Jewish women to existing canons. As we have seen in IR, recent efforts to expand the canon have included one or two historical women, those working before the late twentieth century, but never more than two in one volume. These figures are presented as exceptional individuals (Hannah Arendt, Susan Sontag) and/or primarily concerned with gender (Virginia Woolf, Simone de Beauvoir).[20]

Though a necessary and perhaps inevitable first step, this belated compensation for past neglect does little to expose the appropriations and omissions on which the slightly amended canon was built. It does not address how the production and reception of intellectual labour is deeply gendered, racialized, and classed. It does not account for the intimate and relational nature of intellectual production, for example the work of "canon-adjacent" figures or "wives of the canon," collaborators who were central to the production of "great texts" by "great men" but are erased in canon-formation.[21] And it rarely centers the multiple genres through which people thought about international relations. In other words, it is limited in its modifications and methods because it does not center gender, race, and class substantially, empirically, theoretically, and methodologically.

[19] See, especially, Hilda L. Smith and Bernice A. Carroll (eds.), *Women's Political and Social Thought: An Anthology* (Bloomington, IN: University of Indiana Press, 2000); Penny A. Weiss, *Canon Fodder: Historical Women Political Thinkers* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania University Press, 2009) and Mia Bay, Farah J. Griffin, Martha S. Jones, and Barbara D. Savage (eds.), *Toward an Intellectual History of Black Women* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2015); Blain and Gill, *To Turn the Whole World Over*. Also see Gerda Lerner, *The Majority Finds Its Past: Placing Women in History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981); Joan Wallach Scott (ed.), *Feminism and History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996). Within international intellectual history see Glenda Sluga, "Turning International: *Foundations of Modern International Thought* and New Paradigms for Intellectual History," *History of European Ideas*, 41:1 (2015): 103–115.

[20] See Cerwyn Moore and Chris Farrands (eds.), *International Relations Theory and Philosophy: Interpretive Dialogues* (London: Routledge, 2010); Henrick Bliddal (ed.), *Classics of International Relations* (London: Routledge, 2013); Richard Ned Lebow, Peer Schouten, and Hidemi Suganami (eds.), *The Return of the Theorists: Dialogues with Great Thinkers in International Relations* (London: Palgrave, 2016). For analysis of women as "exceptional" see Joanna Russ, *How to Suppress Women's Writing* (London: Women's Press, 1983), 80.

[21] Jennifer Forestal and Menaka Philips, "Gender and the 'Great Man': Recovering Philosophy's 'Wives of the Canon,'" *Hypatia*, 33:4 (2018): 587–592.

Asking questions about women and histories of international thought allows us to identify and trace how these axes of difference organized intellectual production and reception of work on international relations. We refer to "historical women" to indicate both our temporal focus on the late nineteenth to long mid-twentieth centuries, and also to signal the discursive and historical constructs ("women") emergent from the sex/gender binary and intersecting axes of difference.[22] We understand "women" not as a biological category or ontological designation, but as an historical and intersectional identity which shapes and is shaped by racialized, national, class, and sexual identities and relations. This challenges any essentialization of gender or naturalization of "white women's IR."[23] There is no single axis of subordination that affected the production of international thought. Hence, there can be no such thing as a women's *tradition* of international thought, given the multiple intersecting relations of power that shape intellectual production.[24]

Thus, in this volume, we adopt a capacious understanding of the gendered history of international thought. Through the twentieth century, norms around gender and sexuality came under greater scrutiny and repeatedly shifted in ways that reflected and reinforced racial and class hierarchies.[25] Indeed, the deliberate exclusion of African Americans from IR's intellectual and disciplinary histories was constitutive of "American IR" because the early science of international relations was the science of race relations, taking the form of racism and white supremacy.[26] Black scholars were excluded as active agents and

[22] Kimberlé Crenshaw, "Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics," *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 1 (1989): 139–167; Patricia Hill Collins, *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment* (New York: Routledge, 1991). For a recent account of intersectionality as a tool against structural domination see Barbara Tomlinson, *Undermining Intersectionality: The Perils of Powerblind Feminism* (Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 2018); Jennifer C. Nash, *Black Feminism Reimagined: After Intersectionality* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2019).

[23] Owens, "Women and the History of International Thought," 467.

[24] Hutchings and Owens, "Women Thinkers."

[25] See Christina Crosby, *The Ends of History: Victorians and "The Women Question"* (New York: Routledge, 1991); Anne McClintock, *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Context* (New York: Routledge, 1995); Leila Rupp, "Outing the Past: U.S. Queer History in Global Perspective," in Leila J. Rupp and Susan Kathleen Freeman (eds.), *Understanding and Teaching U.S. Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender History*, 2nd ed. (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 2017), 17–30.

[26] Robert Vitalis, *White World Order, Black Power Politics: The Birth of American International Relations* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2015); Vineet Thakur and Peter Vale, *South Africa, Race and the Making of International Relations* (London: Rowman and Littlefield, 2020).

producers of international thought while people of color were objects of study and thought, as in works by Margery Perham, Lucy Philip Mair, Annette Baker Fox, and many others in this volume. Since international relations meant race relations, explicitly so in the first half of the twentieth century, international thinking itself is implicated in producing the meanings of racialized difference in the Anglo-American world, including that of a white "Anglosphere."[27] Many of the thinkers in this volume were African American. Still more were neither racialized as white nor born in the United States or Britain, but through migration from the Caribbean and elsewhere shaped international thought in Anglo-American locations.

Significantly, most of the figures in this volume possessed something that made them members of a small minority, a university degree, often a doctorate. Into the twentieth century, husbands and fathers held patriarchal legal control over women's professional and educational lives. Yet the extension of white women's social and political rights in the United States and Western Europe opened the doors of university education to a privileged few, some of whom rose to the most senior positions, such as Agnes Headlam-Morley, who took the Montague Burton Professorship of IR at Oxford in 1948.[28] Black women's educational opportunities in the United States were even more limited and often confined to those institutions built up by African American thinkers and educators, such as Anna Julia Cooper, Nannie Helen Burroughs, and Mary Church Terrell.[29] Among university students in general, women were a minority before the late twentieth century, and they suffered multiple forms of discrimination. Many institutions established separate women's colleges or institutes that were fundamental to supporting and circulating women's international thought, though they remain peripheral in IR's existing disciplinary and intellectual histories.[30] Formal higher education

[27] Srdjan Vucetic, *The Anglosphere: A Genealogy of a Racialized Identity in International Relations* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2011); Duncan Bell, *Dreamworlds of Race: Empire and the Utopian Destiny of Anglo-America* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2020).

[28] Oliver Janz and Daniel Schönpflug (eds.), *Gender History in a Transnational Perspective: Networks, Biographies, Gender Orders* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2014); Anne Oakley, *Women, Peace and Welfare: A Suppressed History of Social Reform* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2018).

[29] Stephanie Y. Evans, *Black Women in the Ivory Tower 1850–1954: An Intellectual History* (Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida, 2007).

[30] On co-education in the United States see Nancy Weiss Malkiel, *"Keep the Damned Women Out": The Struggle for Coeducation* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2016); Lynn Gordon, *Gender and Higher Education in the Progressive Era* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1990), 13–51.

was an admission ticket to intellectual recognition, mentorships, and publishing, but it was hard to attain before mass entry to higher education late into the twentieth century.[31] The significance of the co-emergence of the field of international relations and the expansion of women's higher education is a crucial area of ongoing research.[32]

Critically linked to access to higher education, and the material resources it required, is the privileged class position of most of the thinkers in this volume, especially when it influenced their position in racial and/or international hierarchies. Literacy, the time to write, and access to publication opportunities have often been the domain of a privileged few.[33] At times, class power shaped women's international thought in very tangible ways. Born into the upper echelons of society in the British Empire and the daughter of an English Viscount, Margaret Lambert used her connections to conduct interviews and fieldwork in the borderlands of 1930s Europe. Similar class privileges were afforded to Bertha von Suttner. Born into the princely Czech House of Kinsky, she later married an Austro-Hungarian baron. F. Melian Stawell was the daughter of a British colonial statesman and a Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Victoria, Australia.

Marriage or patronage could facilitate entry into educational and political worlds.[34] Yet, for university women, marriage to a male academic could be a distinct disadvantage as anti-nepotism rules in the United States meant that women married to male faculty were often denied academic jobs. And the intellectual credentials of Agnes Headlam-Morley and her Oxford colleague Sybil Crowe were sometimes disparaged because they were daughters of prominent diplomats.[35] Thus, while filial and marital relationships could constrain intellectual

[31] Britain followed broader trends in Western Europe. In 1900, university students made up less than one percent of their age cohort (between 20 and 24), rising to just over two percent by 1940. The United States offered more access to higher education. In 1900, 2.3 percent attended university and by 1940 the figure was 9.1 percent. Hartmut Kaelble, *Social Mobility in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries: Europe and America in Comparative Perspective* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1986), 42–43.

[32] Joanna Wood, D.Phil. dissertation in progress, University of Oxford.

[33] Valentine Cunningham, *British Writers of the Thirties* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), 308.

[34] Paula E. Stephan and Mary Mathewes Kassis, "The History of Women and Couples in Academe," in Marianne A. Ferber and Jane W. Loeb (eds.), *Academic Couples: Problems and Promises* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1997), 59; Linda M. Perkins, "For the Good of the Race: Married African-American Academics, a Historical Perspective," in Marianne A. Ferber and Jane W. Loeb (eds.), *Academic Couples: Problems and Promises* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1997), 80–105.

[35] Carroll Quigley, *The Anglo-American Establishment: From Rhodes to Cliveden* (New York: Books in Focus, 1981), 310.