Manchester Metropolitan University

e-space

Manchester Metropolitan University's Research Repository

Please cite the Published Version

Starnes, Kathryn (2023) Absent Mothers: a folkloric reading of the exclusionary practices of writing IR's canonical history. Global Studies Quarterly, 3 (1). ksad003. ISSN 2634-3797

DOI: https://doi.org/10.1093/isagsq/ksad003

Publisher: Oxford University Press

Version: Published Version

Downloaded from: https://e-space.mmu.ac.uk/630554/

Usage rights: CC BY Creative Commons: Attribution 4.0

Additional Information: This is an Open Access article which was published in Global Studies Quarterly, published by Oxford University Press.

Enquiries:
If you have questions about this document, contact openresearch@mmu.ac.uk. Please include the URL of the record in e-space. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our Take Down policy (available from https://www.mmu.ac.uk/library/using-the-library/policies-and-guidelines)

Global Studies Quarterly (2023) **3**, 1–11

Absent Mothers: A Folkloric Reading of the Exclusionary Practices of Writing IR's Canonical History*

Kathryn Starnes
Manchester Metropolitan University

Women's exclusion from the international relations (IR) canon has been widely documented, and many have undertaken to systematically address these exclusions. However, consideration of how women's exclusion is written into canonical texts is less well explored. This paper draws on folkloric approaches to understanding canon constitution to perform a close reading of disciplinary history texts. This paper considers these texts in parallel to Cinderella stories to understand the absence of "founding mothers" and illuminate how women's exclusion has been written into the canon as a natural absence. This paper builds on the growing literature about women's exclusion to document the specific ways in which how we write can reiterate exclusions within the canon. This is relevant to understanding these historical practices of exclusion and to reconsidering how we write the contemporary IR canon.

L'exclusion des femmes du canon des relations internationales est largement documentée, tandis que nombreux sont ceux qui la dénoncent systématiquement. Cependant, nous avons encore assez peu étudié la manière dont cette exclusion transparaît dans les textes canoniques. Le présent article se fonde sur des approches folkloriques de la constitution du canon afin de réaliser une lecture attentive des textes historiques de la discipline. Parallèlement à ces textes, cet article s'intéresse aux histoires de Cendrillon pour comprendre l'absence de « mères fondatrices » et explique comment le canon fait apparaître l'exclusion des femmes comme une absence naturelle. Le présent article se fonde sur la littérature grandissante concernant l'exclusion des femmes afin de documenter précisément les écritures permettant de renouveler les exclusions au sein du canon. Ainsi, nous comprendrons ces pratiques historiques d'exclusion et pourrons envisager une nouvelle manière d'écrire le canon des relations internationales contemporain.

La exclusión de las mujeres del canon de las RRII ha sido ampliamente documentada y mucha gente se han embarcado en abordar estas exclusiones de manera sistemática. Sin embargo, la consideración de cómo la exclusión de las mujeres se recoge en los textos canónicos ha sido menos explorada. Este artículo se basa en los enfoques populares relativos a la comprensión de la constitución del canon con el fin de realizar una lectura atenta de los textos de historia disciplinaria. Este artículo considera estos textos en paralelo a las historias de Cenicienta para entender la ausencia de «madres fundadoras» e ilustrar cómo la exclusión de las mujeres ha sido incorporada al canon como una ausencia natural. Este artículo se basa en la creciente literatura sobre la exclusión de las mujeres para documentar las formas específicas en que la forma de escribir puede reiterar las exclusiones dentro del canon. Este aspecto es relevante para entender estas prácticas históricas de exclusión y para reconsiderar cómo escribimos el canon contemporáneo de las RRII.

Introduction

Founding fathers have been integral to international relations' (IR) constitution as a legitimate, bona fide discipline ("Editors' Introduction" 2010, 499; Stockmann 2017, 216–18; Owens and Rietzler 2021, 1160). Efforts to distinguish IR as a distinct social science, establish lineage, fund a discipline separate from political science, and create a narrative of great texts have long populated accounts of IR's history and development (Hoffmann 1977, 41; Ashworth 2009, 17; Stockmann 2017, 217). "Founding fathers" populate accounts of disciplinary history and anthologies of canonical works, even if these founding fathers long predated the discipline (Hoffmann 1977, 41; Stockmann 2017, 218). These figures' significance, the myths built on their legacies, and the stories we tell about them are well documented, from the invention of debates (Ashworth 2002, 34–35; 2014, 1–3, 261–70; Buzan and Lawson 2014, 439; Hutchings et al. 2022, 136) to the discipline's core assumptions that continue to constrain "legitimate IR" (Smith 2004; Tickner and Blaney 2012).

The establishment of any canon is a process of exclusion and boundary drawing (Harries 2001, 19–22; Starnes 2017, 13–22; Hutchings et al. 2022, 128), with attempts to create a unified discipline excluding those who digress from the established narrative, or who do not fit the image of a canonical figure (Tickner and True 2018, 9–10; Hutchings et al. 2022, 114–21). These "canonical figures" in IR included white, formally educated, Western, men, ignoring the international thought of most of the world's population. Women's exclusion from IR scholarship has been documented, via a gendered citation gap in the literature (Maliniak, Powers, and Walter 2013; McLaughlin Mitchell, Lange, and Brus 2013) and an overwhelming exclusion of women's early international thought generated through women's scholarship, activism, and art (Shepherd 2017, 79; Stockmann 2017, 215–16; Tickner and True 2018, 2). New historiographers of IR are systematically addressing these exclusions (Ashworth 2009, 21; Owens and Rietzler 2021) with women's absence in foundational texts chronicling canonical thinkers taken up by many (Ashworth 2011; Hansen 2011; Lake 2016, 2017; Stockmann 2017;

*The phrase "absent mothers" is borrowed from Warner (1994).

Starnes, Kathryn (2023) Absent Mothers: A Folkloric Reading of the Exclusionary Practices of Writing IR's Canonical History*. *Global Studies Quarterly*, https://doi.org/10.1093/isagsq/ksad003
© The Author(s) (2023). Published by Oxford University Press on behalf of the International Studies Association. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted reuse, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Downloaded from https://academic.oup.com/isagsq/article/3/1/ksad003/7093182 by Manchester Metropolitan University user on 03 April 2023

Owens 2018; Tickner and True 2018). These efforts to devote "a substantial body of scholarship [to challenging] the neglect of women in the 'canon' of international thought" (Owens 2018, 467) are notable as they begin to reclaim the work of women and document women's extensive absence. While laudable, "reclaiming" lost authors in IR is often less radical than it seems, focusing on the assessment of individual authors, rather than key assumptions about the boundaries of the discipline and "scholars" used to justify their exclusion (Ashworth 2009, 21). Cynthia Enloe clearly outlines the political stakes of this distinction in *The Curious Feminist* when she builds on her now famous question "where are the women?" to point out that a lack of curiosity about women's absence is itself political (Enloe 2004, 3). It is thus not just women's absence, but also how it came about that should be interrogated.

Among efforts to "write women in" is also a call for an engagement with the processes through which such exclusions have become embedded in the discipline's canon. There are hints of how these processes might work: that work may be obscured, or that some early works were mischaracterized leading to the exclusion of other works based on a faulty understanding of key texts (Ashworth 2009, 21; Owens 2018, 468). Similarly, Owens, in providing some preliminary thoughts on why women have been excluded, explores the nebulous concept of "influence" used to justify men's inclusion, while exclusions of women (as well as any scholarship outside the gendered and raced definition of "influence") are overwhelmingly ignored (Owens 2019). This exclusion becomes systematic, encoded in disciplinary narratives. For example, the ideas included in introductory textbooks are taken as the foundational tenets and assumptions by which future contributions to the canon are judged (Ashworth 2009, 22; Shepherd 2017; Starnes 2017, 79). This establishes canonical boundaries that reify seemingly incidental exclusions as disciplinary boundaries, which in turn become self-validating and naturalized (Starnes 2017, 25–28).

Women's exclusion from the IR canon is not the result of piecemeal omissions, or a lack of women's scholarship on the international. Numerous means of "writing out" are revealed alongside the main agenda of documenting or rectifying women's absences, for example, shaping the discipline to ignore issues addressed primarily by women, or the active pursuit of a structural approach to IR, or, in some instances, a social scientific approach that excludes the pragmatic experimental work of most of (not all) women's scholarship (Tickner and True 2018, 4, 8–10). Similarly, scholarship on race or imperialism has long been written out on the basis that it was outside the discipline's remit, despite acknowledgment that the discipline's remit was broad and evolving (Vitalis 2015; Owens and Rietzler 2021, 6). However, "writing out" takes many forms, from the date of the birth of the discipline, repeated references to select founding fathers, or a dismissal of women's work on the grounds that women are unqualified (while denying them the "right" qualifications although women made up substantial enrolment figures at some institutions) (Stockmann 2017, 217–18, 221–24, 229–30). This is compounded by the well-documented "gendered citation gap" in IR (Maliniak, Powers, and Walter 2013; McLaughlin Mitchell, Lange, and Brus 2013).

This exclusion needs more exploration, the aim of this article. These omissions are systematic practices of writing out that are deeply entrenched in the criteria by which work is deemed "canonical." Consequently, the work that is included reflects the priorities of those authors who are deemed canonical contributors. As with all canons, those scholars who are recognized become gatekeepers—willing or not—and their work establishes standards by which future contributions to the canon are judged: "White man's IR begets white man's IR" (Lake 2016, 116). However, recognizing the systemic means of exclusion that define who is producing "scholarship" and what is produced as "scholarship" means examining the formal and informal practices that define production of knowledge about "the international."

The examination of how these gendered, raced, and classed boundaries are constituted is as important as the canon's content in establishing rules for who or what gets to count (Starnes 2017, 24–27). Recognizing naturalized processes of boundary drawing, however, can be difficult. This often means looking at "the spaces between- and all of the people who are theorising (in) those spaces" (Shepherd 2017, 78). Canonical processes of exclusion are rarely reducible to explicit policies, but instead take on subtle forms. Recognizing systematic but subtle modes of inclusion requires closely examining how those texts that *are* accepted are written and finding a means of rendering familiar practices of exclusion visible and identifiable within those texts.[1]

The next section outlines how an approach based on folkloric engagements with the fairy tale canon reveals the relationship between the gendered practices of knowledge production deemed worthy of canonical inclusion and the content and producers of this content. I outline how the fairy tale canon has a distinctive history that bears a particular resemblance to the IR canon, particularly in terms of how stories about the canon's formation and debates about canonical boundaries have sought to constitute a recognized discipline of study while enshrining specific writing practices that marginalize women. The recent excavation of this process makes fairy tales a fruitful avenue for canon reflections, particularly for the gendered reading in this paper. In short, *who* is allowed to produce and *what* they are allowed to produce are also shaped by the practices of production endemic to a particular canon. While who produces (the folk) and what they produce (the lore) are related, this relationship is complex, shaped both by evolving epistemological standards and, in part, by positionality. This folkloric approach draws these elements together and through parallels to fairy tales renders them visible and shows that they are political. Exploring boundary drawing practices in IR complements efforts to "write in" marginalized voices. The constant evolution of canonical texts means that boundaries, too, are evolving and thus we need ongoing means of recognizing how voices are silenced. This folkloric approach thus has wider application.

Mechanisms of Writing Out

Those engaging with canonical marginalization in IR often turn to literature to explore the boundaries and mechanics of a canon (Starnes 2017; Bruff and Starnes 2018; Owens 2018). Exploring women's exclusion in literature parallels how exclusions are written into IR texts. Owens (2018, 468) cites literature scholar Russ who identified eleven ways women's writing has been suppressed, from a double standard of content, or the labeling of one set of experiences as more valuable than another (Russ 1983, 40) to identifying the achievement as an isolated, anomalous event (Russ 1983, 62). Nonetheless, Owens acknowledges that more work in IR needs to be done (Owens 2018, 468). While detailing the marginalized contributions of many women, *Women's International Thought* explores the reasons for some

[1] I draw on Pin-Fat's grammatical readings that render the familiar unfamiliar to reveal operations of power.

Downloaded from https://academic.oup.com/isagsq/article/3/1/ksad003/7093182 by Manchester Metropolitan University user on 03 April 2023

women's exclusion, but there is a broader question here, of how habits of exclusion are integrated into canonical texts and reiterated into invisibility. The connection between who produces scholarship and the scholarship they produce should also be a part of the exploration, since knowledge and knowledge producer are linked, as are the practices of production shared formally and informally in the renegotiation of canonical boundaries.

This paper uses a close reading of the ten disciplinary history texts Owens (2018) identified as canonical (Table 1) and from which she has documented women's absence. Disciplinary history texts demonstrate whose voices have been identified as foundational, and they are also sites of canon constitution. This paper will show how the mechanisms that marginalize women's international thought have been written into IR's canon via disciplinary history and that looking at content alongside who produces that content can reveal more about how women's international thought has been silenced.

Close reading reveals how mechanisms operate. The use of parallels between texts and identification of relevant excerpts is based on similar techniques deployed in literary criticism (Auyoung 2020, 97). Contrasting with surface, denotative or literal reading, the aim is to identify homological ways that women's thought is not just absent but actively excluded (Freedgood and Schmitt 2014, 1–3). Identifying how women are excluded relies on background knowledge, particularly of IR's popular disciplinary history and how marginalization and exclusions can be written into any canon. This approach is thus aimed at alerting readers already familiar with these and similar texts to "a new way in which a subset of details from the text fit together" (Auyoung 2020, 99). To provide a basis for close reading, outside texts with similar historical processes of writing women out as both authors and subjects are deployed. Bringing to bear outside texts that demonstrate modes of writing that have perpetuated similar exclusions in other canons enables me to detect "something not obvious to others and [uncover] a hidden history" (Auyoung 2020, 100). Outside texts enrich the close reading, providing both context and contrast that illuminate habitual practices the trained reader forgets to notice.

The choice of outside texts is important. Although literature has previously been generally invoked, there is also a tradition of challenging the IR canon by exploring the "myth function" in IR texts (de Wilson 1998; Osiander 2001; Teschke 2003; Weber 2010, 6–7; de Carvalho, Leira, and Hobson 2011; Bliesmann de Guevara 2016; Leira and de Carvalho 2018). These engagements with the IR canon focus on the canon's content, demonstrating how accounts of the discipline's birth and history are naturalized and hold disciplinary power. However, who produces the canon is also at stake, and it is therefore important that outside texts used for close reading reveal how the voices represented in the canon shape the canon's content, and in turn how the canon's content shapes which voices are included. I propose that fairy tales offer better scope than myths to explore this relationship.

As both a genre and a subject of academic study, fairy tales provide a unique parallel to IR. Unlike myths, which often have definitive content, fairy tales are iterative stories that can be retold and remade by anyone. Myths, by design, attempt to create an orderly account or to serve as a "back story," lending explanation where needed (Wilson 1998, 1; Leira and de Carvalho 2018, 736). On the other hand, fairy tales have a long history of being used to debate social norms, with stories being reshaped into contrasting iterations (Starnes 2017, 55–58). Although early fairy tale scholarship focused on the search for ur-texts and attempted to record a "pure" oral tradition of folklore with specific attribution and definitive stories, contemporary folklorists point out that many claims to accurately record were dishonest, while the strict delineation of what constituted a fairy tale excluded content that did not adhere to arbitrary criteria (Warner 1994, xvii, 289; Harries 2001, 13). Subsequent projects to "re-discover" these stories revealed a gendered relationship between the content (or lore) and those producing it (the folk). That is, the shape of the stories written by women differed from the shape of stories written or recorded (as a scholarly endeavor) by men (Harries 2001, 21–22). The formation of fairy tale scholarship by male scholars established standards for what a fairy tale looked like based on the stories men recorded. The folklore discipline subsequently reiterated these standards, thereby naturalizing the exclusion of stories written by women on the basis that they did not follow the form and content of a "real" fairy tale (Harries 2001). However, because fairy tales exist in many iterations, comparisons between stories that bear a family resemblance can show us how the gendered disciplining of the genre that came about through early fairy tale scholarship had a direct impact on the content of the stories. When Owens and Rietzler explain that they use a capacious definition of thought and that they found women's international thought in a variety of forms inside and outside the academy, they are working to counteract a similar relationship between the folk and the lore of the IR canon that has consequences both for the silencing of women and for what has been considered "legitimate" international thought in the IR canon (Owens and Rietzler 2021, 5–13).

Fairy tales thus provide a unique parallel process of women's marginalization. Recent engagements with women's exclusion from fairy tales reveal something relevant to IR's retelling of its disciplinary folklore: the reliance on patrilineage for assessing the legitimacy of texts as bona fide canonical contributions. Fairy tale history often reveres those proposed to have "discovered" ur-texts, particularly "fathers" of folklore whose work was remarkable not only for its output, but also for its influence on the formation of the genre. The gendered constitution of the fairy tale canon illuminates similar moves in IR's disciplinary history.

The term "fairy tale" became popular with the circulation of French salon tales written by a group of women known as the Conteuses in the 1600–1700s (Zipes et al. 2005, 176). These stories, and those written by Charles Perrault, were referred to as fairy tales. Subsequently, however, "fairy tale" applied to stories collected from an oral tradition of folklore by expert (usually male) collectors (Harries 2001, 55). This shift to focus on formally collected written tales is important because it is a tradition advanced by the subsequently authoritative Grimm brothers and because it is explicitly gendered. "The Grimms' legacy influenced how fairy tales were defined and by extension what kinds of stories were admitted to the canon" (Starnes 2017, 23). Their name became synonymous with fairy tales, and their claims to record stories from a "pure" oral tradition, and reverence for Perrault's symbolic evocation of Mother Goose as the oral "folk" source of his stories eclipsed a variety of stories by women (Harries 2001, 22–23). Where women were included, they were relegated to the role of anonymized tale teller, while the role of tale *writer* (far more prestigious) was denied them because their stories did not resemble the Grimms' (Harries 2001, 72). While the Grimms claimed to record tales exactly as they found them, their "scientific" approach involved substantial editing and the short formulaic style

Downloaded from https://academic.oup.com/isagsq/article/3/1/ksad003/7093182 by Manchester Metropolitan University user on 03 April 2023

they favored came to dominate the accepted form of stories, resulting in a retrospective process of curation by which tales were grandfathered *out* of the genre (Starnes 2017, 23). The Grimms cite Perrault as a "father" of fairy tales, writing out both women's writing and simultaneously delineating boundaries for what constituted a fairy tale for future generations. Perrault endows legitimacy on the burgeoning systematic study of folklore as an academic pursuit involving recording and classification (Harries 2001, 22). This pursuit not only is distinct from story creation and bears the legacy of gravitas Perrault afforded collectors of tales over mere tale tellers, but also erases a radical legacy of stories used to debate the historical moment in which they were produced (Harries 2001, 24).

Similarly, the renowned men said to have influenced the formation of IR are revered as much for their contributions as their engagement with antecedents such as Machiavelli, establishing theoretical and philosophical legitimacy for the nascent discipline. The content and form of their contributions also matters, as efforts to systematize IR and attract institutional support ran parallel to and were part of establishing a canon where women were largely either absent or invisible. As documented by those texts explored above, much of the activist, educational, or practical work undertaken by women is excluded from formalized accounts of IR's birth and development. Reliance on patrilineage, or in the parlance of IR, founding fathers, is elemental in understanding *how* women have been written out of IR, but it also takes place through the delimitation of what work counts as IR scholarship. The constitution of the discipline as a social science to lend it institutional legitimacy was gendered (Starnes 2017, 120–24). Reiteration of early disciplinary boundaries intended to establish IR as a social science also embed gendered boundaries of content and producers of content.

Exclusions from a canon can come from outright prohibition, but often subtle marginalizing practices do the work of writing out. This subtle marginalization has been documented in folklore, with the exclusion of women so endemic in the canon of fairy tales that the definition of a fairy tale was itself shaped in the image of men's writing (Harries 2001, 72). Canonical boundaries can thus police contributions on the basis of both who is producing and what they are producing.

Cinderella is one of the more ubiquitous examples of links between story creator, story content, and canon formation. Because of the numerous iterations of Cinderella stories, there is substantial scope for exploring the differences between iterations and using them as a comparison to illuminate parallel marginalizing practices in IR's disciplinary history texts. The content of those stories that emerge from the gendered disciplinary boundaries of the nascent study of folklore differs from that of iterations of Cinderella that fall outside of this scope. Examining the two in parallel with IR texts thus allows for a fuller understanding of the relationship between content and producers of that content along gendered lines. Unlike myth, the multiple iterations of the same story and the extensive scholarship on how gender influenced the differences in those iterations allow us to enrich our reading of the lore and consider how the folk producing that lore disciplined the rules for what counts. The content of Cinderella stories lends itself particularly to attempting to unpack founding father stories because of the way that matrilineage is explored differently in different iterations of the story.

For this reading, I focus on Cinderella's absent mother and her changing role between different iterations of the story as a parallel to the marginalization of women's international thought. In Cinderella stories, the "good mother often dies at the beginning of the story" (Warner 1994, 202). Cinderella has no allies and in the ubiquitous Perrault story of 1697, adapted by Disney for the eponymous 1950s film, she turns to a fairy godmother to help her in times of distress. The fairy godmother, a separate character from the mother, has become familiar in many societies. However, in other iterations of the story, the mother comes back in the form of trees, fish, and other animal helpers nourished by the mother's grave or bones (Warner 1994, 204).

This reveals an interesting difference: in Perrault's iteration, this helper is divorced from the late mother by "omitting any mention of graves or bones, [which] severs the narrative link between the orphan's mother and the fairy enchantress" (Warner 1994, 206). In contrast, Yeh-Hsien demonstrates that the mother still nurtures her child after death. In this story, the mother's spirit returns in the form of a fish. The fish befriends Yeh-Hsien but is killed when the father's second wife learns of this friendship. An enchanter tells Yeh-Hsien where to find the fish's bones and tells her to hide them. Subsequently, Yeh-Hsien need only ask the fishbones for what she needs to be cared for (Warner 1994, 202). More recent iterations of the story have tended to follow the example set by Perrault and "The absence of the mother from the tale is often declared at the start, without explanation, as if none were required" (Warner 1994, 210). This absence persists, with the mother replaced by a fairy godmother.

Writing out mothers becomes common, particularly with the Grimms who

> literally could not bear a maternal presence to be equivocal, or dangerous, and preferred to banish her altogether. For them, the bad mother had to disappear in order for the ideal to survive. (Warner 1994, 213)

Warner argues that the absent mother is a feature of the society where these stories were told, "when death in childbirth was the most common cause of female mortality" (Warner 1994, 213). Several things contribute to writing out mothers who did not embody a wholesome ideal: a reflection of female mortality and an unwillingness or inability to talk about female mortality, as well as an unwillingness to present equivocal mother figures. Alongside Yeh-Hsien, stories actively written by women that explore women's subjectivity in meaningful ways have become less prominent[2] while the stories that garner substantial retelling and Hollywood films are those that actively suppress dynamic female characters and emerge from a canon dominated by men's voices. That is not to say that only women give their female characters agency, but that there is an element of author positionality that influences content. Marginalization via both content and authorship is thus reiterated through which stories are (re)produced.

Cinderella stories are also useful because they are familiar, but not usually deployed in the context of IR. The parallels between Cinderella and the stories of disciplinary history examined in this paper, particularly on the theme of absent mothers, render the familiar in IR more visible through juxtaposition. Juxtaposition guides a close reading revealing homologous ways women are written out and linking content and authors. Both the types of content that are included and which disciplinary voices are documented

[2]Yeh-Hsien has featured in television, film, and a children's book. However, the story lacks the infamy of *Cinderella* and is frequently referred to as a "Chinese Cinderella" despite the Chinese version long predating Perrault's story.

Downloaded from https://academic.oup.com/isagsq/article/3/1/ksad003/7093182 by Manchester Metropolitan University user on 03 April 2023

matter. Operations of power, invisible in their familiarity, need to be revealed, not as neutral features of how we write disciplinary history, but as active exercises of writing women's political thought out of IR's disciplinary history.

Bringing Cinderella stories to this reading inspires five mechanisms for writing women out of IR. These five mechanisms bring textual similarities together to create a new understanding of how women's international thought has been written out of the canon.

1. Anonymize women's contributions while attributing the contributions of men
2. Move the "relevant content" goalposts
3. Tell the story of one woman's exceptional contribution
4. Revere institutions and scholarship that excludes women
5. Focus on aspects of the discipline that establish patrilineage

Taking each mechanism in turn, the analysis explains what the mechanism looks like and focuses on one or two examples from disciplinary history texts, while also gesturing toward the crossover between these mechanisms of marginalization. Rather than identifying each mechanism in every text, this analysis focuses on a close reading of the mechanism to demonstrate how it functions and to facilitate similar readings elsewhere.

Analysis

Anonymize Women's Contributions While Attributing the Contributions of Men

The practices of acknowledgment in fairy tales differ in form from those in academia, but the principle of attribution is the same. When Perrault invokes Mother Goose as the tale teller, he also anonymizes the women who tell tales (Warner 1994, 18). Similarly, the Grimms' vague attribution of the stories they collected to peasants and references to sending out reliable tale collectors to "the kitchens where old women told them tales" survive in the forewards of their anthologies (Grimm and Grimm 1996, 12). As Warner explains, "although male writers and collectors have dominated the production and dissemination of popular wonder tales, they often pass on women's stories from intimate or domestic milieux" but rarely with the privilege of attribution (Warner 1994, 17). Of course, they often changed aspects of these stories to fit their preferred style, thus also changing content. Figures such as Shahrazad, Mother Goose, or vague references to old wives take the place of attribution (Warner 1994, 16–20). In an interesting parallel, work in canonical IR texts is often discussed without reference to who produced it. This silence is particularly telling when that work appears outside dominant canonical stories or takes a form other than academic writing. Women's contribution to the development of curricula, an essential aspect of (re)producing the canon, is a broad example, with the significance of the activity frequently mentioned but attribution almost universally missing (Stockmann 2017, 224). In another example, C.A.W. Manning refers repeatedly to a conversation with "a lady of local quality," his "corseted Boston friend," that took place in a drawing room about the possibilities of the United States joining the League. While he is dismissive of her, he also sees her as representative of a strain of foreign policy thought but not significant enough to name (or recount without ad hominem attacks) (Porter 1972, 313). As Ahmed has argued, "citation is feminist memory" and serves to acknowledge the work on which our own is built (Ahmed 2017, 15–16). While many have documented an absence of women in citations (Maliniak, Powers, and Walter 2013; McLaughlin Mitchell, Lange, and Brus 2013), there are also narrative processes that naturalize this silence, particularly in the constitution of "relevance."

This silence is particularly noticeable in *History and International Relations*, as are the gestures that naturalize those silences. The *Introduction* sets out to historicize the discipline and looks at prominent intersections of work. Students are instructed to examine the work of E.H. Carr as an application of history to the study of IR (Malchow 2020, 4), whereas diplomatic history is explored with more mixed (but still white male) references. Topics including negotiation in early modern sovereign states and the study of bureaucracies and officials sent abroad are deemed relevant (Malchow 2020, 7). In war studies, work including that dating back to Thucydides and that from active military practitioners and contemporary (white male) scholars is dealt with in overview. However, on the corresponding topic of peace, the book remains silent (Malchow 2020, 9–10). Political science is also dealt with in more general terms including service roles and the formal study of the subject, and the emergence of the study of IR as a field (Malchow 2020, 13). When the section turns to IR, more extensive citations abound, including a number of contemporary scholars (Malchow 2020, 15). It is thus surprising that women are absent. Nonetheless, silence on the topic of peace, an area where women's international thought was particularly prolific (although often in more domestic contexts as with Elizabeth Lippencott McQueen), naturalizes this silencing. The chapter finishes with a list of recommended reading to enable the student to expand on these contextualizing efforts. However, only two women warrant mention in the two and a half pages dedicated entirely to these references, Lene Hansen and Miriam Findus Elman.

The absence of women is particularly pronounced in the subsequent two chapters that deal with *IR from First World War to Early Cold War*. While a broad scope of institutions and conferences bears mention (Malchow 2020, 25), many of the women active in these circles are unmentioned. While international law and the liberal canon are discussed with reference to early modern thinkers, even moving into interwar liberal idealism warrants only mention of men (Malchow 2020, 31). This pattern repeats itself through Cold War history with a whole subsection dedicated to Morgenthau's use of history. When we come to the recommended readings section, there is a testament to "A sense of the variety of thought concealed by the label 'interwar Idealism' [that] can be found" in Long and Wilson's text that reiterates the focus on the same (white male) thinkers that appear throughout the discipline's canon (Malchow 2020, 45). Without the substantial efforts at recovery, these silences are difficult to see. The claims to thorough documentation suggest that there is nothing of consequence missing. Of course, work on citations has made readers more conscious of gendered and raced citation gaps, but the narrative indications of consummate coverage obscure this silencing.

There is another way citational silences reiterate marginalization. This marginalizing gesture is particularly evident when there are few, if any citations, with the reader expected to take on board a work's argument based on reasoning, the reputation of the author, or the examples given. While citation practices have varied historically, the absence of citation in an academic text (written by anyone) affords a different kind of authority to the author. Where names are mentioned without citation, the author relies on prestige, assuming that the reader is familiar enough with the name's

Downloaded from https://academic.oup.com/isagsq/article/3/1/ksad003/7093182 by Manchester Metropolitan University user on 03 April 2023

place in the canon to recognize the authority it brings. This assumption is itself a reproductive aspect of the canon and likely to reproduce a patrilineage of authority where there has previously existed a gender bias in prominent canonical voices. One example of this is the chapter Hans Morgenthau contributed to *The Aberystwyth Papers*. Not a single citation appears throughout the chapter. Citation practice throughout the book is mixed with some chapters containing citations and others more reticent to attribute influence and ideas. This absence matters because, returning to Ahmed (2017, 15–16), citation is not only how we acknowledge the work that our own is built on, but also how we acknowledge that work is built in the first place. Gaining enough epistemic privilege to be featured in one of these texts is not the consequence of an isolated mind working alone. There is clearly a hierarchy of content at play, in addition to a hierarchy of voices. Absence of citation not only silences work that came before, but also makes contestation more difficult. The reader cannot revisit influential texts or point to absences and the process of arriving at what content counts and whose voices warrant naming is obscured.

Move the "Relevant Content" Goalposts

Broadly defining relevance is no guarantee that women's work will be included but narrowing the focus of the canon is often justification for excluding work that is simultaneously devalued. Vitalis documented this kind of shift with the move away from the question of race (Vitalis 2015), but the boundaries of "relevance" shift, often adjusted at the expense of those whose voices are most absent in the canon. Moving the goalposts of what constitutes a contribution to international thought substantive and influential enough to warrant space in a canonical text often takes teasing out within the text, examining how the authors delineate the discipline's borders and thinking about who is likely to produce thought on this topic.

Olson and Groom's *International Relations Theory Then and Now* does this subtly but systematically. This seemingly thorough book traces IR's history through its antecedents, naming thinkers and concepts dating back as early as 771 BC. Nonetheless, it only mentions eight women (Owens 2018, 5). In the subsection "The Period of the Second Consensus," the authors contemplate what they refer to as "just over twenty standard texts of the realist period of 1945–1960" (Olson and Groom 1991, 112). Among the twenty-three books with thirty authors, only two women appear, Margaret Sprout, the co-editor of *Foundations of National Power*, published in 1945, and Margaret Ball, the co-author of a 1956 book entitled *International Relations*. Of course, women *were* thinking and writing about international politics, so how were they so effectively erased from such a wide period and scope?

The story Olson and Groom tell about how they arrived at this list of books and authors is revealing. First, they refer to these as "standard texts" code for citing the same mainstream identified by other histories of IR—just like scholars following the Grimms cited Perrault and his idea of a fairy tale as the mainstream adhering to and reiterating as well as *constituting* a history of IR that excludes women. Identifying what has become the center of the discipline during this period, they talk about how this center has shifted from the consensus in IR that emerged after World War I (WWI). Among the things they argue had shifted is that by the end of the World War II (WWII), the mainstream discipline had moved from a preoccupation of peace to a preoccupation of power (Olson and Groom 1991, 113). This shift might seem like a well-established fact, but I want to reflect that the determination of what constitutes IR's mainstream is partly created in books such as Olson and Groom's. Much like the Grimms' reverence for Perrault's style of folklore over the Conteuses, their representation of disciplinary history is not an objective portrayal of facts, but is part of examining texts and ideas, centering them, and shaping the discipline. This reiteration of what constitutes mainstream thought is a site of writing out.

Two groups of women written out are those writing about the peace movement, and those working in education. Stockmann has documented that "by the end of the 1930s, women were essential to the study of IR, as educators" (Stockmann 2017, 216) He notes that "feminist pacifism was dominated by Western women from privileged backgrounds" (Stockmann 2017, 223). While structural barriers to women's participation in IR certainly existed (Stockmann 2017, 224), women were prolific contributors to the peace and pacifist literature as well as in developing curricula.

This period predates the "Second Consensus" Olson and Groom identify, so some of the writing out happens earlier. Turning to the "First Consensus" emerging after WWI, the authors describe this period as a "quest for peace." They even acknowledge that "There can be little doubt that the ideas of the peace movement, particularly societies promoting a post war organisation of states, at least indirectly affected the outcome at Paris" (Olson and Groom 1991, 56). So, one could expect some of these influential women peace thinkers to feature. Their absence, however, is because in this section, Olson and Groom *decide* to focus on scholars from Law, History, and Economics. They focus on those books that they argue "represent overall treatments resembling textbooks of a discipline" (Olson and Groom 1991, 68).

They find space to talk about activities such as teaching economics to the statesmen negotiating the Treaty of Versailles, the activities of the Royal Institute of International Affairs and the Council on Foreign Relations, along with several other institutes concerned with public education. They argue that "All of these organizations, populist or elitist, played a crucial role in the development of IR insofar as they were performing independent research and 'teaching' functions" (Olson and Groom 1991, 60). They also discuss the activities of newspapers, the establishment of university departments, and thinkers and conferences contributing to the teaching of IR—but neglect the contributions of women in any of these contexts. Many of the thinkers who were mentioned, such as Zimmern, were active both in scholarly and in activist and diplomatic contexts. Even philanthropic institutions bear exegesis in this chapter, and yet it is peace thought that warrants being a key area of consensus but without detailed exegesis. Of course, there is a similar anonymization of women's contributions in the arenas that are mentioned. Women's names and contributions do not appear so that any influence their work may have had is erased through anonymization.

The idea that Olson and Groom changed the rules of what got to count as a mainstream text in IR solely to exclude women is far-fetched, but the devaluation of work produced by women is and has been systematic. The shift in focus within the discipline away from those areas such as curricula, peace research, and activism where women's voices were prolific, and the failure to acknowledge women's writing in these areas (while acknowledging that this work was influential), actively writes women out through exclusion of some kinds of content and voice. This shift in focus effects both the folk and the lore of IR's disciplinary history. The

Downloaded from https://academic.oup.com/isagsq/article/3/1/ksad003/7093182 by Manchester Metropolitan University user on 03 April 2023

inconsistency of this boundary policing, and the tendency to include some nonacademic practices and not others, and at different periods of time, is itself a marginalizing practice. Addressing these moving goalposts influences the recovery work featured in Owens and Rietzler's collection of women's international thought. The editors grapple with how "international thought" is defined, and explicitly examine women's thinking in and beyond the academy, showing whose work has been silenced as a consequence of these moving goalposts (Owens and Rietzler 2021, 2, 12).

Olson and Groom themselves repeatedly acknowledge the overlap between academic thinkers and practitioners, citing those who moved fluidly between diplomacy, think-tank positions, and serving in the League. That said, their emphasis is still largely on the professionalized or scientific outputs of these spaces, ignoring popular writing on IR where projects of recovery demonstrate that women's writing both existed and was influential.

Tell the Story of One Woman's Exceptional Contribution

Sometimes, the inclusion of work reinforces gatekeeping: focusing on a "token" author often distracts from silencing others in marginalized groups. Although Cinderella stories may seem to be about women's lives, they often revolve around a woman who has little agency. Tatar traces the relationship between stories in which a daughter is pursued by her widower father forcing her to flee and other stories in which a stepmother is jealous and cruel to the daughter of her husband's first marriage, making her a domestic slave (Tatar 1992, 139). In these stories, the absence of a mother looms large, presaging the difficulties she finds herself in. A substitute mother figure often appears as a fairy godmother, or a magical animal, embodying her mother's spirit. These substitute maternal figures have extraordinary abilities, able to produce dresses of impossible colors, enlist animals to perform impossible tasks, or produce food out of their ears. "Variants on the tale from all over the world give the mother's ghost some kind of consoling and magical role in her daughter's ultimate escape from pain…" (Warner 1994, 205). Ordinary women (including mothers) cannot hope to match these phenomenal achievements and it is only their suffering, or in the case of stepmother and stepsisters cruelty, which earns them a place in the story. These requirements for inclusion are not accidental, however, and the link between who tells the tale has a notable impact on the misogyny of fairy tales dictating when women suffer and when they have authority (Warner 1994, 208). Replacing the equivocal and flawed mother figure with the idealized and magical fairy godmother as the only female participant with any agency is deceptive. Women have a role that is agential and influential, but it is only through their death and reincarnation as mythical beings that they acquire this power.

Including the contributions of a particular extraordinary woman in our canonical accounts can be a deceptive marginalizing practice because it performs inclusivity while distracting us from the absence of more thorough discussion of women's contributions. It also represents a higher bar for women's inclusion: that women must do something unrepeatable to make it into the canon. This gesture is a chimera that distracts from asking key questions about representation within the text. What Cinderella stories reveal is not just the tokenism or equivocation with which women are included, but the extraordinary standards to which women are held if they are to be "founding mothers." Their inclusion reinforces, rather than challenging, patrilineage by introducing a narrow conception of "founding mothers" into dominant canonical narratives that reinforce a significantly higher bar for inclusion than that men are held to. Challengers can no longer rely on women's absence to point to women's silencing but must engage in a more complex reading to expose silencing practices. Fairy tales are thus useful, both for the homological contrast and for the broader comparisons to canon constitution. The two clearest examples of this kind of writing out appear in texts that focus on Susan Strange's role in the evolution of the discipline at particular institutions.

Strange's work is heralded in both *The Aberystwyth Papers* and *International Relations at the LSE*. In both cases, women's work is not given the same exegesis in the texts' discussions of the discipline's evolution as men's work, except in the case of Strange. That is not to say that other women's work is unmentioned (although the work of men is still disproportionally represented), but that the work that merits in-depth discussion remains that of men. Strange's phenomenal influence on the advent of international political economy is difficult to ignore, but her inclusion in these accounts is equivocal and distracts from other silencing.

Fig.1 Professor Susan Strange, ca. 1980. LSE Image Library.

Goodwin's account of "Economics and International Politics" in Aberystwyth gives accounts of Strange's work, such as E.H. Carr and Martin White, earlier in the text. However, there is extra justification for her inclusion. The field of international political economy is described as "barren" with the author devoting considerable space to making the case that it should form an integral part of the international political system (Porter 1972, 254). The subsequent exegesis of both the work and the influence of Strange seems more of an exception granted based on a burgeoning field of study rather than a reflection of her influence on IR (much less her role in bringing International Political Economy (IPE) to bear). It is only her extraordinary influence that garners her inclusion.

This extraordinarily high bar for inclusion would be a less obvious example of tokenism as part of a wider process of marginalization, except that other mechanisms of writing women out prevail throughout the rest of the text. Where considerable space is devoted to the interwar idealists and peace research at the start of the book, women's international thought is almost entirely ignored in these sections. Explicit justification, such as the divide between scholarship and practice and a cursory treatment of work on imperialism/colonialism and Pan Africanism (Porter 1972, 5, 233), serves as a boundary-drawing exercise for "what counts as canonical" that conveniently deems the

Downloaded from https://academic.oup.com/isagsq/article/3/1/ksad003/7093182 by Manchester Metropolitan University user on 03 April 2023

substantial body of women's international thought beyond the scope of the discipline. This boundary drawing is reminiscent of the Grimms' exclusion of women's invented stories on the basis that they did not fit their criteria of authenticity (Harries 2001, 22–23). We also see the goalposts shift as the theory/practice divide that warranted the exclusion of women's thought earlier in the discipline's evolution dissipates in the 1950s and 1960s, allowing for "a critical eclectic approach [in the department] … rather than the large-scale, single-minded commitment to fashionable methodologies which characterized American expansion" (Porter 1972, 101).

There is a similar trajectory in accounts of the evolution of the discipline at the London School of Economics (LSE) described in the volume edited by Bauer and Brighi. While the editors note in the *Preface* that the role of women in the discipline is an area insufficiently excavated by the book, there is no discernible reason why women's contribution could not be explored within the overall aims of the book "to sketch experiences, recollections and analyses from no less than 75 years" at the LSE (Bauer and Brighi 2003, ix). The book's coverage of Strange begins with a brief history of the Department of International Relations where few other women, even into the 1990s, merit mention much less extensive discussion.[3] Only Strange's history with the institution merits the kind of elucidation dedicated to scholars such as Wight and Bull. Where Strange's work is discussed, there is ample commentary on her failings, including her failure to establish a unifying theory of political economy, partly due to her personal failings of being impatient and unsystematic (Bauer and Brighi 2003, 117). Her failure to pay homage to founding fathers and a focus on provisional, rather than universal, scholarship are all taken as reasons why it is surprising that her work made it into the volume in the first place (Bauer and Brighi 2003, 119–21).

This tension between being critical of the mainstream but innovative haunts the account of Strange's work, becoming more apparent when the influence of *Millennium* on the department's development is discussed. Here, Strange's presence and the absence of so many other women are acutely apparent. While the journal's relatively radical position in relation to the department's at the center of The English School is noted, with particular emphasis given to the groundbreaking special issues in 1988, women's names are unmentioned (Bauer and Brighi 2003, 153). The subsequent Volume 18 issue 2 that featured a discussion section on "Women and International Relations" is also noted, including Cynthia Weber's scathing response to Robert Keohane's attempts to rationalize the contributions of feminist theory, but it is telling that outside of the coverage of Strange's work, women's thought is only considered in any depth when addressing the topic of gender in IR and even then names are frequently absent. It is not that other women did not exist, but that only Strange merits discussion. Strange may have founded IPE, but her status as "founding mother" is the opposite of Yeh-Hsien's mother. She is embodied, named, and present, but fails the "nurturing test" in these narratives.[4]

[3] For examples of how other women's work is treated, see Bauer and Brighi (2003, 13, 15, 22, 34, 39, 79, 83, 153).

[4] Conference feedback highlighted a "founding mother" narrative of Strange nurturing future generations of scholars. Although many have heard this story, I can only find it retold without attribution. This oral history merits investigation, although as one anonymous reviewer pointed out, "it is often gossipy and opaque. In itself, this is a gendered inclusions/exclusion."

Revere Institutions and Scholarship that Exclude Women

Part of how one gains access to the privileged position of documenting and commenting on the canon is to become a part of the most revered institutions, as Strange did. Even work within the boundaries at one point or another often does not warrant mention in the canon. In fairy tales, stories told by men came to dominate not only as the most popular stories, but also as the index against which many future contributions were measured. Efforts to systematize and approach the genre scientifically proliferated. For many, what distinguished literary fairy tales from their mere folk counterparts was the process of collecting and anthologizing (Harries 2001, 20–28). The style favored by the Grimms not only shaped the stories that were to come, but retrospectively wrote out the stories of the French Conteuses, contemporaries of the widely revered Perrault whose stories were often told in Salons, written in letters, or published but not anthologized. The Conteuses' penchant for challenging societal norms is not only absent in later story collections, but was actively suppressed in the folktales that were recorded, particularly when marketed for children (Tatar 1992, 8–9; Harries 2001, 23). The Grimms' commentary on Perrault as a founding father of the literary fairy tale and their use of their position as expert folklorists created an institutionalized genre that suppressed previously radical contributions and contributors, both historically and into the future. The institutionalized canon of literary fairy tales reiterated the Grimms' gatekeeping long after their death. A similar phenomenon appears in the IR canon. While, unsurprisingly, historical exclusions wrought by elite institutions also manifest in the canon, this marginalization persists beyond the removal of formal barriers and is reiterated in historical accounts of the discipline when focusing on work within and around the institution. Women were present, but their work is often relegated to the archive and stays there when the institution's influence is reexamined.

Hood, King, and Peele's *Forging a Discipline* focuses on Oxford's contributions to IR. While exhibiting many of the other marginalizing practices discussed, it gives the best sense of what it looks like when reverence for an exclusive institution is conflated with a measure of rigor. Oxford is among several institutions that serve in this proxy capacity, as do Manchester and Newcastle Universities, having their "key politics professors" named as being inextricably linked with the development of IR (Hood, King, and Peele 2014, 7). In other chapters, authors trace "the origins of the academic study of politics (and its various cousins or aliases, such as 'government' and 'public administration') in three major British Universities…" (Hood, King, and Peele 2014, 25). While there were certainly women involved in these institutions, the book points out that "the graduate colleges [at Oxford] were in the vanguard as regards gender balance" (Hood, King, and Peele 2014, 79) and the leadership at these institutions was overwhelmingly male with all the usual structural barriers to women's progression serving to make women's inclusion more difficult (Hood, King, and Peele 2014, 273–74). While the editors reflect on this, the issue is that the focus on these institutions as key sites of disciplinary history reiterates and amplifies women's exclusion, as well as the exclusion of anyone else facing similar structural barriers to participation. While there are moments when the authors reflect on these structural barriers, such as reflecting on the extension classes run by Oxford from the 1880s taken by both women and working class students (Hood, King, and Peele 2014, 12) and on the exclusion of women from taking degrees from "the ancient Universities"

Downloaded from https://academic.oup.com/isagsq/article/3/1/ksad003/7093182 by Manchester Metropolitan University user on 03 April 2023

(Hood, King, and Peele 2014, 52), the overarching story of the development of politics at Oxford University is one in which "institutions do indeed matter in fostering or holding back scientific development" (Hood, King, and Peele 2014, 270), something that is also reflected in the subject matter addressed.

For students at Oxford, this has been evident in how diversity issues are tackled, and in what order: "religion, gender, and social class" (Hood, King, and Peele 2014, 273) with the first two involving challenging legal bars. The focus on legal barriers rather than wider structural change is itself a telling account of a conservative approach to change. Similarly, "gender in practice has been the most salient diversity issue affecting the political science faculty" (Hood, King, and Peele 2014, 274). Each of these aspects is, of course, entwined. If gender inequality remains an issue for faculty and is primarily tackled through the removal of legal or other kinds of "bars," and if the representation of both women in the faculty and the work that reveals this representational gap is not fostered, then veneration of the institution as a significant site of the development of the discipline will inevitably reiterate as canonical those thinkers who were formally included. There is also the compounding factor of the self-validating canon. Women who were present in these institutions are forgotten anew when retrospective canonical accounts reiterate absences by failing to reintroduce thinkers relegated to the archives. Owens and Rietzler extensively document women's diverse and widespread international thought and while some came from within these elite institutions, much of it also arose outside of formal institutions (Owens and Rietzler 2021, 2–5). Reflecting the diversity of thinkers and their thought requires not only a capacious definition of thought, but also moving away from narrow institutional accounts of IR's history, both delving further into the archives and moving beyond the institution itself.

Focus on Aspects of the Discipline that Establish Patrilineage

A close cousin to an uncritical reverence for exclusive institutions is also the attempt to tell stories of disciplinary history that feature a lengthy list of "founding father" antecedents distracting us from women's absence. In Cinderella stories, we are often directed to focus on her father's grief and loneliness. Sometimes, this grief prompts him to propose marriage to his own daughter, other times to remarry a woman who is cruel to his child. Rarely, in those Cinderella stories that have become the most popular, are we asked what happened to Cinderella's mother. The narrative ignores matrilineage as much as it focuses on patrilineage and there is an interesting parallel in how the history of IR is related with reference to founding fathers and absent mothers.

This focus on "founding fathers" has hardly been a secret, as "state of the discipline" literature has long pointed out that IR needed to justify funding and the founding of departments, variously attempting to cite "great men." Efforts to form the discipline in the scientific image of other successful social sciences involve documenting "progress" toward a bona fide social science. This attempt to be a "social science" has often led to the dismissal of work from sociological, anthropological, practical, and other approaches as falling outside the discipline, one of the many ways women's work is devalued and excluded. While women's international thought is incredibly diverse, there is a significant strand that has been written out on these grounds. A focus on more scientific methods, a shift to "high politics," and a concern with policy relevance that focuses on the "kitchens of power" rather than the policies of the everyday are itself gendered. It is here that mothers are most noticeably absent and another instance where the folk and the lore of IR's history are inextricably linked.

While the arguments surrounding this kind of writing out are familiar, it is worth revisiting within these canonical texts, particularly to highlight the narrative structures that make such writing appear to be genderless historicization of the discipline. Wright's *The Study of International Relations* is dense with examples. Rather than focusing on a linear history or the history of a particular aspect of the discipline, Wright's treatment is broken down in aspects of analysis, how the discipline is defined, the chief objectives and features, and how it is analyzed. In a section devoted to exploring what it means for the discipline to have an international viewpoint, Wright explores pacifism and peace research, arguing "the influence of the peace movement on international relations has been important" (Wright 1955, 49). He goes on to cite Erasmus as the originator of modern pacifism, also exploring the role of religion on various historical phases of the pacifist movement, and the inspiration they provided for foundations such as the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and the Nobel Peace Prize (Wright 1955, 49). However, he explains that

> The literature of the peace movement has been voluminous, but I have often been inspired by emotional hatred of war rather than by intellectual analysis of the nature of peace, the obstacles to achieving it, and of practical means to that end. Peace education has emphasized the costs of war in terms of economic loss and human suffering and the inconsistency of war with other national and international objectives and policies and has proposed moral and political reforms sometimes of a sweeping character.

He concludes that "Pacifism is hardly capable of becoming an academic discipline itself" but acknowledges that it has influenced theories of the psychology of IR before swiftly moving on to explore other disciplines that address aspects of the international (Wright 1955, 51). The dismissal of this work as overly emotional and unable to constitute a discipline is familiar, but it is nonetheless important to point out that none of this work merits citation and that it is both the voices and the content that are devalued and marginalized.

The Invention of International Relations Theory edited by Guilhot also takes an unusual approach to explore the history and formation of the discipline, focusing on "transcripts of a meeting organized by the Rockefeller Foundation in May 1954" (Guilhot 2011, 7). The conference aimed to create a new disciplinary field, so the decision to start with this conference inevitably defines who constitutes a founding member and what constitutes the discipline's antecedents based on participation. This point is acknowledged, as well as the influence of factors such as institutional support, availability of funding, and alliances, with the authors choosing to focus on "backstage logistics" because it "makes visible the work of identification, classification, and promotion that is involved in the constitution of disciplinary canons" (Guilhot 2011, 14–15). This is later born out in explanations of a key tension: that between early realists, opposed to a science of politics, and the behaviorists, in which the Rockefeller Foundation took a clear side, "interested in the work of the early realists, who were emphasizing the role of power and conflict in international politics" (Guilhot 2011, 81). This tension is also expressed via the lack of support for scholars in the field of international politics who

Downloaded from https://academic.oup.com/isagsq/article/3/1/ksad003/7093182 by Manchester Metropolitan University user on 03 April 2023

were not receiving the same level of support as those interested in international law and organization who were receiving support from institutions such as the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and the World Peace Foundation (Guilhot 2011, 88).

Examining the field through the lens of this conference focuses on those scholars who were concerned with a narrow version of international politics, a realist discipline not overly scientific, and that did not focus too much on law and organization. In Waever's chapter, the lack of unity among idealists and utopians and their absence at the conference itself meant that this position, too, was marginal (Guilhot 2011, 111). Consequently, when Waever notes that "the 1954 conference attendees simply [felt] entitled to speak on behalf of the discipline," there is a reification of this conference's centering of certain voices, voices that largely ignore interwar scholarship or topics and institutions where women's work proliferated (e.g., Owens and Rietzler 2021). The conference coalesced around power politics (Guilhot 2011, 148), and while there was women's scholarship in this vein, a great deal of women's international thought that was significantly more diverse remains on the cutting room floor when this conference is taken as "the original vision of IR" (Guilhot 2011, 155). Of course, in many instances, women were more active in conferences and think tanks than is revealed by canonical accounts of these spaces and more robust digging is required.

Conclusion

Rather than exhaustively documenting every instance of marginalization in canonical disciplinary history texts, this article has focused on revealing processes of marginalization embedded in how we think about, identify, and write IR's history. The anonymization and shifting goalposts that prevail in many disciplinary history texts are things that readers rarely notice. On the other hand, a focus on isolated extraordinary women's contributions and attempts to understand the birth of a discipline via institutions can obscure how our stories continue to reiterate exclusions previously thought to be overcome. This obfuscation often manifests in an ongoing patrilineage for IR. Because marginalization happens through suppression of content (lore) and voices (folk), identifying it requires looking at how the two are entwined. It is unsurprising that these processes of exclusion continue to manifest in contemporary writing by authors attempting to be inclusive, given their ubiquity and previous widespread ignorance of the work women contributed to all aspects of international thought. Reading these texts alongside Cinderella stories effectively highlights that the absent mother trope influences how we write the history of IR. Projects to recover women's international thought are thus complemented by an examination of the gendered narrative structures reproducing patrilineage in disciplinary history.

Documenting the absence of women's international thought and the diversity and scope of that thought has revealed the extent that women have been actively silenced, rather than silent. Understanding the processes of this silencing is important, not just to understand how women's thought was written out of the IR canon, or to understand the impact this has had on how international thought has been shaped by poor representation. It is also important because it reveals where those processes of marginalization continue to pervade disciplinary narratives. Of course, there is a possibility for much wider application of the approach used in this article. While race and class are mentioned early on, this paper has focused primarily on gender, although of course race and class have played a significant role in which women's scholarship did make it into the canon. The fairy tale canon, however, lends itself to this kind of approach. Although different stories will reveal different iterative differences, the iterative genre is itself a valuable place to look for comparative texts for close readings. The relationship between the folk and the lore is at the heart of knowledge production and how knowledge producers and the knowledge produced are co-constitutive. The point of this article is thus to reveal some of the most persistent marginalizing practices and to reflect on what they look like in practice, to encourage reflection on both reading and writing, and to notice not only the silence but also the silencing.

Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank the anonymous reviewers as well as participants and organizers of the Women and History of International Thought conference. Helpful feedback on a very early iteration of this work was given at the Popular Culture and World Politics v. 12 conference and the Millennium 2018 conference, with particular thanks to Karoline Faerber, Mamokgethi Molopyana, and Matt Davies.

References

Ahmed, Sara. 2017. *Living a Feminist Life*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Ashworth, Lucian M. 2002. "Did the Realist–Idealist Great Debate Really Happen? A Revisionist History of International Relations." *International Relations* 16 (1): 33–51.

———. 2009. "Interdisciplinary and International Relations." *European Political Science* 8 (1): 16–25.

———. 2011. "Feminism, War and the Prospects for Peace." *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 13 (1): 25–43.

———. 2014. *A History of International Thought: From the Origins of the Modern State to Academic International Relations*. London: Routledge.

Auyoung, Elaine. 2020. "What We Mean by Reading." *New Literary History* 51 (1): 93–114.

Bauer, Harry, and Elisabetta Brighi, eds. 2003. *International Relations at LSE: A History of 75 Years*. London: Millennium Publishing House.

Bliesmann, de Guevara, ed. 2016. *Myth and Narrative in International Politics: Interpretive Approaches to the Study of IR*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bruff, Ian, and Kathryn Starnes. 2018. "Framing the Neoliberal Canon: Resisting the Market Myth via Literary Enquiry." *Globalizations* 16 (3): 245–59.

Buzan, Barry, and George Lawson. 2014. "Rethinking Benchmark Dates in International Relations." *European Journal of International Relations* 20 (2): 437–62.

Benjamin de, Carvalho, Leira Halvard, and John Hobson. 2011. "The Big Bangs of IR: The Myths that Your Teachers Still Tell You about 1648 and 1918." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 39 (3): 735–58.

"Editors' Introduction." 2010. *Millennium* 38 (3): 499–508.

Enloe, Cynthia. 2004. *The Curious Feminist*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Freedgood, Elaine, and Cannon Schmitt. 2014. "Denotatively, Technically, Literally." *Representations* 125 (1): 1–14.

Grimm, Jacob, and Wilhelm Grimm. 1996. *Grimms' Fairy Tales*. New York: Penguin.

Guilhot, Nicholas. 2011. *The Invention of International Relations Theory: Realism, the Rockefeller Foundation, and the 1954 Conference on Theory*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Hansen, Lene. 2011. "A Research Agenda on Feminist Texts and the Gendered Constitution of International Politics in Rebecca West's Black Lamb and Gray Falcon." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 40 (1): 109–28.

Harries, Elizabeth. 2001. *Twice upon a Time: Women Writers and the History of the Fairy Tale*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Hoffmann, Stanley. 1977. "An American Social Science: International Relations." *Daedalus* 106 (3): 41–60.

Hood, Christopher, Desmond King, and Gillian Peele, eds. 2014. *Forging a Discipline: A Critical Assessment of Oxford's Development of the Study of Poli-*

Downloaded from https://academic.oup.com/isagsq/article/3/1/ksad003/7093182 by Manchester Metropolitan University user on 03 April 2023

tics and International Relations in Comparative Perspective. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

HUTCHINGS, KIMBERLY, SARAH DUNSTAN, PATRICIA OWENS, KATHARINA RIETZLER, ANNE PHILLIPS, CATHERINE LU, CHRISTOPHER J. FINLAY, AND MANJEET RAMGOTRA. 2022. "On Canons and Question Marks: The Work of Women's International Thought." *Contemporary Political Theory* 21 (1): 114–41.

LAKE, DAVID A. 2016. "White Man's IR: An Intellectual Confession." *Perspectives on Politics* 14 (4): 112–22.

LEIRA, HALVARD, AND BENJAMIN DE CARVALHO. 2018. "The Function of Myths in International Relations: Discipline and Identity." In *The Sage Handbook of the History, Philosophy and Sociology of International Relations*, edited by Andreas Gofas, Inanna Hamati-Ataya and Nicholas Onuf, 222–34. Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.

MALCHOW, HOWARD LEROY. 2020. *History and International Relations: From the Ancient World to the 21st Century*, 2nd ed. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

MALINIAK, DANIEL, RYAN POWERS, AND BARBARA F. WALTER. 2013. "The Gender Citation Gap in International Relations." *International Organization* 67 (4): 889–922.

MCLAUGHLIN MITCHELL, SARA, SAMANTHA LANGE, AND HOLLY BRUS. 2013. "Gendered Citation Patterns in International Relations Journals." *International Studies Perspectives* 14 (4): 485–92.

OLSON, WILLIAM C., AND A.J.R. GROOM. 1991. *International Relations Then and Now: Origins and Trends in Interpretation*. London: Harper Collins.

OSIANDER, ANDREAS. 2001. "Sovereignty, International Relations and the Westphalian Myth." *International Organization* 55 (2): 251–87.

OWENS, PATRICIA. 2017. "Racism in the Theory Canon: Hannah Arendt and 'the One Great Crime in Which America Was Never Involved'." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 45 (3): 403–24.

———. 2018. "Women and the History of International Thought." *International Studies Quarterly* 62 (3): 467–81.

———. 2019. "Sex, Gender and the Canon." *Women and the History of International Thought* (blog). August 27, 2019.

OWENS, PATRICIA, AND KATHARINA RIETZLER, eds. 2021. *Women's International Thought: A New History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

PORTER, BRIAN, ed. 1972. *The Aberystwyth Papers: International Politics 1919–1969*. London: Oxford University Press.

RUSS, JOANNA. 1983. *How to Suppress Women's Writing*. London: The Women's Press.

SHEPHERD, LAURA J. 2017. "Whose International Is It Anyway? Women's Peace Activists as International Relations Theorists." *International Relations* 3 (1): 76–80.

SMITH, STEVE. 2004. "Singing Our World into Existence: International Relations Theory and September 11." *International Studies Quarterly* 48 (3): 499–515.

STARNES, KATHRYN. 2017. *Fairy Tales and International Relations: A Folklorist Reading of IR Textbooks*. Abingdon: Routledge.

STOCKMANN, JAN. 2017. "Women, Wars, and World Affairs: Recovering Feminist International Relations." *Review of International Studies* 44 (2): 215–35.

TATAR, MARIA. 1992. *Off with Their Heads! Fairy Tales and the Culture of Childhood*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

TESCHKE, BENNO. 2003. *The Myth of 1648 Class, Geopolitics and the Making of Modern International Relations*, 2nd ed. London: Verso.

TICKNER, ARLENE B., AND DAVID L. BLANEY, eds. 2012. *Thinking International Relations Differently*. London: Routledge.

TICKNER, J. ANNE, AND JACQUI TRUE. 2018. "A Century of International Relations Feminism: From World War I Women's Peace Pragmatism to the Women, Peace and Security Agenda." *International Studies Quarterly* 62 (2): 1–13.

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

WARNER, MARINA. 1994. *From the Beast to the Blonde: On Fairytales and Their Tellers*. London: Chatto & Windus.

WEBER, CYNTHIA. 2010. *International Relations Theory: A Critical Introduction*, 3rd ed. Abingdon: Routledge.

WILSON, PETER. 1998. "The Myth of the 'First Great Debate'." In *The Eighty Year Crisis: International Relations 1919–1999*, edited by Ken Booth and Michael Cox, and Tim Dunne, 1–15. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

WRIGHT, QUINCY. 1955. *The Study of International Relations*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

ZIPES, JACK, LISSA PAUL, LYNNE VALLONE, PETER HUNT, AND GILLIAN AVERY. 2005. *The Norton Anthology of Children's Literature: The Traditions in English*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Downloaded from https://academic.oup.com/isagsq/article/3/1/ksad003/7093182 by Manchester Metropolitan University user on 03 April 2023