Women's International Thought in the 20th Century Anglo-American Academy: Autobiographical Reflection, Oral History and Scholarly Habitus.[1]

Intellectual history and oral history have never been easy bedfellows. They have, in fact, seldom been bedfellows at all. The methodologies of textual and linguistic analysis that have long been a desideratum for the practice of intellectual history as a sub-field have historically left little conceptual space for the use of oral history. Over the past few decades, however, intellectual historians have increasingly attended to the need to understand how questions of difference -- whether it be on the basis of nationality and race or gender, class or sexuality -- manifest in the production and dissemination of thought. In part, this is due to a growing focus in the sub-field on the relationship between a human subject's lived experience of the world -- a concept I will refer to as 'habitus' -- and the ideas that an individual produces. More often than not, this approach is adopted by intellectual historians working on marginalized groups whose thought is produced outside the context of academe. In this essay, I argue that in order to fully understand how scholars within the academy generate thought, intellectual historians must also reconstruct the practices and processes that led them to their arguments. In so doing, I will make a case for the way that oral history, read as a form of autobiographical self-reflection, can be used as a tool for establishing 'scholarly habitus'.

My argument will unfold in four parts. In the first I offer a brief review of the history and state of the field of intellectual history as practiced in the Anglo-American academy, and particularly in relation to the history of the discipline of international relations. In so doing, I also make a case for the importance of establishing 'scholarly habitus' for understanding the factors that shape scholars' production of thought. The second section will relate the development of oral history as a practice and argue that, as a medium for autobiographical reflection, it can be a useful methodology for establishing 'scholarly habitus' and interrogating disciplinary histories. In the third section, I lay out the rationale behind the case study of oral history interviews I conducted with twenty senior women International Relations scholars from the United States, Canada and the United Kingdom as part of the Leverhulme Women and the History of International Thought Project. The fourth and final section is an exercise in praxis wherein I will reconstruct some aspects of the 'scholarly habitus' of these women in relation to their published work. In so doing, I flesh out a new dimension of the intellectual history of international relations in the twentieth century.

Intellectual History and the Need to Establish 'Scholarly Habitus':

In the Anglo-American academy of the 1960s and 1970s, there was a sense that social history threatened to swallow up European and US intellectual history.[2] Practitioners of social history, with their emphasis upon quantitative methodologies, called into question the elitism and abstract focus of the sub-field.[3] The 'new cultural history' of the 1980s held similar consequences for intellectual history, with its focus on anthropological methods to construct the mental worlds of ordinary people.[4] Beleaguered by (apt) charges of elitism, sexism and racism intellectual history plunged into a period of

self-reflection and debate over the ends and methods of the sub-field and its relationship to social and cultural history.[5] It re-asserted itself in the early years of the 21st century, not least through the establishment in 2004 of the new Cambridge University Press journal, *Modern Intellectual History*, and the Taylor and Francis journal, *Global Intellectual History* in 2016, as well as through the founding of the African American Intellectual History Society in 2014 and the revitalisation of the older University of Pennsylvania Press publication, the *Journal of the History of Ideas.*[6]

Today, the relationship between intellectual history and social and cultural history remains blurrily defined, not least because of a distinct lack of methodological consensus amongst its practitioners. Nevertheless, this new wave of intellectual history has been indelibly marked by the influences of cultural and social history's methodological practices.[7] Whilst intellectual historians still focus on canonical works in variations of a practice perhaps most famously espoused by the Cambridge School, such readings are increasingly supplemented with analysis of archival materials which might indicate the flow and influence of particular ideas.[8] So too have historians sought to map out the influence of the work of intellectuals upon public contexts ranging from grassroots community through foreign policy.[9] Within intellectual history treatments of the discipline of international relations specifically, alternate sites and practices of knowledge production – from the examination of 'unconventional genres' of international thought through to indigenous, minority and non-Western thinking – have also begun to receive attention.[10]

One crucial implication of the methodological innovations of cultural and social history remains, however, under-theorized and under-worked in the intellectual history of international relations as a discipline: the gendered, embodied experience of the producer of thought themselves. As James Clifford also observed in relation to 'discourse analysis,' intellectual histories of international relations scholars remain not so much interested in the author as a subject but in the author's 'statements as related to other statements in a field.'[11] The intellectual historian becomes the genealogist, mapping ideas in such a way as to reduce living, breathing human beings to producers of arguments.[12] On surface analysis, the idea or thought the historian is attempting to trace is decoupled from the human subject who produces the idea. I say 'on the surface' because this decoupling lends itself to the construction of an implicit 'rationalism' which presupposes an objectivity in the act of charting thoughts. It also allows historians to skirt around the issue of exclusion and the nature of canon formation as a process contingent upon the scholar's individual experiences.[13] What changes in how we understand intellectual history when we connect the lived and bodily realities of the human subjects producing the ideas to the ideas themselves? After all, despite aspirations to scholarly objectivity and neutrality, 'the body can and does intervene to confirm or deny various social significances' such as gender and race.[14]

African American feminist theorist bell hooks has written about how 'black folks have, from slavery on, shared in conversation with one another 'special' knowledge of whiteness gleaned from close scrutiny of white people. Deemed special because it was not a way of knowing that has been recorded fully in written material, its purpose was to help black folks cope and survive in a white

supremacist society.'[15] Her insight is fruitful not just in terms of race but for those individuals and groups implicitly or explicitly cast as 'other' or 'different' by virtue of bodily significance. In thinking specifically about tracing intellectual histories of academics, a number of quantitative studies of the tertiary sector have indicated the direct link between factors such as gender, tenure, institutional culture and field socialization in practices of research and publication across academic disciplines.[16] It is past time for intellectual history to include those 'ways of knowing' that are not recorded fully in written material yet shape the development and transition of both scholarly careers and scholarly thought.

I am not the first to make this argument. Many of the recent debates about the relationship between cultural or gender and intellectual history have called for a blurring of these sub-fields boundaries precisely because it can be difficult to readily parse out the impact of politicized particularities such as gender, race, nationality, sexuality and class in conventional methodological approaches to intellectual history.[17] Indeed, in their 2014 edited volume reviewing the state of European intellectual history, Samuel Moyn and Darrin M. McMahon noted that, alongside a willingness to overcome 'tired dichotomies' between cultural or social and intellectual history, contemporary intellectual history was also marked by a revived interest in 'intellectual biography and the self.'[18] Such statements come on the heels of decades of work by feminist scholars and practitioners of African-American and African intellectual history, amongst other fields, that attends to the significance of questions of positionality and otherness in extra-textual ways through the development of methodologically innovative approaches to intellectual history.[19] These often include the 'bodily significances and realities' of difference that individuals experience.[20] This is not least because the factors pressing upon an individual thinker to shape their sense of self and their intellectual biographies is crucial to understanding the practices informing the production of ideas.[21] For the purposes of this essay, with its case study focus on women scholars working on questions of international relations, I am interested in how such a critique lends itself to establishing methodological tools for establishing the ways that difference impacts the epistemological practices and career trajectories that lead to the production and dissemination of particular ideas. Disciplinary histories of international relations have long erased women's intellectual contributions and experiences.[22] This essay is an effort towards addressing that erasure.

In a 2011 article in *History & Theory*, Herman Paul developed a conceptual apparatus useful for these purposes when he called for philosophers of history to look beyond the published output of historians. For Paul, histories of the discipline of History and its methodologies would be incomplete without the acknowledgement of what he called the 'historian's "doings."'[23] Production of knowledge, he argued, begins to look quite different when we inquire into the ways that "scholarship is embedded in 'practices' or 'epistemic virtues'."[24] Such doings or virtues are embedded in 'routinized forms of behaviour.' Some behaviours are common to scholars across field boundaries whilst others are associated with particular academic disciplines.

Paul's thinking intersects neatly with the theoretical framework proposed by the French anthropologist Pierre Bourdieu, on the notion of 'habitus.' Bourdieu developed this notion in order to explain the actions and dynamics he documented within the Kabyle peoples of Algeria in the 1950s. He wanted a theoretical framework that would illuminate how these actions were both constitutive of the prevailing social structures and the consequence of them.[25] The framework he developed is also useful for establishing and understanding 'the routinized forms of behaviour' Paul called for scholars to attend to in their analyses. In his case, Bourdieu stresses that habitus is perpetually in flux and responds to changing conditions – 'the field' -- and can result in a multiplicity of practices. [26] It also animates action at the level of the individual as well as the collective or institutional. Those individuals who operate from similar positions within particular fields inevitably tend to adopt similar practices that generate research practices and ensure environmental stability. In this way, habitus becomes a mechanism for reproducing particular structures in society.

In the case of academic disciplines like History or IR, individuals are socialized through particular undergraduate and graduate university training programmes and research environments to replicate what Paul called certain 'epistemic behaviours.' Bourdieu would characterise this training as a 'faith in practice' that functions as a gatekeeping exercise that perpetuates the assumptions and structures of the field. [27] These assumptions, mostly unwritten, constitute 'doxa' or the 'silent experience of the world' that unconsciously and consciously shapes the intellectual output of scholars and the way that they position themselves within a chosen field.[28] For my purposes, such concern with 'practices'; 'processes', 'intellectual ethic' and 'habitus' is tied to the desire to understand the methodology deployed by the scholar as well as the trajectories of said scholars' careers. It is important, in other words, to establish the orthodoxies of the field and how they are reproduced via habitus. We must then ask what tensions this produces for embodied, gendered scholars as they navigate their location within the field and produce their own intellectual contributions.

The question is, how do we, as intellectual historians, go about establishing an individual scholar's output and career trajectory in relation to 'the silent practices' or 'doxa' of a given academic field? One answer is through the critical reading of autobiographical reflection alongside more traditional textual analyses. For intellectuals and scholars of all disciplines, autobiographical reflection has long played a key role in the development of theoretical writings. [29] Much of the early (and contemporary) feminist and gender literatures framed autobiographical reflection as an important critical practice.[30] For the purposes of this article's case study, we can look to the IR feminist Cynthia Enloe as an example of a scholar who has long combined her feminist scholarly output with autobiographical reflection, publishing interviews explicating her intellectual trajectories.[31] Within recent intellectual history itself, we need only to look to Dominick LaCapra's 2004 'Tropisms of Intellectual History,' where he narrates a series of ruptures in his own intellectual biography -- his loss of faith; 'a semi-demi-oedipal' interaction with his father -- to make an argument for the particular kind of historical understanding that can be derived from such reflection.[32] But not all scholars are so explicit

in their presentation of their intellectual workings or 'scholarly habitus'. It is here that oral history can prove a useful tool in the intellectual historian's arsenal.

Taking Oral History Seriously as Autobiographical Practice:

Oral history has only relatively recently gained legitimacy as a research practice within the discipline of History as a whole.[33] The duality of oral versus written sources has been a cultural diagnostic in Anglophone scholarship since at least the mid-20th century.[34] Orality was considered, *prima facie*, as the predecessor to the more sophisticated or more rigorous form of communication required by the written word. The former is pre-modern, the latter modern and capable of 'a more objective recognition of the difference between what was and what is.'[35] Much of this suspicion can be linked to a process of disciplinary 'gatekeeping': many of the earlier practitioners of oral history were outside the academy and their research was explicitly linked to political projects of recovery associated with contemporary social, labour and feminist movements.[36] In the 1970s and 1980s, however, social and cultural historians increasingly adopted oral history as a tool for recovering the experiences of traditionally marginalized groups and individuals such as people of colour, women and members of LGBTQIA communities.[37] The practice provided a means through which the historical record could encompass such group's experiences despite a lack of textual records or as a counterpoint to material that privileges the perspectives of those in power.[38]

This association with social and cultural history projects of recovery made oral history particularly alien to intellectual history in this period, not least because of intellectual history's privileging of the written word. Moreover, oral history as a practice remained plagued by criticisms of the reliability of memory and the inherent subjectivity in the relationship between the interviewer and interviewees.[39] As a result, from the 1980s onwards, practitioners focused on developing sophisticated theoretical frameworks for working with oral history. Rather than attempting to contradict accusations of the inherent subjectivity of oral history, such works maintained that it is precisely this subjectivity that gives oral histories real value as historical sources: 'what is really important is that memory is not a passive depository of facts, but an active process of creation of meaning.'[40] Consequently, the past few decades have seen the shift from understanding oral histories as a social survey technique to 'an autobiographical practice' in which meaning is constructed through a self-reflexive engagement between the interviewer and interviewee.

It seems logical then, as a parallel turn to autobiography and notions of selfhood re-emerges in intellectual history, to inquire into the ways that oral history might be relevant to establishing the consciousness and intellectual lives of literate elites.[41] Indeed, the never-dead, but now robustly resurrected genre of intellectual biography squarely aims to bring lived experience into relation to abstract argument. This is not least because intellectual influences are never purely documentary in form. Moreover oral history provides a way of accessing each scholar's perceived influences and the way that individual intellectuals understand and perform their own intellectual biographies.[42] An early example of this kind of approach can be found in the 2005 UN Intellectual History Project volume, *UN*

Voices. Therein, Thomas Weiss, Tatiana Carayannis, Louis Emmerij and Richard Jolly used interviews with 73 UN professionals as the basis for narrative structure that combined individual voices with 'the main themes of international cooperation debated within the UN system.'[43] They argued that their oral histories gave 'life, color and imagination to the experiences of individuals,' and provided a way of accessing the ideas that influenced these individuals' 'attitudes and actions…toward economic and social development.'[44] These are the kinds of insights I argue oral history can offer for elaborating the 'scholarly habitus' of the women scholars I interviewed.

In making this case for the utility of oral history, I am not ignoring the warnings of historians such as Joan W. Scott that accounts of experience do not entail a window to the social reality of the past.[45] Instead, I contend that the language and discourses that interview subjects deploy in oral histories to make sense their experiences as scholars are revealing.[46] For the purposes of this essay, I understand 'oral history' to be the practice of conducting interviews as well as the process of transcription and interpretation. This definition derives from the belief that the process of interviewing is deeply entwined with narrative and interpretation of that narrative it generates.[47] Understood thus, oral history becomes a methodology that enables us, as the Italian pioneer of such history, Luisa Passerini, famously put it, 'to write history from a novel dimension undiscovered by traditional historiography.'[48] Oral history becomes 'a new kind of historical document,' another kind of text rather than 'historical truth.'[49]

A Rationale for an Oral History Archive of Women Scholars in IR:

As part of the Leverhulme Women and the History of International thought project between 2018 and 2020, I created an oral history archive of interviews with twenty senior women scholars in the overlapping fields of International Relations, Diplomatic History and Political Science.[50] The disciplinary identity of each woman is contingent upon the way that scholarship on international relations questions were categorized during their graduate school experiences in the 1950s and 1960s. In their own work, the women participants explicitly engage with and are engaged by literatures that would now come under the bracket of International Relations. The interdisciplinary nature of their intellectual formation is reflective of IR's disciplinary origins in the Anglo-American context.

In the aftermath of World War One, early contributors to IR approached questions about the international state system from the vantage points of history, law, geography, anthropology, economics and philosophy. Yet from the 1950s and 1960s onwards, when the interview candidates received their scholarly training, IR moved away from its interdisciplinary origins to become a primarily theoretical field of social and political science. Until recently, histories of academic IR reflected the discipline's dispensation with its historicist origins by constructing accounts of the academy without seriously reflecting upon the multiple ways in which women and people of colour were excluded from such sites of knowledge production, or included and later erased from disciplinary histories.[51] Whilst historical studies of international thought and IR have proliferated in recent years and increasingly acknowledged the field's organisation around forms of gendered and racialized epistemologies, discussions of

women's thought and the way that their gendered difference might have shaped their 'scholarly habitus' and career pathways remain largely ignored.[52]

For these oral histories, interviewees were asked to reflect upon their autobiographical trajectories in relation to their intellectual and scholarly careers. These women were trained and gained their doctorates in the mid-twentieth century as the field developed towards the discipline it has become today. They went on to teach and publish on questions of international relations from the vantage of tertiary institutions in the United States, Canada and the United Kingdom. For all of these scholars, their socio-cultural identities as women, signified by their bodily realities, set them apart from their peers. In graduate school, for example, they were either the sole woman, or in a clear minority. For those from the United States, they gained their degrees before prestigious Ivy League schools like Harvard, Yale, Princeton, and Dartmouth admitted female undergraduate students.[53] Consequently, some attended separate or parallel, all-female institutions for their undergraduate degrees. One candidate, Janice Gross Stein, was one of the first women admitted to Yale's graduate program, whilst another, Margaret Hermann, was refused admittance to several US graduate school programs on the basis that such an education would be wasted on a woman.[54] In the UK, Oxford and Cambridge, long considered the most prestigious universities in Great Britain, underwent a similar process of transition away from single-sex colleges in the same period.[55] The diplomatic historian Margaret Macmillan, also interviewed for this project, completed her graduate degrees at Oxford in an all-female college, St. Hildas. For many of these women, their careers after graduate school continued in a similar vein as they were often the only women in their respective departments. How each candidate believed that this difference operated to shape their scholarly practices and intellectual trajectories varied in intersection with other socio-cultural and political experiences.

Reading the interviews together, and alongside the scholarly publications of the interview candidates, makes it possible to draw out common themes that illuminate some of the ways that gender cut across other experiences – such as national belonging, race, class and heteronormativity – to project certain understandings of 'scholarly habitus' for these academics as they generated international thought.[56] What follows, then, is an exercise in listening to these women scholars and understanding how the subjective meaning they attach to their lived experiences intersected with the norms and values internalized from their socialization within the academy to shape their particular 'scholarly habitus' and the trajectory of their careers.[57] In so doing, I shed light on some of the 'silent practices' of the academic field of IR and further underline the connections between 'scholarly habitus' and intellectual output that make establishing the former as a crucial part of writing intellectual history in a way that attends to the significances of difference.

Determining Scholarly Location in the Field:

Choices shaped by national, class and racial identity, as well as methodological inclination and training, were incredibly important in the publication and research trajectories of all of the women interviewed for this study. Caribbean specialist Jacqueline Braveboy-Wagner, for example, felt that

because her own anti-colonial methodological approach ran counter to mainstream IR, her work was often unwelcome in key IR journals. When she tried to publish after she completed her dissertation at the University of Arizona, she had 'already been warned in Trinidad by an African professor who… [was] well-experienced in all of this…. He had said… 'Don't even try to send your work to those mainstream journals. They are not interested in the kinds of things that we say and in our perspectives.' When she started sending her work to 'the obligatory' journals such as *The American Political Science Review* that 'you are supposed to send to', these warnings proved prescient. The rejection letters all justified the decision along the lines of 'we don't believe there is such a thing as South-South co-operation. We don't believe that the Third World countries can come together in this way.'[58] All of her work was deeply grounded in empirical data but it was nonetheless rejected. As a result, Braveboy-Wagner published mainly in regional and area studies journals such as the Latin American Studies Association journal, the *Latin American Research Review*. This also drove her towards writing books rather than journal articles because she felt that former did not require so much conformity with field norms.

In the case of war studies expert, Janice Gross Stein, she also felt very strongly that 'the most intense discrimination I've encountered in my life -- and I tick the boxes for several -- was intellectual discrimination in the field.'[59] From her graduate training onwards, she recalls, there was just 'zero tolerance' for difference. People dealt with it 'by rolling their eyes.'[60] Amongst her graduate peers at McGill University in Canada, the focus was on asking structural questions. It seemed to her that 'Kenneth Waltz's book was the bible' and anyone who wasn't taking that approach was considered reductive.[61] J. David Singer's Correlates of War project at the University of Michigan, with its focus on quantitative research into the causes of war, was becoming increasingly influential in the mid-1960s and 'people were beginning to take seriously rational choice approaches.'[62] Game theory, and theorists such as Thomas Schelling, were also gaining traction in this moment.[63] The field was beginning to move towards formalisation on the one hand and structuralism on the other, neither of which were directions Stein was interested in pursuing. In contrast, drawing on her undergraduate and masters training in both history and political science, she was interested in understanding the role of decision-making 'around issues of war and escalation and use of force.'[64]

At the beginning of Stein's doctoral training at McGill, she worked with Michael Brecher, who had a similar curiosity about decision making.[65] Moreover, he was 'open to history' in a way that other faculty members there were not, partly because he himself had deployed historical method in his own work. (He had written what remains one of the most influential biographies of Nehru).[66] Despite his support, Stein described the process of writing her dissertation as one in which she had to 'wear down' her committee. They were not 'genuinely intellectually remit with' her methodological approach but she believed they made the decision to 'give up' on pushing her to change because they pushed her as far as she would go.[67]

When Dina Zinnes worked towards her PhD at Stanford University, she felt similarly about her

dissertation committee's approach to her doctoral research, recalling that in the end her thesis was a product of reluctant compromise. In her case, the problem was the opposite of Stein's: her undergraduate degree in psychology at the University of Michigan had given her a background in statistical methodologies and she was interested in applying the quantitative innovations in that field to her political science research. In contrast, her committee 'wanted more historical data.'[68] Whereas such an approach had evidently gained traction at Canadian institutions such as McGill by the mid-60s, Stanford's political science department remained wedded to a more descriptive and historically grounded framework for understanding international relations. This was borne out in Zinne's viva defence, which she remembers as being a particularly difficult experience. Once again, her committee focused on historical questions rather than pressing her on 'the science of this interaction between decision-makers.'[69]

This sense of the dissertation as an exercise in disciplinary conformity rather than exciting research was shared by Christine Sylvester. In order to complete her PhD at the University of Kentucky, Sylvester completed a predictive logic study of the UN as a peace organization. Such a quantitative approach did not satisfy her but she felt very strongly that it was a hurdle that had to be passed in order to gain entry into the field and legitimacy as a scholar. As soon as she passed her viva, she put her dissertation to the side and sought the kind of historical and philosophical analysis that interested her more. When describing this aspect of her intellectual trajectory, Sylvester framed it in terms of her personal history. She noted that when she applied to college, her mother had told her not to let them know that she came from an Italian-American family because 'Italians were considered sort of dumb or likely to be good athletes' rather than intellectuals, 'not people who would aspire to, well, getting a PhD let alone going higher up in the professional world.'[70] Sylvester would become the first person in her family to attend university and, even then, she was unusual amongst her peers because she worked to support herself throughout her studies (and had done so since she was 16). These experiences and sense of identity drove her to resist the swing towards statistical analysis in IR. She felt that human experience mattered and 'chafed under the American approach' that prioritised 'tables and statistics' over people, and particularly people like her family.[71] Much of Sylvester's publication record reflects her desire to rectify this gap and locate the people in international relations, from her work on development in Zimbabwe through to her research into Art and Museums as 'unexpected' locations of international relations.[72]

Braveboy-Wagner came from a different family and national background to Sylvester but she found this formation equally significant to her research trajectory. Like Sylvester, she was interested in 'bottoms up… approach' that directly clashed with the 'Western mainstream approach.'[73] Born under British imperial rule in the Trinidad and Tobago, she came to intellectual maturity as her nation grappled with the political possibilities of decolonization and independence. These questions remained at the heart of her scholarly inquiry. Whilst she studied languages in her undergraduate programme in Jamaica, she was involved in the Walter Rodney student riots and a close friend of the daughter of the

man who would become a Jamaican Prime Minister, socialist Michael Manley. The scholarship funding her degree had been inaugurated by the Caribbean's first Prime Minister, Eric Williams. When it came time to decide what and where she would study for her Masters, she chose the Institute of International Relations at the University of the West Indies in Trinidad and Tobago partly because of Williams' annual budget speeches. Before becoming President, Williams had completed a DPhil in history at Oxford and he brought this scholarly training to his political career, beginning each budget speech with an analysis of the current state of international relations from a Caribbean perspective. Braveboy-Wagner was fascinated by William's approach, partly because it meshed well with the anti-colonial political sensibilities she had developed through her activist experiences in Jamaica. It later drove her decision to write a dissertation on contemporary South/North relations and the impact of decolonisation.

Such a perspective was very different to the one that she encountered in existing US-centred IR literature during her PhD programme at the University of Arizona.[74] Remembering her experiences as a graduate student, she commented, 'I was sort of an exotic species at the University of Arizona…I think I met one black person there and that student was an American… and he disappeared after a year or two.'[75] It did not help that her subject area lay outside the expertise of the faculty members. Neither the members of the political science department at Arizona nor her colleagues in her first job at Bowling Green State University in Ohio disputed her *bona fides* as a researcher. They did, however, criticise her engagement as a scholar-citizen in the respective faculty communities. Braveboy-Wagner became used to the refrain: 'We cannot dispute her scholarship. The only thing we can dispute is whether she is one of us… as a team… She isn't collegial enough.'[76] It seemed evident to her that this was really about her resistance to hegemonic perspectives in the discipline. Her response, always, was that 'If I, as a black woman in IR, right, in a field that his dominated by white men like you all… if I really agreed with you on everything then shouldn't you be suspicious?'[77] Here Braveboy-Wagner was operating as a scholar in a context where she was not only working on substantively differently questions to her male peers but in which her physical body, as a person of colour and as a woman, was visibly different. This made Braveboy-Wagner determined to keep asking 'difficult questions' and to look suspiciously on work considered to be methodologically and substantively mainstream.

In all these cases, the interviewed women's self-narratives of scholarly identity are deeply tied to a sense of being 'other', whether this otherness was constructed upon lines of race, national belonging and subject like Braveboy-Wagner; class and race like Christine Sylvester; or methodological approach like Stein and Zinnes. Each publication, then, became an act of resistance against their sense of prevailing norms in the field of IR.

Marriage and Motherhood:

Of the women interviewed for this study, those whose personal lives followed heteronormative patterns believed that their roles as wives and mothers intruded explicitly upon their identities and practices as scholars. In her 1938 critique of the relationship between militarism and gender, *Three Guineas*, Virginia Woolf made an observation that is relevant to this inquiry into the women's 'scholarly

habitus'. Speaking to a university educated male interlocutor who occupied a similar socio-economic sphere she argued, 'your education was not merely in book-learning; games educated your body; friends taught you more than books or games.'[78] The training of the educated man versus even the educated woman, is very different. Woolf argued that in women and men, 'body, brain and spirit have been so differently trained and are so differently influenced by memory and tradition. Though we see the same world, we see it through different eyes.'[79] Gender, in other words, had been socialized into the two groups, preparing them physically, mentally and psychologically for different functions within the contemporary social order. In the specific context of the British middle and upper class, Woolf observed that until 1919, marriage 'the only profession open' to women 'was held to need no education, and indeed was of such a nature that education unfitted women to practise it.'[80] Simone de Beauvoir, writing just over ten years after Woolf, in her 1949 book, *The Second Sex*, complained that 'if I wish to define myself I must first of all say: 'I am a woman'; a man never begins by presenting himself as an individual of a certain sex, it goes without saying that he is a man.'[81] This thinking creates a very different template for those who wished to pursue careers as scholars, or as thinkers more generally, because they automatically had to contend with the way that their visible, gendered difference set them apart.

By the time the women interviewed for this study attended university, times had changed somewhat. Nonetheless, marriage and the visible, bodily experience of motherhood remained a key determinant in their professional lives and scholarly practice. Whilst men could be, and often were, both scholars and husbands, being a wife and a scholar was an altogether different proposition. In the case of Elizabeth Hanson and Rosemary Foot, we can see that this held true more generally too. Foot, born in Essex, England, in 1948, was the first person in her family to attend university and she did so only after several years in the workforce. She felt very strongly that she, and her school friends, were expected to either 'get a decent job and stay in it' or 'get married and have children.'[82] Hanson, born during the Great Depression in Memphis, the United States, had similar recollections. These expectations were borne out in the trajectories of her female school peers. She noted that of her 'very large' high school graduating class, she and two other women were the only ones to have 'a professional career,' whilst their peers had become wives and mothers. Unlike Hanson, both the other women with careers had also remained 'unmarried.'[83]

Cornelia Navari, who completed her undergraduate degree at the women's liberal art's college in New York, Barnard, had similar recollections. She noted that her cohort at Barnard were mainly 'very blue stocking, intellectual women' who expected to have a career but that such endeavours would 'be fitted around the family life.'[84] Later, when Navari worked as a research associate at the British think tank Chatham House in the 1960s before going on to complete a PhD in IR at the University of Birmingham, she met with these expectations too. Most of the administrative women staff at Chatham House were unmarried themselves but she remembers that they all 'expected me to be married very soon.'[85] These recollections about the way that marriage was conceived of as woman's career are perhaps unsurprising insights into gendered expectations of professional vocation in mid-century

Britain and the United States. They are nevertheless an important aspect of understanding the scholarly practices and field-socialized behaviours of the women interviewed, as the following analysis will show.

More generally, the accounts in the oral history interviews illustrate how determinative personal relationships could be in informing the development of scholarly experience and practice. One such example comes from Margaret Hermann's experiences in applying for graduate school in the early 1960s. She was one of the few students (and even fewer women) to be a recipient of the prestigious Woodrow Wilson Fellowship for her graduate studies. Extremely competitive, this award reflected an exemplary academic record and recipients were highly sought after by universities across the United States. Despite this achievement, Hermann received multiple rejection letters from graduate institutions (that she chose not to name) on the basis that a postgraduate education would be wasted on her because she would only end up getting married and either leaving the programme or, later, abandoning the profession in order to carry out the responsibilities of married life.[86] There was no sense that she could combine the two roles.

Hermann was 'very angry' at 'the blatant discrimination' in these letters and she still has them.[87] She notes, however, that it was hard to remain angry for long ('just perturbed') because Northwestern University had accepted her with enthusiasm and was her first choice due to its interdisciplinary work at the frontiers of psychology and political science. Moreover, several of her Professors at Northwestern, upon reading the rejection letters she had received actually wrote to their colleagues at the respective institutions to call their actions into question.[88] Nevertheless, Hermann's rejection makes it clear that in this period multiple US graduate institutions considered that to be a woman, even a woman who had already won field accolades, was incompatible with being a scholar. It is also worth noting here that when Dina Zinnes was accepted to Stanford's Political Science PhD program in 1961 she was told that 'we'll admit you but we don't give fellowships to women. They just go off and get married and have babies and well, that's just not a very good investment for us.'[89] At the time, (although she feels differently now) this made sense to Zinnes because having children seemed incompatible with working as a scholar. This, in combination with the fact that her cohort at Stanford, like her undergraduate program at the University of Michigan, was 'heavily male dominated' embedded a sense that she was 'very different', an exception in the field.[90] This experience of gender difference was compounded, as has already been discussed, by her resistance to the historical methodologies favoured by the political science department at Stanford.

Even where marriage -- or the spectre of it -- did not have explicitly structural ramifications, its influence upon life decisions also impacted the sort of graduate training scholars received. In consequence, it shaped the way that these scholars were socialized into the field of IR and taught its specific epistemic behaviours. Braveboy-Wagner, for example, had been planning to apply for a doctoral programme in Canada, at McGill or the University of Toronto. [91] From her vantage point in the Caribbean, where she had completed an undergraduate degree at the University of the West Indies in

Jamaica and a Masters at the International Relations Institute in Trinidad and Tobago, the United States was not an appealing option for graduate study. It seemed to be a very 'race-conscious' place. [92] Everything changed when she represented the Caribbean at a six-week summer seminar in Connecticut during her Masters' programme. At the seminar, she met her now husband 'and that was the end of the story.' [93] He was completing a PhD at the University of Arizona and it made sense that she would join him there. The decision was a personal one – and certainly not one forced upon her by virtue of her gender -- but Arizona was not a natural choice for her research interests. Braveboy-Wagner quickly realized 'that Americans knew so little about the rest of the world.'[94] She was doing her dissertation on South-South co-operation and 'they didn't have a clue what South-South cooperation was about and they doubted… simple little things' like 'that there was Afro-Asian solidarity.'[95] Ultimately, she felt most of her research was informed by her own drive to answer questions because 'it was a case of enlightening them' rather than the other way around.[96] Braveboy-Wagner's introduction to IR thereby became an exercise in the constant defence of her research subject and questions. This only strengthened her methodological inclinations towards 'solid and empirical' standards of proof.[97]

The question of motherhood, just as much -- if not more than -- marriage, played a significant role in shaping women's scholarly trajectories. In 1979, shortly after she completed her doctoral training at Northwestern University in the United States, Margaret Hermann took up an adjunct teaching position at Princeton University. Charged with coaxing thirty undergraduate students into honing their critical thinking and debating skills through Princeton's precept system, she began the semester prepared for intellectual and pedagogical challenges. She was unprepared, however, for the shocked silence that would greet her first overtures to the all-male class. None of the students in the room had ever been taught by a woman. Many would later confide to her that they had never even met a woman in their social circles who worked outside the home. This shock was compounded by the fact that Hermann was also visibly pregnant with her first child. If her students were confounded by the notion that a woman could also be a scholar, they were doubly surprised to discover that a scholar could also be a mother.[98]

Not only were these students then in a single-sex tertiary environment but they had hitherto been educated in male-only schools with male teachers. The categories of 'Teacher' and 'Professor' were therefore implicitly masculine. Moreover, women had only ever occupied social and familial spheres in their lives, not intellectual or professional ones. Confronted with a woman who was simultaneously carrying a child and training them in a scholarly discipline, Hermann's students had to reckon with what this meant about their tertiary education and their understanding of the spaces where women could be. The physical visibility of Margaret Hermann's pregnancy ruptured the 'doxa' or 'silent experience' of the scholar as male, (or, at least, as not-a-mother) for her male students. Asserting her scholarly *bona fides* against these expectations became an integral part of Hermann's teaching experience.

Whereas Hermann's experiences of pregnancy often required explicit assertion of her scholarly

identity, the impact of assumptions about scholarly identity were not always so explicitly expressed. Unlike Hermann, Elizabeth Hanson had her children whilst a graduate student at Columbia University, New York, in the late 1950s and early 1960s. Nonetheless, she had the sense that her pregnancy was a condition somewhat incompatible with being taken seriously in academe. Heavily pregnant whilst sitting her comprehensive exams, she recalls 'I worked very hard to find some clothing that would disguise that because I did feel that would not enhance my possibilities for passing the exam.'[99] No one had explicitly indicated that this would be the case but she had a strong sense that awareness of her bodily difference during her pregnancy would change the way she was perceived as a scholar.[100] Part of this feeling may have been because Hanson knew no other women in her cohort at graduate school who were also pregnant or mothers. Indeed, she only directly recalls two other women from her graduate school days, neither of whom chose to remain in the field of international relations. Hanson's recollection of graduate school as a primarily male space goes some way towards explaining her concern that visibility of her pregnancy, which so clearly indicated her identity as a woman and a mother, would impact upon perceptions of her scholarly seriousness.

Becoming a mother also altered the trajectory of Hanson's research interests and methodology. After graduation in the early 1970s, she moved to New Haven where her husband had taken a job. Rather than applying for a full-time job herself whilst her children were young, she chose to work as a research associate at Yale with Bruce Russett.[101] Taking this role became 'a turning point' in Hanson's career.[102] At Columbia, there had been a heavy emphasis upon qualitative research methods and Hanson's minor in Soviet Studies, had meant a heavy focus on historical work. In contrast, Russett was a pioneer in quantitative methods. Their work together tested 'economic theories of US foreign policy' and resulted in a co-authored book, *Interest and Ideology: The Foreign Policy Beliefs of American Businessmen*.[103] The research for the book required Hanson to train in an entirely new set of methodologies including using punch cards to program computers.[104] This was the beginning of a new phase in Hanson's career, moving away from her graduate training in Soviet studies, and towards quantitative methods in economic research. Drawing on these new methodological skills, she published on the burgeoning sub-field of International Political Economy and developed a new interest in multinationals; was one of the founding members of the International Political Economy Section at the International Studies Association and established undergraduate and graduate courses on Political Economy at Yale and, later, in her first full-time position at the University of Connecticut.[105]

Hanson's autobiographical reflections in her interview, like those of the other scholars that I have discussed in this section, are revealing of some of the ways that gender -- manifesting here in terms of the visibility of pregnancy and the structural implications of motherhood and marriage -- worked to shape her individual 'scholarly habitus' and, as a result, her published intellectual output. They also illuminate the way in which students of IR as well as more senior practitioners understood IR to be incompatible with the practice of heteronormative womanhood. Women such as Hanson, Zinnes and Hermann conducted their research and teaching with a keen sense of being considered 'other' to norms

of the field by virtue of their roles as wives and mothers. As has been discussed in relation to nation, race and class, this also lead to each publication or moment of professional success such as graduation becoming an act of (implicit or explicit) resistance to the 'doxa' that their roles as wives and mothers were incompatible with 'serious' scholarly endeavour.

Women's Work and Work on Women:

Of course, gendered experiences within IR fell outside the realms of marriage and motherhood too. Feminist IR scholars, including in particular three of the women interviewed for this study: Cynthia Enloe, J. Ann Tickner and Christine Sylvester, have long pointed to the way that the dominant approaches to many of the cornerstone subjects of post-World War Two IR such as Security and War Studies have excluded gender as an operational dynamic.[106] So too has Enloe articulated in multiple interview and print mediums her feminist sensibilities in terms of her gendered experiences in the field. In this section, I will relate some of Enloe and Tickner's influential feminist writings to their autobiographical reflections in the oral history interviews and in print to parse out the relationship between the methodological innovation of their published work and their 'scholarly habitus'. Doing so allows me to illuminate the factors that shaped these two women's scholarly practice. This will include their lived experience of gendered difference as well as the symbiotic relationship between published output and professional function and socialization in tertiary institutions.[107] In illuminating the latter, I will also bring to bear the work and experiences of Margot Light who, whilst primarily a scholar of Russia, played an important role in developing the first course on Women and IR to be taught in the UK at the London School of Economics.

Cynthia Enloe began her professional career as 'a comparative politics person' focusing on ethnic politics in South East Asia, although her experiences as a woman scholar led her to the development of a feminist conceptual lens.[108] In a 2003 interview with Carol Cohn, another influential feminist IR scholar, she related a story of sitting in a café in Oslo, working on the index of her 1980 book *Ethnic Soldiers.*[109] With her green and pink index cards spread out across the table in front of her, Enloe reflected on the inherently political nature of indexes: they reveal what it is the author wants to make visible in their work.[110] At the time, Enloe had just read Adrienne Rich's *Of Woman Born* and she imagined Rich picking a copy of *Ethnic Soldiers* off the shelf at her local store.[111] In this imagining, Rich would thumb through the index to see if there was an entry under W for 'women', find nothing there and put the book back on the shelf. It was not an unrealistic imagining, Enloe herself had to look hard to find an entry for the category: only twice in the 500 page manuscript had she referred to women.[112] In part this reflected her training and the field of comparative politics at large in the 1960s and 1970s when she wrote the book: common practice saw women as peripheral at most to the study of war.

Retrospectively, Enloe considered this realisation to be a turning point in her intellectual trajectory, because it made her more open to thinking about the role of women in politics. In the same period, undergraduate students at Clark University asked her to put together a comparative politics

course on women. These students had been reading feminist literature in their own time and they wanted to study these issues in their courses as well. The "embarrassment" Enloe had felt in imagining Rich's reaction to *Ethnic Soldiers* made her open to the idea.[113] Developing the courses steeped her in the cutting edge of literature on gender and discussions with her (mostly female) students allowed her to test out how these ideas might apply to her research into war and military strategy.[114] Enloe's 1983 book, *Does Khaki Become You?*, was her first to bring these feminist perspectives gleaned from her teaching, her institutional experiences and her personal politics to her scholarly work on security and war.[115]

In the interview I conducted with Enloe and in two books she published in 2013 and 2017 respectively, she offered another reason that she had become so interested in gender and its operational dynamics in the period of researching and writing *Khaki* between 1979 and 1983: her involvement in the sexual harassment case brought against a professor at Clark University by her friend and colleague from the Anthropology Department, Ximena Bunster.[116] At the time, sexual harassment was a 'brand new body of law' and 'set of regulations from the US Department of Labor.'[117] The Clark case was one of the earlier examples of these legal protections tested in the US and it attracted the attention and support of feminist activists such as Adrienne Rich. One of the key challenges of the case was developing an effective language or vocabulary to talk about patterns of gendered workplace abuse. For Enloe, fighting for justice for Bunster and other, similarly affected, women colleagues taught her the 'power of concepts to make visible what was invisible.'[118] This filtered into her development of feminist conceptual apparatuses in her academic work. She feels very strongly that the process of writing *Khaki* showed her 'that what I was doing in my workplace, as a supporter of harassed women… had enormous consequences for my professional work as an academic researcher and writer.'[119] It made Enloe very attentive to the dynamics of sexual assault and sexual relations in understanding international issues.

After writing *Khaki*, Enloe turned her attention to a broader critique of the field, and, in 1990, published the most influential book in feminist IR, *Bananas, Beaches and Bases*: *Making Feminist Sense of International Relations*. [120] Therein, she argued that military bases and the debates they generate cannot properly be understood without attending to the quotidian and personal interactions that take place in and around these places. For Enloe, this included the lives of sex workers, the women who have been assaulted by military personnel and those groups who mobilise around both those affected. On the 25th anniversary of its publication in 2014, a new, revised edition of the book was released, updated to explore new examples of militarism. It remains a key text for understanding how war, gender and the experiences of women are inextricable. The innovative conceptual framework Enloe presented in the book is the direct product of the research questions she developed in response to institutional environment, her professional practice as a teacher and her experience of gender.

Much like Enloe, J. Ann Tickner was also prompted by her teaching experiences to think closely about the role of gender in International Relations. She recalls teaching about nuclear strategy at the Liberal Arts College of the Holy Cross, Worcester, Massachusetts, in the mid-1980s. She 'noticed that

many of my women students seemed to find it terribly uninteresting.' When pressed they would tell her that the subject matter just did not speak to them 'and they would name a male student who would sit in the front row and answer questions about bombs and things.'[121] In their minds, this male student was going to perform much better in the course. Such views did not usually map on to these female student's marks. Often, 'when it came round to exams they did much better than many of the men. It was just a perception.'[122] For Tickner, who found the subject matter of nuclear strategy extraordinarily interesting, this was unsettling. What was it that made her male students feel comfortable with this subject matter that left the female students cold? Her interest in nuclear technology prompted her to read a book by the physicist, Evelyn Fox Keller, called *Gender and Science*, and she found some answers there. Keller argued that 'physical science is very masculine biased in the way they ask their questions and in the way that they go about answering them.'[123] This observation seemed to Tickner to be equally applicable to the field of IR.

Reflecting upon her teaching experiences and the conceptual framework Keller proposed, Tickner wrote her first feminist piece, a critique of a canonical text in the field, Hans Morgenthau's 'Six Principles of Political Realism'.[124] Following his structure, she elaborated six principles of feminism which could be read alongside his list. The idea was not to 'debunk' Morgenthau *per se* but to illustrate how much was missed by solely adhering to his narrow view of the world. Tickner's essay came out in 1988 and it marked the beginning of her scholarly interest in feminist and gender perspectives that also mapped on to her teaching. She developed courses on these subjects both at her home institution of *Holy Cross* and, in 1988-89 taught into the new Masters course on 'Women and International Relations' being developed at the London School of Economics (LSE) by Fred Halliday and Margot Light.[125]

Margot Light had arrived at thinking and teaching about the role of women in international relations by a slightly different route. A Russian, Security Studies and Foreign Policy Analysis specialist at the LSE, she was also the only woman in her department. Gender and feminism, whilst influential to the way she thought about her personal identity were not 'a natural' part of her scholarly work. When the LSE launched the 'Women and International Relations,' Masters course -- the first of its kind in the United Kingdom -- it was made clear to her that she was expected to participate by virtue of the fact that she was a woman. Light very much enjoyed working with Halliday and Tickner, both of whom she respected greatly. Nonetheless, she felt that her involvement in the course was yet another example of her experience that being the only woman in the department meant having 'to represent all women, all the time.'[126] For her colleagues, her professional identity as a Soviet scholar was undercut by the perceived social significance of her physical embodiment as a woman. Light later confided to Tickner that 'she had been extremely annoyed that she'd been asked to do this because she was a Russia specialist.'[127] It was one of many jobs that she had taken on or been allocated by virtue of her gender, many of which involved a kind of 'pastoral care' eschewed by her male colleagues.

Light's job at the LSE was not the first time that she had been the sole woman scholar in the room, and this exacerbated her frustration with the situation. Earlier on in her career she had been

associated with the Centre for the Analysis of Conflict, directed by John Burton and based at the University of Kent. The Centre was key to her scholarly development, not least because its links with Soviet scholars based in Moscow gave her access to materials and perspectives relevant to her research. With her colleague, John Groom, Light published two 'state of the field' monographs that became very widely used in British Universities at the time.[128] Nevertheless, Light was the only woman attached to the Centre and this often resulted in her doing much of the 'dogsbody' administrative and organising work, both for published work and in the coordination of conferences and trips affiliated with the Centre. Poorly funded, there was no room in the budget for any outside administrative assistance, and this was implicitly considered 'women's work'.

At the Centre, this 'women's work' ate into her time for research but was at least connected to her specialism. In the case of Light's 'Women and International Relations' course, which ran from 1988 to 1998, Light found the added burden particularly frustrating because these were years in which the Soviet State transformed into the Russian State. Working on the area became 'completely different' and there were fresh challenges to retaining expertise. It was a 'hugely, hugely exciting' moment and her scholarly passion and reputation were focused on engaging with these changes. So whilst she was politically committed to the course, it was an additional burden. This was doubly so, as for both Halliday and Light it was also only one of three courses they taught in addition to their research activities.[129] Moreover, Light felt a huge sense of guilt that she did not have the time to put into researching and publishing on the topic of women.[130]

The notion that teaching or administrative work can operate to curtail a scholar's research time is hardly a novel insight into the dynamics of an academic career. There is room to argue that this particular situation restricted Light's capacity to experience teaching as a medium for experimentation within her chosen sub-field and that it thus produced an absence, rather than a presence, in her intellectual output. This is important to acknowledge but is too slippery to pin down precisely. More tangible is the related argument that the specific teaching and administrative loads placed on Light were the direct product of her colleagues' recognition of her gender and their consequent professional engagement with her as 'other'. Light's 'scholarly habitus' was therefore defined by the constant resistance to this 'othering' from the 'field' as she continued to publish in her chosen area despite being pushed towards subjects her colleagues associated with her identity as a woman.

Unlike Light, J. Ann Tickner's publishing trajectory increasingly engaged with the question of women and gender in IR in these years, as we have seen. In 1992, she published a book titled *Gender in International Relations.*[131] The monograph has been very influential amongst feminist IR scholars. It has taken longer to permeate mainstream IR thinking. Students have approached her to say that they read the book in college. When she asks who assigned it and how the discussions on the book went in class, they offer a variation of the same story: 'Oh, well. It was assigned but the professor said you better read this on your own because I can't really understand it. Similarly, other students have admitted that, 'We didn't actually talk about your book but it was on the syllabus.'[132] Many of these students had

found her gendered analysis useful in their own work but they also had the sense that it still was not quite considered mainstream to the discipline. The reluctance of IR theorists to engage in the classroom with Tickner's work, as well as the feminist perspectives of such peers as Cynthia Enloe and Christine Sylvester, was also reflected in citation practices in the published literature.[133]

Tickner's 1997 *International Studies Quarterly* article, 'You Just Don't Understand,' was an effort to engage with these perspectives. Therein she mapped how, with some exceptions, 'scholars trained in conventional scientific methodologies,' tended to consider IR as a 'gender-neutral field' in which 'feminist approaches appear to be a-theoretical -- merely criticism, devoid of potential for fruitful empirical research.'[134] Tickner was at pains to make clear that she was not commenting on a male-female binary within the field but was instead pointing to the misunderstanding between those scholars who adopted a feminist conceptual framework and those 'methodologically conventional IR scholars' whom she took to include 'realists, neorealists, neoliberals, peace researchers, behavioralists, and empiricists committed to data-based methods of testing.'[135]

In many ways, the article Robert Keohane published the following year in response to Tickner's piece, was further evidence for her argument. Keohane directly challenged IR feminists to develop a 'scientific method in the broadest sense' in order to 'convince non-believers of the validity of the message that feminists are seeking to deliver.'[136] As Tickner pointed out in her 2005 published response, not only is there no single feminist methodology or approach to IR, few feminist scholars believe establishing such a thing is desirable.[137] To this day, Tickner believes that this kind of attitude is a product of 'methodological goals, much more so from the actual subject matter of what we're studying. Mainstream IR in the US is very quantitative, it's very positivist, it's very rational choice and they just don't think that we're doing theory.'[138] She maintains that feminist scholarship requires nuanced attention to both quantitative and qualitative modes of inquiry.

Reading the exchange between Tickner and Keohane alongside Tickner's recollections of conversations with her students is revealing. It indicates the extent to which many IR scholars in the US (and beyond) in the mid-1990s understood their scholarship and methodological practices as gender-neutral, despite their occupancy of and socialization within a disciplinary field populated by scholars with unavoidably gendered significances. In the case of Enloe and Tickner, their gendered experiences of the field at large resulted in the development of feminist methodologies and foci in their written work. Any intellectual history of their output needs to attend to this relationship between their 'scholarly habitus' and their publications, not least because the latter led them to identify the former as acts of resistance against non-feminist norms within IR.

The importance of fleshing out this connection and of establishing how socialization in 'routinized behaviours' in the field of international relations can have multiple consequences is underlined by the differences between Light's experiences and publication choices and Enloe and Tickner's trajectories. For Light, in contrast to Tickner and Enloe, her lived experience of gender translated into juggling bifurcated teaching and research trajectories rather than the development of an

explicitly feminist or gendered methodological approach. She nonetheless understood her continued work on Russia as an act of defiance vis-à-vis the gendered expectations of the field that a woman would automatically want to work on questions of international thought relating to women or gender.

Conclusion:

A crucial tenet of scholarly practice is the need to define one's own work in relation to the field at large. In various ways and for diverse reasons, each of the women scholars interviewed for this article understood their scholarly output in terms of resistance to prevailing norms within the field of international relations and in their experience of the academy. All of these women had to contend with the way that their gender marked them out as 'other' in fields wherein the (white) male scholar was the norm. As we have seen, this difference intersected in important ways with positionalities of race, class and nationality, to shape the scholarly opportunities and experiences of each woman. Oral history, as a medium of autobiographical reflection, offered a useful means of illuminating the implications of each woman scholar's specific context for the generation and dissemination of their thought.

To those who might argue that the reconstruction of their 'scholarly habitus' is a project for social or cultural disciplinary history rather than intellectual history, this article is a contribution to the growing body of work that underlines the importance of understanding cultural and intellectual history as inherently linked. We cannot understand the intellectual output of particular thinkers without also acknowledging how the 'routinized behaviours' that form their respective 'fields' and which are embedded with notions of gender, national belonging, race and class shape the research choices and possibilities of individual scholars. The evidence provided in the oral histories revealed the decisive stamp of a gendered, embodied experience on these women's 'location' – both self-identified and imposed - within their scholarly field or subfields. This is crucial to understanding their intellectual output. Further research on a different group of scholars might consider other autobiographical contexts, such as job precarity, migration, the experiences of coming out or working as a transgender scholar. By bringing together such an understanding of "scholarly habitus" with readings of each scholar's published work, we can gain a much richer and inclusive understanding of the dynamics of individual scholars' thought. So to can we gain a deeper appreciation of the forces that have shaped the discipline of international relations.

[1]Research for this article was carried out with funding from the Leverhulme Trust for the Leverhulme Women and the History of International Thought Project. It would not have been possible without the generosity of the women scholars who agreed to be interviewed for the oral history archive. Thanks to my colleagues on the project, Patricia Owens, Katharina Rietzler, Kimberly Hutchings and Joanna Wood for their thoughtful feedback, and to Boyd Van Dijk, Immi Tallgren and Barbara Metzger for their insights on earlier iterations of the manuscript. So too am I grateful to the editorial team at *Gender & History*, and the two anonymous reviewers for their comments.

[2] John Higham and Paul Conkin, eds., *New Directions in American Intellectual History* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1979); Dominick LaCapra and Steven L. Kaplan, eds., *Modern European Intellectual History: Reappraisals and New Perspectives* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1982). For disciplinary histories of this moment see: John W. Burrow, "Intellectual History in English Academic Life: Reflections on a Revolutions," in R. Whatmore and B. Young B., eds,

Palgrave Advances in Intellectual History (London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), 8; Dominick LaCapra, "Tropisms of Intellectual History," *Rethinking History*, 8:4 (December 2004): 500; Leslie Butler, "From the History of Ideas to Ideas in History," *Modern Intellectual History*, 9:1 (2012): 157; Samuel Moyn and Andrew Sartori, "Approaches to Global Intellectual History," in *Global Intellectual History* (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 2013), 3.

[3] Robert Darnton, "Intellectual and Cultural History (1980)," in his *The Kiss of Lamourette: Reflections in Cultural History* (New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company, 1990), 191.

[4] See Lynn Hunt, ed., *The New Cultural History* (Berkeley,CA: University of California Press, 1986).

[5] Darrin M. McMahon and Samuel Moyn, "Introduction: Interim Intellectual History," in Darrin M. McMahon and Samuel Moyn, eds., *Rethinking Modern European Intellectual History* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2014), 3. For work parsing the relationship between cultural and intellectual history in the 1980s see: Robert Darnton, "Intellectual and Cultural History (1980)"; Dominick LaCapra, "Rethinking Intellectual History and Reading Texts," *History and Theory* 19: 3 (1980): 245–76.

[6] Here I will use intellectual history and the history of ideas as interchangeable terms, taking my lead from the practice of the *Journal of the History of Ideas*.

[7] David Armitage has reflected upon this in the case of the convergence of international history and intellectual history: "The International Turn in Intellectual History," in Darrin M. McMahon and Samuel Moyn, eds., *Rethinking Modern European Intellectual History*, 232-252.

[8]The 'Cambridge School' refers to the work and influence of Cambridge University historians J.G.A. Pocock, Quentin Skinner and John Dunn. In different ways, through their own scholarship and the training of graduate students, these scholars promoted the epistemological principle that ideas should be studied within the context of their initial articulation in order to be properly understood: Peter Gordon, "Contextualism and Criticism," in McMahon and Moyn, *Rethinking Modern European Intellectual History*, 36. For examples of works looking at the flow of ideas see: Leslie Howsam and James Raven, eds., *Books between Europe and the Americas: Connections and Communities, 1620-1860* (New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011); Joan Shelley Rubin, *Songs of Ourselves: The Uses of Poetry in America* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2007); Jonathan Rose, *The Intellectual Life of the British Working Classes* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2001).

[9] See Stefan Collini, *Absent Minds: Intellectuals in Britain* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2006); David Engerman, *Modernization from the Other Shore: American Intellectuals and the Romance of Russian Development* (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 2003); Paul Kramer, *The Blood of Government: Race, Empire, the United States, and the Philippines* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2006); Samuel Moyn, *The Last Utopia: Human Rights in History* (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 2010).

[10] See Robbie Shilliam (ed.) *International Relations and Non-Western Thought: Imperialism, Colonialism and Investigations of Global Modernity* (New York, NY: Routledge, 2011); Robert Vitalis, *White World Order, Black Power Politics: The Birth of American International Relations* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2015); Valeska Huber, Tamsin Pietsch and Katharina Rietzler, "Women's International Thought and the New Professions, 1900-1940," *Modern Intellectual History*, First Read, (2019): 1-25; Adom Getachew, *Worldmaking after Empire: The Rise and Fall of Self-Determination* (Princeton, NJ.: Princeton University Press, 2019).

[11] James Clifford, *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature, and Art* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988), 270.

[12] Martin Jay, "Intention and Irony: The Missed Encounter Between Hayden White and Quentin Skinner," *History and Theory*, 52:1 (February 2013): 36.

[13] Bonnie Smith has mapped this out in relation to the discipline of history, showing how 'the language of the body and sexuality became crucial to in establishing the coherence-conditions for breakthroughs in the field.': *The Gender of History: Men, Women and the Practice of History* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2000), 11.

[14] Moira Gatens, *Imaginary Bodies: Ethics, Power and Corporeality* (London and New York: Routledge, 1996), 10. See also Kathleen Canning, "The Body as Method? Reflections on the Place of Body in Gender History," *Gender and History*, 11:3 (November 1999): 499-513.

[15] bell hooks, *Black Looks: Race and Representation* (Boston, MA: South End Press, 1992),165.

[16] See S.J. Mayer and J.M.K. Rathmann, "How does research productivity relate to gender? Analyzing gender differences for multiple publication dimensions?" *Scientometrics*, 117:3, (December 2018):1663-1693; R. Gill, "Breaking the silence: The hidden injuries of the neoliberal university," in R. Ryan-Flood and R. Gill, eds., *Secrecy and silence in the research process: Feminist reflections* (New York and London: Routledge, 2010), 228-244; K. B. Ward, & L. Grant, "Gender and academic publishing," In J. C. Smart, ed., *Higher education, handbook of theory and research* (Vol. XI). (New York, NY: Agathon Press, 1996); M.F. Fox, "Gender, environmental milieu, and productivity in science," In H. Zuckerman, J. Cole, & J. Bruer eds., *The outer circle: Women in the scientific community* (New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Co., 1991).

[17] See Rachel Foxley, "Gender and Intellectual History," in R. Whatmore and B.Young B., *Palgrave Advances in Intellectual History*, 180-209; Dominick LaCapra, "Intellectual and Cultural History, and Critical Theory," in his *History and Its Limits: Human, Animal, Violence* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2009), 22; Sandrine Sanos, "The Subject and the Work of Difference: Gender, Sexuality, and Intellectual History," *Modern Intellectual History*, 8:1 (April 2011): 213-225; Judith Surkis, "Of Scandals and Supplements: Relating Intellectual and Cultural History," in Darrin M. McMahon and Samuel Moyn, eds., *Rethinking Modern European Intellectual History* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2014), 104. For examples of this methodology in practice see Camille Robcis, "French Sexual Politics from Human Rights to the Anthropological Function of the Law," *French Historical Studies* 33 (Winter 2010), 129–56 and Judith Surkis, *Sexing the Citizen: Morality and Masculinity in France, 1870–1920* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2006).

[18] Darrin M. McMahon and Samuel Moyn, "Introduction: Interim Intellectual History,"10.

[19] From feminist scholars see the debates around standpoint theory: Sandra G. Harding, *The Science Question in Feminism* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1986); Alison Wylie, "Why Standpoint Matters," in Sandra Harding (ed.), *The Feminist Standpoint Reader* (New York, N.Y.: Routledge, 2004), 339-351; Janet A. Kourany, "The Place of Standpoint Theory in Feminist Science Studies," *Hypatia*, 24:4 (Fall 2009): 209-218. For examples from African American intellectual history see: Patricia Hill Collins, *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness and the Politics of Empowerment* (1990: reprint, New York, NY: Routledge, 1991); Nell Irvin Painter, "Representing Truth: Sojourner Truth's Knowing and Becoming Known," *Journal of American History* 81:2 (September 1994): 461-492; Adolph Reed and Kenneth W. Warren, eds., *Renewing Black Intellectual History: The Ideological and Material Foundations of African American Thought* (New York, NY: Routledge, 2010); Brandon Byrd, "The Rise of African American Intellectual History," *Modern Intellectual History* (2020): 1-32. On African Intellectual History as a field see: Nancy Rose Hunt, "The Affective, the Intellectual and, Gender History," *Journal of African History*, 55: 3 (November 2014): 332. For examples see: H. Gegenbach, *Binding Memories: Women as Makers and Tellers of History in Magude, Mozambique* (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 2005); J. Glassman, War of Words, *War of Stones: Racial Thought and Violence in Colonial Zanzibar* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2011).
[20] M. Vaughan, *Curing their Ills: Colonial Power and African Illness* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1991); T. C. McCaskie, *Asante Identities: History and Modernity in an African Village, 1850-1950* (Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press, 2000); A. Mbembe, *On the Postcolony* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2001).
[21] For more on this importance of understanding "ideas as necessarily produced in dialogue with lived experience and always inflected by social facts of race, class, and gender" see: Mia Bay, Farah J. Griffin, Matha S. Jones, and Barbara D. Savage, eds., 'Introduction,' *Towards an Intellectual History of Black Women* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2015): 4-6.
[22] Patricia Owens, "Women and the History of International Thought," *International Studies Quarterly*, 62:3 (September 2018): 467-481.
[23] Herman Paul, "Performing History: How Historical Scholarship is Shaped By Epistemic Virtues," *History and Theory*, 50:1 (February 2011):1.
[24] Herman Paul, "Performing History," 1.
[25] Pierre Bordieu, *Esquisse d'une théorie de la pratique, précédé de trois études d'ethnologie kabyle* (Berne: Librairie Droz, 1972).
[26] Pierre Bourdieu, *Le sens pratique* (Paris: Editions de Minuit, 1980), 88–9. For an elaboration of what this might look like in relation to international history see, Peter Jackson, "Pierre Bourdieu, the 'cultural turn' and international history," *Review of International Studies* (2008): 155–181.
[27] Pierre Bourdieu, *Le sens pratique*, 113; 109–15.
[28] Pierre Bourdieu, *Le sens pratique*, 111–12.
[29] See John Sturrock, "Theory versus Autobiography," in Robert Folkenflik, ed., *The Culture of Autobiography: Constructions of Self-Representation* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1993), 20–37.
[30] Naeem Inayatullah, ed., *Autobiographical International Relations: I, IR* (New York, NY: Routledge, 2010); Sadaf Jaffer, "Women's Autobiography in Islamic Societies: Towards A Feminist Intellectual History," *Journal of Women's History*, 25:2 (2013): 153-160; Leigh Gilmore, *Autobiographics: A Feminist Theory of Women's Autobiography* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1994); Joyce Nielsen, *Feminist Research Methods: Exemplary Readings in the Social Sciences*, (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1992).
[31] Cynthia Enloe and R. I. S., "Interview with Professor Cynthia Enloe." *Review of International Studies* 27: 4 (2001): 649-66; Carol Cohn and Cynthia Enloe, "A Conversation with Cynthia Enloe: Feminists Look at Masculinity and Men Who Wage War," *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 28:4, (2003): 1187-1207; Cynthia Enloe, Shelley Koch, Brian Tongier, Lisa-Marie Wright, and Jose Martinez, "Interview with Cynthia Enloe," *Social Thought & Research* 27 (2006): 27-41; Cynthia Enloe, "Cynthia Enloe on Militarization, Feminism, and the International Politics of Banana Boats," Tuesday, May 22, 2012, Theory Talk #48, http://www.theory-talks.org/2012/05/theory-talk-48.html; Cynthia Enloe, "Interview with Cynthia Enloe," *E-International Relations*, March 13, 2013, https://www.e-ir.info/2013/03/13/interview-cynthia-enloe/
[32] Dominick LaCapra, "Tropisms of Intellectual History," 509-510.
[33] For more on opposition to oral history see Paul Thompson, *The Voice of the Past: Oral History* (first published 1978; 3rd edn, Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2000), 77–81.
[34] Haun Saussy, 'Introduction: Weighing Hearsay,' in *The Ethnography of Rhythm: Orality and Its Technologies*, 1-16. (New York, NY: Fordham University Press, 2016), 2
[35] On this form of thinking see: Marshall McLuhan, *The Gutenberg Galaxy: The Making of Typographic Man* (Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press, 1962): 3; Ian Watt and Jack Goody, "The Consequences of Literacy," *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 5:3 (April, 1963): 307-311.
[36] Lynn Abrams, *Oral History Theory* (Oxon, UK: Routledge, 2010), 5.
[37] Alessandro Portelli, "What Makes Oral History Different," in Robert Perks and Alistair Thompson, eds., *The Oral History Reader* (London, UK: Routledge, 1998), 34. For examples of such recovery histories see Elizabeth Roberts, *A Woman's Place: An Oral History of Working Class Women, 1890-1940* (Oxford, UK: Wiley, 1984).
[38] Alistair Thompson, *Voice of the Past*, especially ch. 4, 'Evidence'; Trevor Lummis, *Listening to History: The Authenticity of Oral Evidence* (Totowa, NJ: Barnes & Nobles Books, 1987), 16-20.
[39] Lynn Abrams, *Oral History Theory*, 6.
[40] Alessandro Portelli, "What Makes Oral History Different" (1979), in Oral History Reader, Robert Perks and Alistair Thompson, eds., *The Oral History Reader*, 69; Alistair Thompson, "Fifty Years On: An International Perspective on Oral History," *Journal of American History*, 85:2 (September, 1998), 584.
[41] See Kama Maclean, "Revolution and Revelation, or, When is History Too Soon?", *South Asia: Journal of South Asian Studies*, 39:3 (2016): 678–94

[42] Penny Summerfield, "Oral History as an Autobiographical Practice," *Miranda* [Online], 12 (2016): 1-16.
[43] Thomas G. Weiss, Tatiana Carayannis, Louis Emmerij and Richard Jolly, *UN Voices: The Struggle for Development and Social Justice* (Bloomington, IN., 2005), 7.
[44] Weiss, Carayannis, Eemeris, Jolly, *UN Voices*, 2; 4.
[45] Joan W. Scott, "The Evidence of Experience," *Critical Inquiry* 17:4, (1991): 773-797.
[46] Jeremy D. Popkins adopts this approach in his work on historians as autobiographers: *History, Historians and Autobiography* (Chicago, I.L., 2005).
[47] See Lynn Abrams, *Oral History Theory*, 2-3.
[48] Luisa Passerini, "Work Ideology and Consensus under Italian Fascism," *History Workshop*, 8:1 (October 1979): 82–108.
[49] Saul Benison, 'Introduction,' in *Tom Rivers: Reflections on a Life in Medicine and Science: An Oral History Memoir*, (Cambridge, MS: M.I.T. Press, 1967), ix–x; Twin Cities GLBT Oral History Project, Queer Twin Cities (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2010), 6.
[50] These interviews are available in an open access archive at https://whit.web.ox.ac.uk/oral-history-archive.
[51] Patricia Owens, "Women and the History of International Thought," 467-481; Valeska Huber, Tamsin Pietsch and Katharina Rietzler, "Women's International Thought and the New Professions, 1900-1940," 1-25.
[52] David Armitage, "The International Turn in Intellectual History' in D. M. McMahon and S. Moyn eds., *Rethinking Modern European Intellectual History*, 232–52; Samuel Moyn and Andrew Sartori, eds., *Global Intellectual History* (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 2013); Robert Vitalis, *White World Order, Black Power Politics*; Brian C. Schmidt and Nicolas Guilhot, eds., *Historiographical Investigations in International Relations* (London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018); Robbie Shilliam, *International Relations and Non-Western Thought: Imperialism, Colonialism and Investigations of Global Modernity* (London: UK: Routledge, 2010).
[53] See Nancy Weiss Malkiel, *"Keep the Damned Women Out": The Struggle for Coeducation* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2016).
[54] Janice Gross Stein, "Interview," 19 March, 2019, 6. Margaret Hermann, "Interview," 25 February, 2019, 19.
[55] On the similarities and differences in these transitions see: Nancy Weiss Malkiel, *"Keep the Damned Women Out".*
[56] These particular categories of autobiographical context have been selected due to their relevancy for this set of oral histories.
[57] For more on this approach see Joyce Nielsen, *Feminist Research Methods*, 26.
[58] Jacqueline Braveboy-Wagner, "Interview," 26 April, 2019, 13.
[59] Janice Gross Stein, "Interview," 11.
[60] Janice Gross Stein, "Interview," 12.
[61] Janice Gross Stein, "Interview," 9. See Kenneth Waltz, *Man, the State and War* (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1959.)
[62] Janice Gross Stein, "Interview," 9.
[63] See Thomas Schelling, *The Strategy of Conflict*, (Cambridge, MS: Harvard University Press, 1960).
[64] Janice Gross Stein, "Interview," 8.
[65] See, amongst others, his *The Struggle for Kashmir* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1953); *Nehru: A Political Biography* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1959); *Israel, the Korean War and China*: *Images, Decisions and Consequences* (Jerusalem: Jerusalem Academic Press, 1974).
[66] Michael Brecher, *Nehru.*
[67] Janice Gross Stein, "Interview," 9.
[68] Dina Zinnes, "Interview," 29 March, 2019, 8.
[69] Dina Zinnes, "Interview," 9.
[70] Christine Sylvester, "Interview," 18 March, 2019, 2.
[71] Christine Sylvester, "Interview," 8.
[72] Christine Sylvester, *Zimbabwe: The Terrain of Contradictory Development* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1991); *Art/Museums: International Relations Where We Least Expect It* (Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers, 2009); "Who Gets to Curate Recent American Wars? Looking in Arlington Cemetery and at The Wall That Heals," *Critical Military Studies*, 2019.
[73] Jacqueline Braveboy-Wagner, "Interview," 8.
[74] See her *Interpreting the Third Word: Politics, Economics and Social Issues*, (New York, NY: Praeger/CBS, 1986); *The Caribbean in World Affairs* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1989).
[75] Jacqueline Braveboy-Wagner, "Interview," 12.
[76] Jacqueline Braveboy-Wagner, "Interview," 13.
[77] Jacqueline Braveboy-Wagner, "Interview," 13.
[78] Virginia Woolf, *Three Guineas* (1938, reprint. Ontario: Blackwell Press, 2012), 4.
[79] Virginia Woolf, *Three Guineas*, 16.
[80] Virginia Woolf, *Three Guineas*, 25.
[81] Simone de Beauvoir, *The Second Sex* (Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin, 1975), 15.
[82] Rosemary Foot, "Interview," 11 February, 2019, 2.
[83] Elizabeth Hanson, "Interview," 14 March, 2019, 18.
[84] Cornelia Navari, "Interview," 28 February, 2019, 4.
[85] Cornelia Navari, "Interview," 23.
[86] Margaret Hermann, "Interview," 25 February, 2019, 19-20.
[87] Margaret Hermann, "Interview," 19.
[88] Margaret Hemann, "Interview," 20.
[89] Dina Zinnes, "Interview," 29 March, 2019, 6.

[90] Dina Zinnes, "Interview," 7.
[91] Jacqueline Braveboy-Wagner, "Interview," 9.
[92] Jacqueline Braveboy-Wagner, "Interview," 9.
[93] Jacqueline Braveboy-Wagner, "Interview," 9.
[94] Jacqueline Braveboy-Wagner, "Interview," 9.
[95] Jacqueline Braveboy-Wagner, "Interview," 9.
[96] Jacqueline Braveboy-Wagner, "Interview," 10.
[97] Jacqueline Braveboy-Wagner, "Interview," 11.
[98] Margaret Hermann, "Interview," 17-18.
[99] Elizabeth Hanson, "Interview," 8.
[100] Elizabeth Hanson, "Interview," 8.
[101] Elizabeth Hanson, "Interview," 19.
[102] Elizabeth Hanson, "Interview," 9.
[103] Bruce M. Russett and Elizabeth C. Hanson, *Interest and Ideology: The Foreign Policy Beliefs of American Businessmen* (San Francisco: W.H. Freeman, 1975).
[104] Elizabeth Hanson, "Interview," 10.
[105] In additions to *Interest and Ideology*, see Elizabeth C. Hanson, "International Political Economy a New Field of Instruction in the United States," *International Social Science Journal* 30:3 (Fall 1978): 666-677; Robert, Black, Stephen Blank, and Elizabeth C. Hanson, *Multinationals in Contention: Responses at the Governmental and Intergovernmental Levels* (New York: The Conference Board, 1978); Richard L. Meritt and Elizabeth C. Hanson, *Science, Politics, and International Conferences: A Functional Analysis of the Moscow Political Science Congress* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1989).
[106] It is worth noting that there were a number of neglected IR women from the interwar period who did not exclude gender as an operational dynamic in these subjects. See Lucian Ashworth, "Feminism, War, and the Prospects for Peace: Helena Swanwick (1864-1939) and the Lost Feminists of Inter-War International Relations," *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 13:1 (March 2011): 25-43; Jan Stöckmann, "Women, wars, and world affairs: Recovering Feminist International Relations, 1915-1939," *Review of International Studies*, 44:2 (April 2018): 215-235. See Cynthia Enloe, *Bananas, Beaches and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International* Politics (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1990); *The Morning After: Sexual Politics at the End of the Cold War* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1993); J. Ann Tickner, *Gender in International Relations: Feminist Perspectives on Achieving Global Security* (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1992); "Feminist Perspectives on Peace and World Security in the Post-Cold War Era." in M. Klare, ed., *Peace and World Security Studies: A Curriculum Guide, 6th ed.,* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1994), 43-54; Christine Sylvester, *Feminist Theory and International Relations in a Postmodern Era* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1994); "Empathetic Cooperation: A Feminist Method for IR," *Millennium* 23(2) (1994):315-334.
[107] Here, I understand this professional function and socialization to include teaching and departmental or institutional dynamics.
[108] Cynthia Enloe, "Interview," 12 March, 2019, 27.
[109] Cynthia Enloe, *Ethnic Soldiers: State Security in a Divided Society* (London, UK: Penguin Books, 1980).
[110] Carol Cohn and Cynthia Enloe, "Conversation," 1193.
[111] Adrienne Rich, *Of Woman Born: Motherhood as Experience and Institution* (New York, NY: Norton, 1976).
[112] Carol Cohn and Cynthia Enloe, "Conversation," 1194.
[113] Cynthia Enloe, "Interview," 11; Cynthia Enloe, "Conversation," 1194.
[114] Cynthia Enloe, "Conversations," 1194.
[115] Cynthia Enloe, *Does Khaki Become You? The Militarization of Women's Lives* (London, UK: Pluto, 1983).
[116] Enloe has written about her experience of this case in different ways in two of her books: *Seriously! Investigating Crashes and Crises as if Women Actually Mattered* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2013), 19-38; *The Big Push: Exposing and Challenging Persistent Patriarchy* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2017).
[117] Cynthia Enloe, "Interview," 11.
[118] Cynthia Enloe, "Interview," 12.
[119] Cynthia Enloe, "Interview," 9-11.
[120] On its reception see Judith Hicks Stiehm, "Bananas, Beaches, and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics. Cynthia Enloe," *Signs*, 17:4 (1992): 825-829.
[121] J.Ann Tickner, "Interview," 19 February, 2019, 12. Gendered stereotypes about IR sub-fields such as Foreign Policy and Security exist to this day, although they do not necessarily map on to individual student's subject and career choices: Renee L. Buhr and Nicholas Sideras, "Finding the Invisible Women: Gender Stereotypes versus Student Interest in Foreign Policy and Security Subfields," *Political Science & Politics*, 48:3 (July 2015): 473-477.
[122] J. Ann Tickner, "Interview," 12.
[123] J. Ann Tickner, "Interview," 13.
[124] This was a chapter from Morgenthau's 1948 book *Politics Among Nations* (New York, NY: A.A. Knopf, 1948).
[125] J. Ann Tickner, *Politics Among Nations* (New York, 1948), 13
[126] Margot Light, "Interview," 14 February, 2019, 12. For an exploration of how this dynamic can operate when an academic, not necessarily a woman scholar, is the sole person to focus on gender analysis in their institutional setting see: Emily F. Henderson, 'On being the 'gender person' in an academic department: constructions, configurations and implications,' *Journal of Gender Studies*, 28:6, (2019) 730-742.
[127] J. Ann Tickner, "Interview," 14.
[128] See Margot Light and A.J.R. Groom, *International Relations: A Handbook of Current Theory* (London: UK: St Martins Press, 1986).

[129] Margot Light, "Interview,"15-16 .
[130] Margot Light, "Interview," 16.
[131] J. Ann Tickner, *Gender in International Relations.*
[132] J. Ann Tickner, "Interview," 23.
[133] J. Ann Tickner, "You Just Don't Understand: Troubled Engagements Between Feminists and IR Theorists," *International Studies Quarterly*, 41:4 (December 1997): 611.
[134] J. Ann Tickner, "You Just Don't Understand," 612.
[135] J. Ann Tickner, "You Just Don't Understand," 613.
[136] R.O. Keohane, "Beyond Dichotomy: Conversations Between International Relations and Feminist Theory," *International Studies Quarterly* 42 (1998): 193-198. Quote from 196-197.
[137] J. Ann. Tickner, "What Is Your Research Program? Some Feminist Answers to International Relations Methodological Questions," *International Studies Quarterly* 49:1 (2005): 1-21. See also, S. Reinharz, *Feminist Methods in Social Research*, (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1992): 243.
[138] J. Ann Tickner, "Interview," 24.