"Allowed to serve, not to speak"? The Role of Women in International Peace Activism, 1880-1920

Daniel Hucker

Abstract. As the twentieth century dawned, fledgling transnational networks of peace activists, including the International Peace Bureau and the Interparliamentary Union, grew in prominence, not least in Europe. Impetus came from the United States, notably via the Lake Mohonk conferences and emergent organisations like the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and the World Peace Foundation. Each group purported to speak on behalf of an inclusive and "international" public opinion, yet men dominated them all. This analysis considers the challenge and sustainment to this male dominance in the period from 1880 to 1920, exploring the intersection between existing peace groups and an emergent feminist pacifism. Peace activists of all stripes believed that public opinion's influence was growing, and most positioned themselves as representatives of an enlightened public sentiment; but the composition of this public sphere, and the space afforded within it for women, remained a site of contestation.

Peace advocacy, although not a new phenomenon, organised on an international scale only in the late nineteenth century. The international peace congresses of the 1840s and 1850s had shown

the way, and emergent currents of internationalism facilitated co-ordinated global activism as the twentieth century dawned. The creation of dedicated organisations occurred to promote international concord, notably the Interparliamentary Union – formed in 1889 – and the International Peace Bureau – established in 1892. The focal point of the global peace movement shifted into the twentieth century from Europe to North America, as new and wealthier groups like the World Peace Foundation and the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, both established in 1910, usurped their European forebears in importance and influence. All groups, old and new, shared one vital characteristic: men dominated and led them affording little agency to women: "pacifism, like militarism, was a man's world".[1] Women's peace activism, although usually welcomed and occasionally encouraged, was little more than an adjunct to the work undertaken by men. Although peace activists projected themselves as representatives of an emergent global public sentiment that opposed war, women's position within this international public was ill defined, and they often encountered resistance when trying to carve out a role. This analysis explores further the gendered dimensions of global peace activism as it emerged and developed during this period of both global war and fledgling transnationalism. Women's agency in peace work *did* increase between 1880 and 1920, but only in gendered ways that unsettled male supremacy without genuinely troubling it.

Tracing the place of women within the nineteenth century peace movement has occurred elsewhere. Women were "more than welcome" to participate in early peace societies – invariably national rather than international in composition – but their participation was rarely distinct, and women largely echoed the views of the male-led organisations.[2] Some scholars attach greater importance to the distinctiveness of sex, suggesting that peace societies recognised women's importance and created specific auxiliaries to accommodate them. Still, women saw their roles

confined to the private sphere, the public face of peace work remaining overwhelmingly male. At formal meetings, women "could only play the part of the public".[3] Women's marginalisation was apparent during the international peace congresses of the mid-nineteenth century. At the first meeting at London in 1843, women attended "only as wives accompanying their husbands".[4] Although in keeping with contemporary norms – America's female delegates famously found themselves barred from speaking at the 1840 World Anti-Slavery Convention in London, for example[5] – their exclusion exasperated many women. Following the 1849 Congress in Paris, the Quaker Annie Knight complained to the English radical, Richard Cobden, that women were confined to "sewing circles" whilst her "poor brother is groping his way in darkness without the good sense and clear discernment of his sister by his side".[6] That same year, the French socialist feminist, Jeanne Deroin, claimed that because all wars resulted from the "reign of men", only the empowerment of women could secure universal peace.[7] But women were far from empowered, confined instead to auxiliary positions; they were "seen, but not heard".[8] The proliferation of "Olive Leaf Circles" during the 1840s briefly energised women, but they remained peripheral. Accordingly, women were restricted to "fund-raising activities, petition drives, and moral support, [relegated] to subordinate roles, barred from public speaking, from committee membership, and from leadership".[9]

Male leadership of nineteenth century peace organisations is unsurprising, but as campaigns for equality gained traction, it was clear that men's dominance would not go unchallenged. Numerous organisations, both national and transnational, emerged with a view to furthering women's rights. The *Congrès international de droit des femmes* convened in Paris in 1878 marking the "first international women's congress".[10] By the early 1880s, encounters between British, American, and French women provided the catalyst for the formation of an

International Congress of Women [ICW] in 1888. Within this climate of "bustling internationalism" and ever increasing international travel by women, "peace was now visibly on the political agenda".[11] Even prior to this, efforts occurred to harness women's influence in support of peace. In March 1868, Marie Goegg called for a women's auxiliary to the Geneva-based *Ligue internationale de la paix et de la liberté*, resulting in the first "organized woman's peace society in Europe, the *Association internationale des Femmes*".[12] There was also discussion in the 1870s about establishing a "Women's International Peace Society", resulting in the creation in 1874 of the more modest but still significant "Women's Peace and Arbitration Auxiliary of the Peace Society".[13] Although the twin issues of peace and suffrage remained distinct, "the linkage between pacifist and feminist membership" from the 1870s was increasingly apparent.[14]

Such was the context by the time the International Peace Bureau [IPB] and Interparliamentary Union [IPU] formed in the late nineteenth century. Yet, despite women's enhanced visibility, men dominated these organisations and offered distinctly gendered appreciations of women's potential role. That the IPU was male-dominated is entirely understandable given that this body of sympathetic parliamentarians – chiefly from Europe and North America – *were* all men. Although the IPU was "one of the most significant experiments in the political scoping of internationalism",[15] its website acknowledges that it has "traditionally reflected in its ranks the low proportion and visibility of women in national politics".[16] The IPB, as a non-governmental organisation, could potentially be more inclusive. After all, as the veteran British pacifist Hodgson Pratt asserted in 1890, the fledgling Bureau "represents all men and women, whether in Parliament or out of it, who care for the progress of concord amongst mankind".[17] To be sure, from its inception, the IPB did seek women's active support and

participation. An 1892 "Appeal to Women's Organizations" circulated, based upon a resolution proposed at the 1890 London Congress by the English Quaker and pacifist, Priscilla Peckover. The appeal read,

> The Congress, in view of the vast moral and social influence of women urges upon every woman throughout the world to sustain, as wife, mother, sister, or citizen the things that make for peace; otherwise she incurs grave responsibility for the continuance of the systems of war and militarism, which not only desolate but corrupt the home life of nations. To concentrate and practically apply this influence, the Congress recommends that women should join societies propagating international peace.[18]

A further resolution proposed by the French activist, Maria Martin, at the 1892 Berne Congress, proclaimed, "women are and have always been the most sincere partisans of peace".[19]

Despite soliciting women's support, dominant – and eminently predictable – rhetorical tropes shrouded the IPB's appeal, emphasising women's role as mothers, sisters, wives, and daughters, suggesting that women, by virtue of their sex, were genetically predisposed towards peace. Such a gendered appreciation was not new. In 1883, the London-based International Arbitration and Peace Association [IAPA] sought to enlist "the services of women in all countries". Here, too, gendered stereotypes dictated the particular benefit that women's adhesion would bring, as "the influence of wives and mothers [would do] much to purify and elevate public opinion" on questions of war and peace.[20] Similar arguments were advanced by the *Société française pour l'arbitrage entre nations* that proclaimed that only women, as "mothers, sisters, wives and daughters", could eradicate "fratricidal struggles".[21] For the IPB, women constituted just one social group amongst several that might prove susceptible to propaganda, hence their 1892 appeal targeting:

> Old men, who know by experience that war provokes war,
>
> Young men, who refuse to serve as cannon fodder,
>
> Women, to whom the menace of war is a perpetual nightmare,
>
> Workmen in towns who seek security for tomorrow,
>
> Agricultural workers who depend on the harvest.
>
> Let us all raise our voices to heaven in one great shout that may be summed up in the single word: **"Peace!"**[22]

Women, perceived as a homogenous totality, were thus just one section of a global society, alongside other sections comprised predominantly of men. A crude and deeply gendered appreciation of women prevailed, holding that they shared an innate attachment to peace chiefly by virtue of their biological sex.

Hence, it was not uncommon for peace propaganda to focus on the unconverted, the "prominent men" as Pratt explained to the 1891 Universal Peace Congress, the "leading men" of the future who would someday be capable of effecting meaningful change.[23] He suggested targeting universities, as campuses provided fertile ground where peace propaganda might take hold within impressionable young minds. The annual gatherings in favour of international arbitration hosted at Lake Mohonk, in New York State, first meeting in 1895, also employed the tactic of targeting men of current or future influence. Its organisers sought to exploit the "great interest in this most important topic" by educating influential men in the spheres of business, politics, academia, and journalism. Within the lists of delegates to the Mohonk conferences, women's names were conspicuous for their almost total absence. Many women *did* attend, but chiefly in a social capacity; as Albert Smiley, who founded the conference with his half-brother Daniel, made clear, "it has always been my custom to include in the invitation the wives of

men".[24] Few women attended in an official capacity and the overwhelming majority of speakers were male. The gendered separation of spheres was firmly entrenched.

However, women, too, were often complicit in perpetuating gendered stereotypes, not least when proclaiming that they embodied a more profound and natural pacifism than men. Ellen Robinson of the women's auxiliary of the British Peace Society emphasised women's peculiar attachment to peace in an 1895 appeal from "the women of England to their French sisters". Women's tendency to exalt war required eradication, she insisted, exposing militarism as a "mere chimera" and a "barbaric anachronism". "There is not", continued Robinson, "a woman who, as a mother or teacher, [can] refuse to work for this great reform".[25] Furthermore, women's "natural" affiliation to peace occasionally lent them a privileged position within the movement. For instance, British women were able to express anti-war positions during the second Boer War – 1899-1902 without being physically targeted, as their male counterparts frequently were, by jingoistic mobs.[26] Simply put, greater toleration of women's anti-war activism existed; vilified and emasculated, men who opposed war had their virility questioned.

British women certainly protested the Second Boer War vocally. Robinson alerted the 1900 Universal Peace Congress in Paris to a recent protest of 5,000 women in northern England against their government's prosecution of the war in the Transvaal.[27] Nevertheless, most of these women activists were doctrinal pacifists, often Quakers like Peckover and Robinson who had longstanding connexions with the existing peace groups. The newer organisations established to further women's rights operated in a largely separate sphere. The ICW had existed since 1888, but 16 years later its president, May Wright Sewall, could only assume that the IPB's leadership "know something of the society", indicating how infrequently the two organisations liaised.[28] Indeed, there is little direct correspondence between the two groups to be found in the IPB's

archive in Geneva; the ICW did write to Élie Ducommun, secretary of the IPB, ahead of the 1899 meeting of the ICW's Executive Committee to invite Bureau participation, but only to reiterate that the Bureau's representative "must be a woman". Ultimately, the Bureau nominated Robinson, who was already attending the Congress, to go on its behalf.[29] As late as 1911, Wright Sewall wrote to Albert Gobat, Ducommun's successor, "it would be well [for the ICW] to have presented at your Congress in Berne", as women's organisations were well placed to promote "mutual acquaintance, friendship and cooperation".[30]

This is not to say that the IPB overlooked women's potential contribution. The 1903 Universal Peace Congress featured a detailed report on peace propaganda, including a section on work undertaken by women's societies. It recalled the nineteenth century "Olive Leaf Circles", noting how 150 such organisations had existed at one time. Since then, numerous other women's groups had emerged, many in England – the Women's Peace and Arbitration Association, the Ladies Peace Society of Wisbech, the Ladies Liverpool Peace Association, and the Women's Committee of the IAPA. Some were based in France – the *Ligue des Femmes pour la Paix* and the *Union Universelle des Femmes contre la guerre* – and more in America – although only one was mentioned, the Peace Department of the National Women's Christian Temperance Union. It noted further noted how, since 1889, women's peace work had featured regularly as a subject of discussion at their Universal Congresses.[31] These discussions continued to couch women's participation in ways that stressed their unique and inherent attachment to peace, but the IPB was not alone in succumbing to crudely gendered stereotypes. The ILPL's fourth national peace congress in Grenoble in 1906 urged women to join their organisation, claiming that the movement was doomed to fail without their adhesion as their "role in society" and "influence in the home" rendered women "the best architects of world peace".[32]

Women also appeared as useful conduits of peace propaganda. The 1906 Universal Peace Congress in Milan implored "specially qualified women" to continue an "active propaganda of pacifism among women generally", especially amongst the young.[33] The 1908 Congress, meeting in London, was notable for the participation of the influential Austrian pacifist Bertha von Suttner. Von Suttner had always prioritised peace work over women's rights,[34] but now acknowledged that the two campaigns were complementary. Furthermore, she appealed "as a woman myself" to others of her sex to join the "rising forces" that will inevitably see peace prevail.[35] But for von Suttner, like many women who had long associated with the male-led movement, women must work alongside men rather than independently of them. Von Suttner had always been part of the "centrist mainstream of international pacifism . . . indeed, she helped to fashion it". When asked to pen an article examining "peace from a woman's point of view", she was explicit in asserting that she saw little difference between women's attitudes and men's.[36]

Another speaker at the London Congress, the vice-president of the French-based *Association de la paix et le désarmement par les femmes*, Emma Mackenty, insisted that women were not trying to usurp men but, rather, to act as "the tender collaborators of men in all their efforts to improve the world".[37] At the same Congress, the Countess of Aberdeen reminded women of their complicity in militarism, claiming that "a great deal of the responsibility for the war spirit" rests with them. Challenging the perception that women were natural proponents of peace, she suggested that previous experiences of conflict demonstrated that women were too often "the most ready to buckle on the armour of those who were near and dear to them".[38] Others felt it necessary to divorce the issues of peace and suffrage entirely. The veteran Swedish pacifist, Ellen Key, told the 1910 Congress in Stockholm that suffrage was secondary to peace

work. Hence, women – and mothers especially – must ally themselves with those men working in existing global peace organisations; their "supreme task" to use the moral weight of their maternal instinct for peace to usher in a profound change in global public opinion.[39]

The Lake Mohonk group was similarly intent on creating a global public sentiment in favour of resolving international disputes peacefully. To do so, men remained the principal target of their outreach efforts, notably businessmen.[40] Their attempts at greater inclusivity also remained male-centric, acknowledging the potential role of the increasingly politicised labouring class. The group's secretary, H.C. Phillips, acknowledged his organisation's previous shortcomings in this regard, explaining to the Boston pacifist Edwin Mead that considerable sections of the conference were "opposed to the introduction of the representatives of labor". However, Phillips was more amenable. As he wrote to another correspondent in 1906, "I personally am especially anxious to see them represented".[41] Phillips wrote to Albert Smiley in early 1906 that the inclusion of working men was essential for the Lake Mohonk conference to be truly representative. "The business man, the professions, and in fact practically every other class is represented", he remarked, "and if the conference is too strict regarding workingmen, it will antagonize them when it really needs their help".[42] The help of women seemed rarely solicited and never considered a necessary pre-requisite of genuine inclusiveness and representation. Nevertheless, the Mohonk group *did* invite the participation of the ICW. In 1903, Sewall thanked Smiley for providing "the opportunity of meeting so many advocates of Arbitration, and promoters of Peace", reminding him also that the ICW facilitated regular contact "with representative women of many nationalities and first engaging and then uniting their interests in this movement".[43]

Still, the Mohonk conference continued to prioritise the adhesion of men as they sought

greater international representation. In 1909, Phillips told Nicholas Murray Butler, the president of Columbia University, that their initiatives were "starting now to interest distinguished foreigners", noting specifically the IPU's Lord Weardale and the French pacifist and former statesman, Baron Paul d'Estournelles de Constant.[44] Four years later, still seeking enhanced international collaboration, Phillips asked Murray Butler to suggest suitable "gentlemen from other nations".[45] Whilst welcoming women's participation at their conferences, the Mohonk group clearly favoured the collaboration of men. Whilst possibly inadvertent, the not unreasonable conviction that men wielded more political and diplomatic influence also doubtless motivated it. An idea had crystallised in the first decade of the twentieth century that the recent successes of the international peace movement – notably The Hague Conferences of 1899 and 1907 – owed much to the close co-operation of international *men* of influence. As the secretary of the IPU, Christian Lange, noted in March 1912, "an elite of international men" had recently emerged, constituting a transnational network linking the IPU to other prominent national and international peace bodies, ensuring maximum exposure for their programme.[46]

Women struggled to penetrate these fledgling transnational networks of predominantly male activists and found themselves consistently having to alert others to their existence and potential. In August 1912 the prominent American lawyer and pacifist, Belva Lockwood, wrote to a Danish IPU member, Fredrik Bajer – and his wife Matilda – alerting them to the presence in America of a "Women's Republic" consisting of some 100,000 members and committed to using education to promote peace, arbitration, and woman suffrage, "everything which has a tendency to uplift humanity".[47] It was an example of a growing propensity to emphasise the links between pacifism and suffrage. In 1913, when the Peace Section of the International Women's Congress met in Budapest, it was asserted that only the "political vote will enable [women] to exercise real

influence in the conduct of public affairs".[48] Once able to exert meaningful influence, women's natural proclivity for peace would come to the fore. Yet, even as stressing the suffrage-peace nexus more plainly, gendered conceptions of women's predisposition to peace prevailed. A 1913 leaflet issued by the *Alliance Belge des Femmes pour la Paix par l'Education* prophesied a future European conflagration, noting with horror the blood then spilt and the bodies currently piling up in the Balkan Wars. Reflecting the persistence of the dominant representations of women as mothers, wives and daughters, it was proclaimed, "women cannot want those whom we love to be sent to the slaughterhouse".[49]

Another position permitting women to fulfil was that of educators, which figured prominently in the conceptualisation of their activism by a new organisation, the Boston-based World Peace Foundation [WPF] established in 1910. The WPF was, in essence, simply a new name for "The International School for Peace" – although its rebranding as the WPF did bring with it more financial clout and impetus. Given its previous incarnation, it is unsurprising that the WPF continued to prioritise education.[50] Still, whilst women might have been encouraged to carry out their duties as teachers and nurturers, the WPF held that only men could effect substantive change. "Especially must our young men be enlisted", remarked the WPF's founder, Edwin Ginn, "young men in colleges and elsewhere". The entire success of their initiatives, he continued, was contingent upon "the cooperation of vigorous young men who can devote their whole lives to carrying it forward".[51] The WPF did not entirely overlook, however, the role that women could play. In 1911, they reprinted an article penned by the former American president, William Taft – published originally in *Women's Home Companion* – imploring women to use their influence in favour of the ratification of America's arbitration treaties with France and Britain. Women, argued Taft, suffered more deeply from war than men. No amount of money

could compensate a lost husband, father, or son, and the "glory of death in battle does not feed the orphaned children". Given their unique suffering, continued Taft, it was only natural that women "should speak for peace".[52] A handful of proactive women also undertook prominent work within the WPF, notably Lucia Ames Mead and Anna Sturges Duryea. The latter was particularly active in enlisting the support of women's organisations across the United States, and the WPF noted in 1912 the growing influence of such societies. By April that year, women's groups comprised nearly one million members nationwide, "their social and educative work [becoming] an element of great significance in the life of the country".[53]

Another American-based peace organisation to emerge in 1910 was the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace [CEIP], based in New York. This group quickly established itself as the leading international peace movement because of its vast wealth, deriving from the financial largesse of its benefactor, the industrialist Andrew Carnegie. Cultivating a favourable international public opinion was central to the Endowment's ambitions. At a meeting of the Board of Trustees in November 1913, much discussion centred on efforts to inculcate the public with ideas of peace and arbitration, concluding that initiatives should focus on "the leading men" within society. In essence, they must educate that small, global élite of men who had a direct impact on international affairs. This appeared to be the line favoured by Carnegie, who lamented discussion of trivialities when the pressing need was to "take the most direct means of abolishing what I consider the greatest crime that man commits, the killing of man by man".[54] This more focused ambition enabled the Endowment, as Murray Butler, by now a leading figure within the CEIP, noted in early 1914, to transcend "ephemeral manifestations of sentiment" and instead initiate a deeper "process of moral and intellectual education of a sound international opinion".[55]

As with the older European organisations, the WPF and CEIP focused their propaganda

and education initiatives overwhelmingly – although never exclusively – on men. Women could play their part – heard as well as seen – but their status remained predicated upon traditional, gendered assumptions that largely confined them to restricted spheres. The outbreak of general European war in 1914, however, provided an opportunity for feminist pacifists to carve out a distinct and more autonomous position. This opportunity stemmed chiefly from the failure of existing male-led societies to respond adequately to the challenge of war. The IPB, dominated by French-speaking Swiss – with a Belgian president, Henri La Fontaine – immediately decided that Prussian militarism needed eclipsing before countenancing talk of peace. The slim history of the IPB merely states that the Bureau was "split" over the Great War, some advocating an immediate cessation of hostilities, others adopting an explicitly anti-German stance.[56] The reality, however, is that the IPB leadership resolutely opposed a mediated settlement and insisted that Germany must be defeated. Responding to inquiries from Dutch pacifists as to the prospects of mediation by neutral Powers, the IPB's Henri Golay asserted that the Bureau could hardly maintain neutrality given Germany's "flagrant violation of the [Bureau's] principles". Despite positing this as an "entirely personal" consideration, Golay's position was widely shared by European peace activists, certainly within the belligerent nations. As J.F. Green of the IAPA averred, "It is of no use to talk of peace till Prussian militarism has been crushed".[57]

Ergo, the IPB's official stance was relative inaction. A circular issued in 1915 stated that intellectuals affiliated to the Bureau must not seek a negotiated settlement. "That is beyond your power", it noted. "It is in the power of men to avoid wars, but once war has been let loose it is beyond your power to shorten it. *Your only course is to hold aloof from the slough of hate*".[58] This version of staying aloof was, nonetheless, flagrantly partisan. As the French pacifist, Gaston Moch, wrote to La Fontaine, an Allied victory "will mean the triumph of the fundamental ideas

of pacifism", whereas German victory would result in militarism's triumph and the "oppression" of Europe.[59] Staying aloof without seeking to end the war was also the stance adopted by the CEIP in New York. Murray Butler informed French and British peace activists that whilst the CEIP sympathised with their predicament, "all propaganda had been stopped" – and with it funds – as "the war is doing more than we could and we must keep all our resources for binding up afterwards".[60] Elihu Root, former American secretary of State and current president of the CEIP, concurred, suggesting that the war might even be "one of the necessary steps" on the path to peace, as "only through such a terrible lesson and such a dreadful experience was it possible for certain of the distempers to be worked out of the body of civilization".[61]

It was in this context that an International Congress of Women met at The Hague in April 1915, an apparent illustration of women's greater willingness to embrace both mediation and internationalism. Indeed, the prominent American activist, Jane Addams, noting the "masculine arrangement of the existing Peace Societies", asserted in December 1914 "while I believe that men and women work best together on these public measures, there is no doubt that at this crisis the women are more eager for action".[62] This is not to say that *all* men avoided the topic of a negotiated settlement of the Great War, and there was certainly an appetite for mediation in neutral countries. The IPU's Lange, a Norwegian, hoped to do "some useful work in spite of the difficulties", if only to "focus public opinion" on the need to establish new foundations for international relations.[63] In America, too, the CEIP had not retreated entirely into isolation. At the first meeting of the trustees after war broke out, Murray Butler looked back wistfully at the "high water mark" of their European efforts to date: the international gathering of peace activists held in Paris in June 1914. The subsequent and catastrophic descent into war had altered the landscape irreparably, confronting peace activists with two choices: either "helplessness and

despair" or striving to continue the "co-operation of some of the very best men of the world" to ensure that, from the horrors of war, a more "constructive international peace" would emerge.

Still, the possibility of any immediate action soon disappeared. The veteran former diplomat, Joseph Choate, contended, "the public opinion of the world is perfectly well known", the vast majority of right-minded people supporting the allies in their righteous crusade against Prussian militarism. Although few were as ardently anti-German as Choate, the conviction prevailed that the Endowment must avoid meddling. As Carnegie himself concluded, "the part of wisdom is silence".[64] The IPU, however, continued to urge action, Lange noting in early 1915, "there will be several initiatives started in the same direction" likely to produce "results of a regrettable nature if not guided by the prudent counsels of men of a responsible standing".[65] Others were more melancholy, notably Murray Butler. He was now convinced that "our old machinery has broken down and that our old methods are futile", leaving no option but to "await the end of hostilities and [only] then to try and find new and constructive methods by which to build up a lasting structure of peace".[66] The apparent impotence of the peace movement was a source of frustration and despair. In April 1915, Murray Butler lamented how the outbreak of war had left the CEIP's Division of Intercourse and Education – which he headed – "more or less crushed", their previous efforts to cultivate "close contact of the public opinion of the world" counting for nothing. The activities of the CEIP's European Center at Paris were still more subdued, its entire male staff called to arms leaving only a skeleton administrative structure intact.[67]

Of course, others were not inactive, notably those women meeting at The Hague. Within the papers of the IPB, the IPU, the WPF, and the CEIP, this gathering barely warrants a mention and certainly features less prominently than an earlier gathering at The Hague orchestrated by

men. At this meeting, organised by the Dutch peace movement, representatives of Austria-Hungary, Belgium, Germany, Britain, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, and Switzerland, established a "Central Organisation for a Durable Peace". Preparing for a lasting peace was the sole purpose of this meeting – "everything which might divert attention from this problem", such as discussing immediate peace terms, remained purposely omitted.[68] This was perhaps the key difference – by advocating an immediate cessation of hostilities, the women's gathering went further than their male counterparts were prepared to go. As the well-known British feminist and pacifist, Emily Hobhouse, noted in her foreword to the published version of the "Report" of the 1915 Hague gathering, the International Congress of Women had "unfurled the white flag of peace and – despite the ridicule, disdain, opposition, and disbelief held it aloft before a bloodstained world".[69]

The men, by contrast, sought restraint. "The general impression", remarked Murray Butler in October 1915 "is that we should keep out of anything that looks like agitation for peace in the present war".[70] Communications between women activists and the wider peace movement emphasised strongly that women were potentially more capable and more inclined to bring about a negotiated settlement. In September 1915, Jeanne van Lanscot Hubrecht of the International Council of Women for Permanent Peace wrote to the IPB's Golay demanding that an "impartial neutral conference work towards a settlement without waiting to be officially asked by the belligerents". Women, she continued, were more likely than men to support such a conference given their greater internationalism.[71] D'Estournelles de Constant appeared to agree, admitting readily that women's more overt condemnation of the war showed that they were more courageous than him and that women, more than men, "will repair the disasters of this war".[72]

Not all reactions to the women's initiatives were positive, even within pacifist circles.

Indeed, allegedly inaccurate representations of their Hague Congress published in IPB publications upset many women. Hobhouse complained to Golay that the IPB's magazine, *Le mouvement pacifiste*, failed to convey "the width & depth of the movement", not least by neglecting to mention that three British women *did* attend, and that 180 more had applied for passports. Miss M.H. Huntsman, assistant secretary of the National Peace Council, one of many British women denied transit by the British government, told the IPB's Emma Montandon how it was "very disappointing that no communications were possible . . . between this country and Holland".[73] The intimation was also that the IPB failed to represent accurately the spirit of The Hague gathering. According to Hobhouse, those who had attended were unanimous in asserting, "the spirit of the Congress was excellent & sympathy and understanding increased each day".[74] Another writer noted that whilst no French representatives had attended, "a very sympathetic letter was received from a group of French feminists".[75]

This is not to say, however, that women always operated independently of the male-led organisations. As Addams noted, the Woman's Peace Party of America had received "a great deal of free literature from the Carnegie Foundation".[76] The IPB also acknowledged the role that women could play within the movement, even one constrained in its ability to undertake anything tangible by the current war. In July 1916, La Fontaine discussed the need to educate public opinion on an international level, requiring the harnessing of forces above and beyond the committed pacifists – students, teachers, the working classes, *and* women, who had already begun coalescing into peace-oriented organisations, needed to be exploited more fully.[77] It is striking, nevertheless, that women featured only peripherally within an emergent conception of an increasingly influential – and international – public sphere. After all, as one of the delegates to the 1915 International Women's Congress noted, "Public opinion all over the civilized world is

now created by women as well as by men, and therefore war, or rather the impossibility of war in future, must be influenced by women also".[78]

It could even be suggested that the lack of women's influence hitherto had contributed to the present calamity. D'Estournelles de Constant suggested in 1916 that Europe's fate would have been very different had "the voices of mothers not been deliberately stifled" by a "despotic tradition" that conditioned the diplomatic response to the events of summer 1914.[79] This all speaks to a growing belief during the war years that the will of the people would thereafter exert a far greater influence over foreign policy-makers. Root predicted that "the principles of popular government in the world" would now take hold; hence, peace advocates must endeavour to "inform the minds and educate the attitude of this great new sovereign that is taking charge of foreign affairs".[80] Whether this "great new sovereign" included women was unclear. In November 1916, d'Estournelles de Constant was convinced that women and the working classes would emerge as the "great beneficiaries of the war", the former no longer dismissed as the "weak sex" and the latter no longer viewed as mere "cannon fodder".[81] Yet, within the post-war peace movement as a whole, with the future role of women rarely discussed, considerations of how to inform public opinion remained framed, almost exclusively, in terms of men educating men. On 22 November 1918, Lange urged Murray Butler to visit Europe, the time being ripe for "energetic action" in a bid to "take the lead in the international movement". Lange again referred explicitly to the need for "prominent men" from all nations to constitute "an informal meeting of the General Staff of the movement, the different organisations to be represented in the first line".[82]

The militaristic trappings of his rhetoric are significant and demonstrate the simple expectation that men would retain their leadership roles. In December 1918, when discussing the

"host of new societies and organisations [that] have sprung into existence during the war", Lange again made no reference to any women's groups and instead singled out the Central Organization for a Durable Peace as the most noteworthy.[83] That women's voices faced marginalisation in the coming peace settlement troubled many, and in the United States, Jeannette Rankin, a Republican member of the House of Representatives – and the first American woman to hold federal office – wrote directly to a senior State Department official, Henry White, to vent her concerns. "[T]here is a possibility of this Peace Conference being made up on the assumption that the world is inhabited by men and men only", she wrote, "so may I plead with you . . . to keep in mind that there are women in the world and that they have an interest in the world's affairs".[84] D'Estournelles de Constant was a rare example of a male activist who called repeatedly for women's voices to be heard. Noting how, in France, women had rendered substantial national service whilst the men were under arms, he urged America's President Woodrow Wilson to ensure that they would contribute to the peace settlement.[85] In a letter of 20 January 1919, he argued stridently that women merited a greater status within the post-war order. "The women have done much to finish the war by a just and durable peace", he insisted, yet women found themselves excluded from the peace-making itself. Recalling Virgil, d'Estournelles de Constant termed this device "*Sic vos non vobis*". "They have no seat at the conference", he continued, "no seat at the council of the Society of Nations. They have been allowed to serve, not to speak".[86]

Others also hoped that women might acquire positions of influence in Paris. Marguerite de Witt Schlumberger, president of the *Union Française pour le Suffrage des Femmes*, wrote to White requesting that "the women of the world, more than half its population", sought means through which "their needs and opinions" could be made known to the delegates.[87] The same

group also appealed directly to Wilson, noting how women from countries that were yet to adopt woman suffrage – including France – remained voiceless and "therefore in no way represented at the Peace Congress". Given that "women constitute one half of humanity", and that, as mothers especially, "have both moral and material interests to guard", they pleaded with the president to appoint a Commission of Women to investigate "conditions and legislation concerning women and children throughout the world".[88] Not all women, however, were convinced that their reputation as natural peacemakers had merit. Writing on behalf of the Women's International League [WIL] campaign to end the Allied blockade of the Central Powers, Helena Swanwick acknowledged that some British women – "I have met them" – remained so indoctrinated by the "hymn of hate" that they actually "wish German babies to die". "I doubt whether they mean it", remarked Swanwick, "or whether the wish would survive a visit to the Cologne children's hospital".[89] An accompanying leaflet, "Food and Justice", illustrated nonetheless how the WIL continued to emphasise women's uniquely gendered roles, women seen as ideally placed to "care for the children of Europe . . . to bind up and staunch the gaping wounds of war and to cleanse the corruption of hatred from all hearts".[90]

Debates around women's complicity in war and militarism notwithstanding, it was widely held that the post-war world would be predicated upon an increasingly powerful public sphere, and one, moreover, that had widened considerably since the recent conflict. Lange was thus critical of the projected League of Nations Covenant for failing to represent fully the "will of the people". To remedy this shortcoming, groups like the IPU needed to seize the initiative. Lange remarked that the "extreme weariness, we might even call it apathy, which characterizes public opinion" was forgivable in light of the "superhuman effort" of the war and provided fertile ground in which ideas of peace could take hold and flourish.[91] The resultant peace

settlement – and the League of Nations – certainly enhanced women's opportunities for participating in international affairs, but they remained on the margins of the international peace movement. Some recognised this fact and urged adaptation. Carl Heath of the British National Peace Council noted in March 1919 that the pre-1914 movement had effectively ceased to exist and no longer represented a movement that had changed profoundly. Many of the pre-war societies were now dead or moribund, he remarked, and the "strong new ones", like the "great parallel movements of women, of International Socialism, and of the newer pacifism born of the war [lacked] any organic relation to the Bureau".[92] But there remained stubborn resistance. As the IPB's Golay stated to Heath, "I do not think it is advantageous to confuse us with feminism, socialism, etc. All these movements are related to ours, certainly, and we sympathize with their objectives. Nevertheless, one can be an excellent pacifist without being a partisan of communism or statism".[93]

In short, the IPB wanted to return to how things had been before the war and was thus slow to acknowledge the new directions that peace activism had taken. This course arguably contributed to the IPB's post-war demise. The Berne Bureau was intended to facilitate internationalism, international exchange, and cross-border dialogue and discussion – its *raison d'être*. Nonetheless, internationalism had gathered pace in the early years of the twentieth century, and women's groups were at the vanguard. Even before the war, women had been keen to emphasise the necessity of cultivating an "international mind" in pursuit of universal peace. During the war and after, the Women's International League showcased the possibilities of transnational activism and did so without the support of those societies and organisations that had dominated international peace activism prior to 1914. An early in-house history of this organisation – with the appropriate sub-title "A Venture in Internationalism" – noted how 137

delegates from 21 countries had assembled at Zurich in May 1919, and that this Congress "was thus able to be the first international body to condemn this 'peace'".[94] It is striking, too, that women themselves recognised that their conception of peace remained peripheral. In her presidential address to the Zurich Congress, Addams noted how, throughout the war years, women in every country "have represented a small group which found itself opposed to the full tide of public opinion and of governmental action. And yet this very isolation, resulting in similar experiences, produced a certain fellowship between these scattered groups which has been made very clear to us during the past week".[95] Clearly, this transnational "maternal unity was a particularly effective rhetorical device", allowing women in the immediate post-war period to build bridges between the belligerent nations that their male counterparts were either unwilling or unable to do.[96]

Much had changed since the emergence of a genuinely transnational peace movement in the final decades of the nineteenth century. The movement had failed to prevent the calamity of the 1914-1918 war, but its influence on the post-war settlement was clear. A new era had been ushered in; the volatile balance of power replaced by a seemingly more stable League of Nations capable of preventing a repetition of the recent slaughter. Diplomatic norms had also shifted, the "old" diplomacy of secret alliances being usurped – or so it seemed – by more open procedures conducted in the full glare of publicity and accountable to an expanded, progressive, and influential public sphere. Moreover, in many western countries, this public sphere now included millions of newly enfranchised women. The peace movement, too, had changed, evolving from a small core of religious, doctrinal pacifists to a more secular and far-reaching movement that appealed to broad constituencies of opinion. Yet, most changes were at best superficial. The Paris Peace Conference, dominated by men making decisions behind closed doors, bore all the

hallmarks of its nineteenth century antecedents. Dogged by petty nationalistic rivalries and posturing, it failed to include the vanquished Powers, and America's refusal to join the League of Nations undermined, from the start, the chief mechanism for enforcing the terms of peace. The official sphere of diplomacy and that of international relations scholarship – a burgeoning industry in the post-First World War years[97] – remained dominated by men. The input and influence of women was certainly growing, but they still had to fall back on gendered articulations of peace, rooted in feminised metaphors that distinguished and marginalised them from the masculine realm of international relations.

Not only diplomacy remained a man's world. Whilst the peace movement became "increasingly secular, scientific, and international, the decision-making core of pacifists on both sides of the Atlantic remained exclusively male".[98] The movement had consistently failed to embrace women's participation fully, restricting them to gendered roles of secondary importance. In the aftermath of the Great War, women were visible and increasingly making themselves heard, but men's dominance of the movement was disturbed only slightly. More work was required if women's agency in peace activism was to have a more substantial impact on international relations, but there was scope for optimism. The American activist Emily Balch reminded the 1921 Congress of Women in Vienna that the "good will of women is like a vast current, which largely runs to waste". This situation must be remedied, she proclaimed, as women's "complete internationalism [and] extraordinary moral unity gives us a special opportunity to influence events".[99] Indeed, during the interwar period, women considered themselves uniquely placed to advance peace, the necessary rapprochement between peoples – particularly between French and Germans – being a "specifically feminine task" given women's "pacifist nature".[100] It is beyond the scope of this analysis to assess the success or otherwise of

women's peace efforts in the years to follow, but let us allow Balch the final word: "We already have more power than we ourselves realize and far more than we have yet fully learned to use. Great opportunities of usefulness lie ahead of us if we will but use them".[101]

Notes

[1] Dagmar Wernitznig, "Living Peace, Thinking Equality: Rosika Schwimmer's (1877-1948) War on War", in Bruna Bianchi and Geraldine Ludbrook, eds., *Living War, Thinking Peace (1914-1924): Women's Experiences, Feminist Thought, and International Relations* (Newcastle, 2016), 128.

[2] Sandi E. Cooper, "The Work of Women in Nineteenth Century Peace Movements", *Peace & Change*, 9/4(1983), 12-13.

[3] W.H. van der Linden, *The International Peace Movement, 1815-1874* (Amsterdam, 1987), 171.

[4] Jill Liddington, *The Long Road to Greenham: Feminism and Anti-Militarism in Britain since 1820* (London, 1989), 16.

[5] Leila J. Rupp, *Worlds of Women: The Making of an International Women's Movement* (Princeton, NJ, 1997), 14.

[6] Cited in Bonnie S. Anderson, *Joyous Greetings: The First International Women's Movement, 1830-1860* (Oxford, 2000), 134.

[7] Van der Linden, *International Peace Movement*, 361.

[8] Sandi E. Cooper, *Patriotic Pacifism: Waging War on War in Europe, 1815-1914* (Oxford, 1991), 22.

[9] Anderson, *Joyous Greetings*, 134. Martin Ceadel, *Semi-Detached Idealists: The British Peace Movement and International Relations, 1854-1945* (Oxford, 2000), 30; Liddington, *Long Road to Greenham*, 14 discuss the "Olive Leaf Circles".

[10] Rupp, *Worlds of Women*, 14.

[11] Liddington, *Long Road to Greenham*, 35.

[12] Cooper, "Work of Women", 16. As Cooper notes, the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian War soon cut short the life of this group.

[13] Liddington, *Long Road to Greenham*, 24.

[14] Cooper, "Work of Women", 17-18.

[15] Glenda Sluga, *Internationalism in the Age of Nationalism* (Philadelphia, PAZ, 2013), 12.

[16] Inter-Parliamentary Union: http://archive.ipu.org/wmn-e/meeting.htm.

[17] "Proceedings of the Universal Peace Congress, London, 14-19 July 1890 – opening address by Hodgson Pratt", SCPC [International Peace Bureau Papers, Swarthmore College Peace Collection, Swarthmore, PA] Box 3a.

[18] International Peace Bureau, "Appel aux Associations des Dames", 12 May 1892, IPB [Papers of the International Peace Bureau, United Nations Office, Geneva] First period, 144/1.

[19] Resolution proposed by Mme Maria Martin, IPB First period, 58/6, Berne Congress, 1892.

[20] Third Annual Report of the IAPA and report of their Annual Meeting, London, 23 July 1883, SCPC Papers of the International Arbitration and Peace Association.

[21] Société française pour l'arbitrage entre nations, "Appel aux Femmes!", [circa 1892], IPB First period, 117/1.

[22] IPB, "Appel aux peoples pour un pétionnement universel en faveur de la Paix", 26 août 1892, [original emphasis], IPB First period, 117/2.

[23] "Projet de Conférence Internationale et Annuelle entre les Membres des Diverses Universités: Mémoire présentée au Congrès International de la Paix tenu à Rome en novembre, 1891", [Hodgson Pratt], IPB First period, 8/7.

[24] Smiley to Emmott [Baltimore], 16 November 1895, SCPC Lake Mohonk Papers Box A1.

[25] "Les femmes d'Angleterre à leurs sœurs de France", 28 April 1895, IPB First period, 144/2. Robinson sent this appeal to Élie Ducommun at the Berne Bureau, who assisted her in getting it published across France. This initiative seemingly paved the way for the formation of the *Union internationale des femmes pour la paix*, a "Paris-London axis" led by Robinson and Eugénie Pontonié-Pierre, although dominated by the former. See Sandi E. Cooper, "French Feminists and Pacifism, 1889-1914: The Evolution of New Visions", *Peace & Change*, 36/1(2011), 11.

[26] Eliza Riedi, "The women pro-Boers: gender, peace and the critique of empire in the South African war", *Historical Research*, 86/231(2012), 110.

[27] Paris Congress, 1900, Message transmitted by Miss Ellen Robinson, IPB First period, 8/7.

[28] Sewall to Ducommun, 15 January 1904, IPB First period, 144/5.

[29] Wilson to Ducommun, 22 April 1899, IPB First period, 144/5; "Procès-verbal des Séances de la Commission des 5 et 6 mai 1899 à Berne", IPB First period, 8/1.

[30] Sewall to Gobat, 4 April 1911, IPB First period, 144/5.

[31] IPB, "Rapport sur l'exécution des résolutions des Congrès de la Paix relatives à la propagande", 30 août 1903, IPB First period, 58/6.

[32] "Discours de la président provisoire du Comité de la Ligue Internationale de la Paix et de la Liberté, Section d'Isére, au 4ème Congrès National de la Paix, Grenoble, 18 août 1906", IPB First period, 118/10.

[33] IPB, "Circular to the Peace Societies", 7 February 1907, IPB First period, 103/1.

[34] See Laurie R. Cohen, "'Fighting for Peace Amid Paralyzed Popular Opinion': Bertha von Suttner's and Rosa Mayreder's Pacifist-Feminist Insights on Gender, War and Peace", in Bianchi and Ludbrook, *Living War, Thinking Peace,* 108-22, for more on von Suttner's gravitation towards the organised feminist movement

[35] "Report of Proceedings at the Seventeenth Universal Congress of Peace, London, 26 July-1 August 1908", Von Suttner speech, 28 July 1908, IPB First period, 106/8.

[36] Sandi E. Cooper, "Women's Participation in European Peace Movements: The Struggle to Prevent World War I", in Ruth Roach Pierson, ed., *Women and Peace: Theoretical, Historical and Practical Perspectives* (London, 1987), 66.

[37] "Report of Proceedings at the Seventeenth Universal Congress of Peace, London, 26 July-1 August 1908", Mackenty speech, 29 July 1908, IPB First period, 106/8.

[38] Countess of Aberdeen speech, 31 July 1908, Ibid.

[39] "XVIIIme Congrès Universel de la Paix à Stockholm (1910): Résumé d'un discours de Ellen Key, 'La femme et la question de la paix'", IPB First period, 112/1.

[40] See Phillips to Novicow, 8 January 1903, Phillips to Carnegie, 24 January 1903, both SCPC Lake Mohonk Papers Box A2.

[41] Phillips to Mead, 8 February 1906, Phillips to Maynard, 9 February 1906, both SCPC Lake Mohonk Papers Box A6.

[42] Phillips to Smiley, 9 February 1906, Ibid.

[43] Sewall to Smiley, 20 July 1903, SCPC Lake Mohonk Papers, Series III, Box 20.

[44] Phillips to Murray Butler, 24 September 1909, SCPC, Lake Mohonk Papers, Series III, Box 117.

[45] Phillips to Murray Butler, 14 February 1913, Ibid.

[46] Christian Lange, "Coordination et Coopération dans le domaine du mouvement international de la Paix", extract from *La Vie Internationale* (March, 1912), SCPC Inter-Parliamentary Union Papers Box 2.

[47] Lockwood to Fredrik and Matilda Bajer, 19 August 1912, IPB First period, 14/3.

[48] *Le Mouvement Pacifiste* (July 1913); *Resolutions passed by the Peace Section of the International Women's Congress* (Budapest, 1913), IPB First period, 112/1.

[49] "Protestation" [leaflet issued by the Alliance Belge des Femmes pour la Paix par l'Education, circa 1913], IPB Second period, 275/6.

[50] This became abundantly clear in one of the first WPF publications outlining its central objects. Edwin Ginn, "World Peace Foundation: Formerly Known as The International School for Peace", February 1911, WPF [Papers of the World Peace Foundation, Tufts University, Medford, MA] Box 001.

[51] Ibid.

[52] William H. Taft, "The Dawn of World Peace", published by the WPF, circa 1911 WPF Box 001. The WPF distributed this article to numerous Women's Clubs across America. See letter sent by Anna Sturges Duryea, 11 December 1911, Ibid.

[53] World Peace Foundation, Pamphlet Series, "The World Peace Foundation: Its Present Activities", April 1912, WPF MS076/011.

[54] Meeting of the Board of Trustees of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 13 November 1913, CEIP [Papers of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Columbia University, New York], Series I, Box 13, Folder 1.

[55] "Report of the Acting Director of the Division of Intercourse and Education", 21 February 1914, CEIP Series III, Box 393, Folder 2.

[56] Rainer Santi, *100 years of peace making: A history of the International Peace Bureau and other international peace movement organisations and networks* (Geneva, 1991), 24.

[57] Golay to van Beek en Donk, 30 November 1914, IPB Second period, 262/2; Green to Golay, 22 August 1914, IPB Second period, 290/2.

[58] IPB circular, "To Intellectual Leaders in all Nations", 5-6 January 1915 [original emphasis], IPB Second period, 405/1.

[59] Moch to La Fontaine, 1 January 1915, IPB Second period, 400/2.

[60] "Notes of a conference with Murray Butler", 29 September 1914, CEIP Series I, Box 40, Folder 4.

[61] Meeting of the Board of Trustees of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 13 November 1914, CEIP Series I, Box 13, Folder 2.

[62] Addams to Catt, 21 December 1914, SCPC Papers of the Women's Peace Party, Reel 12.1.

[63] Lange to Murray Butler, 24 September 1914, CEIP Series III, Box 553, Folder 2.

[64] Ibid.

[65] Lange to Murray Butler, 18 February 1915, Ibid.

[66] Murray Butler to Perris, 9 February 1915, CEIP Series III, Box 485.

[67] Meeting of the Board of Trustees of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 15 April 1915, CEIP Series I, Box 13, Folder 2.

[68] Lange to Murray Butler, 29 May 1915, CEIP Series III, Box 553, Folder 2.

[69] "Report of the International Congress of Women, The Hague, 28 April-1 May 1915", "Foreword" by Emily Hobhouse, SCPC WILPF Papers, Reel 141.1.

[70] "Conference with Nicholas Murray Butler", 7 October 1915, CEIP Series I, Box 40, Folder 5.

[71] Van Lanschot Hubrecht [International Council of Women for Permanent Peace] to Golay, 25 September 1915, enclosing Press Notice, IPB Second period, 302/4.

[72] D'Estournelles de Constant to Butler, August 1916 [exact date unspecified], CEIP Series III, Box 474, Volume 130, Folder 1.

[73] Huntsman to Montandon, 4 May 1915, IPB Second period, 297/6.

[74] Hobhouse to Golay, 4 July 1915, IPB Second period, 299/2.

[75] Huntsman to the editor, *Le Mouvement Pacifiste*, 7 July 1915, IPB Second period, 299/3.

[76] "First Annual Convention of the Woman's Peace Party, Washington D.C., 9-10-11 January 1916", Jane Addams, SCPC Papers of the Woman's Peace Party, Reel 12.1.

[77] LaFontaine note, July 1916 [my emphasis], IPB Second period, 264/1.

[78] "Report of the International Congress of Women, The Hague, 28 April-1 May 1915", Louise Keilhau [Norway], 28 April 1915, SCPC WILPF Papers, Reel 141.1.

[79] D'Estournelles de Constant to Murray Butler, 18 June 1916, CEIP Series III, Box 474, Volume 130, Folder 1.

[80] Annual Meeting of the Board of Trustees of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 21 April 1916, CEIP Series I, Box 13, Folder 3.

[81] D'Estournelles de Constant to Murray Butler, 10 November 1916, CEIP Series III, Box 474, Volume 130, Folder 2.

[82] Lange to Murray Butler, 22 November 1918, CEIP Series III, Box 553, Folder 8.

[83] Lange to Murray Butler, 19 December 1918, Ibid.

[84] Rankin to White, 30 November 1918, White [Henry White Papers, Library of Congress, Manuscripts Division, Washington, DC] Box 23.

[85] D'Estournelles de Constant to Murray Butler, 21 January 1919, CEIP Series III, Box 476.

[86] D'Estournelles de Constant to Wilson, 20 January 1919, Wilson [Woodrow Wilson Papers, Library of Congress, Manuscripts Division, Washington, DC] Reel 390.

[87] De Witt Schlumberger to White, 15 January 1919, White to De Witt Schlumberger, 15 January 1919, White Papers Box 38.

[88] Union Française pour le Suffrage des Femmes to Wilson, 13 February 1919: Wilson Papers Reel 393.

[89] Helena Swanwick, "The Reproach of Hecuba", *Women's International League Monthly News Sheet* [copy], Volume III, No. II (February 1919), IPB Second period, 306/1.

[90] WIL leaflet, "Food and Justice", circa 1919, Ibid.

[91] Christian Lange, "Rapport du Secrétaire Général du Conseil Interparlementaire pour l'année 1918 suivi du programme du Bureau pour 1919", SCPC Papers of the Interparliamentary Union, Box 2.

[92] Heath to the IPB, 31 March 1919, IPB Second period, IPB 263, Dossier 1.

[93] Golay to Heath, 3 June 1919, IPB Second period, 263/1.

[94] *Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 1915-1938: A Venture in Internationalism* (Geneva, July 1938), LSE [London School of Economics, Women's Library, London] WILPF/20/5.

[95] "Presidential Address delivered by Jane Addams", "Report of the International Congress of Women, Zurich, May 12 to 17, 1919", SCPC WILPF Papers, Reel 141.1.

[96] Sarah Hellawell, "Antimilitarism, Citizenship and Motherhood: the formation and early years of the Women's International League (WIL), 1915-1919", *Women's History Review*, 27/4(2018), 559.

[97] For recent efforts to emphasise women's contribution to international relations scholarship in the interwar period, see Jan Stöckmann, "Women, wars, and world affairs: Recovering feminist International Relations, 1915-39", *Review of International Studies*, 44/2(2017), 215-35; Lucian M. Ashworth, "Feminism, war and the prospects for international government: Helena Swanwick (1864-1939) and the lost feminists of interwar International Relations", *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 13/1(2011), 24-42.

[98] Wernitznig, "Living Peace, Thinking Equality", 130.

[99] Emily Balch, Tuesday morning session (11 July 1921), in "Report of the Third International Congress of Women, Vienna, July 10-17, 1921", LSE WILPF/20/5.

[100] Marie-Michèle Doucet, "Prise de parole au féminin: la paix et les relations internationales dans les revendications du mouvement de femmes pour la paix en France (1919-1934)" (PhD dissertation, Université de Montréal, 2015), 264.

[101] Emily Balch, 11 July 1921, in "Report of the Third International Congress of Women, Vienna, July 10-17, 1921", LSE WILPF/20/5.