Chapter 25

Gender, Peace and the New International Politics of Humanitarianism in the First Half of the Twentieth Century

Glenda Sluga

In the midst of the First World War, the American peace activist and feminist Jane Addams (1860–1935) observed that the conflict had produced two types of masculinity. One was more akin to the "Victorian man," while the other consisted of young men less inclined to be skeptically militarist and more inclined to be practically internationalist in their world outlook:

> Even in their conception of internationalism, the two groups of young men and old men differed widely. The Victorian group, for instance, in their moral romanticism, fostered a sentiment for a far-off "Federation of the World" and believed that the world would be

18 December 2016

federated when wise men from many nations met together and accomplished it. The

young men do not talk much about internationalism, but they live in a world where

common experience has in fact become largely internationalised.[1]

Addam's observations invite us to reflect on the impact of the First World War on the

significance of simultaneously "internationalized" and gendered conceptions of peace. That war

marked the changing tenor of those conceptions, shifting under the influence of international law

and the experiment of international governance. Here we need only think of the growth of

international organizations such as the Red Cross, founded in 1863. The Geneva Conventions

agreed between 1864 and 1906 (and later 1929 and 1949) are indicative of these trends. These

legal conventions defined the basic rights of prisoners of war—military personnel and

civilians—and established the terms by which wounded soldiers and civilians in and close to a

war zone should come under the protection of international law. Add to these the Hague

Conventions of 1899 and 1907—a series of international treaties and declarations negotiated at

two international peace conferences at The Hague in the Netherlands—and we can see a trend of

embedding questions of disarmament, the conduct of warfare and the laws of war and of war

crimes, as both state and international-level responsibilities.[2]

By the early twentieth century, changing approaches to war and the conceptualization of

peace as a political and legal problem intersected with the transformation of humanitarian

practices. As we will see, over the first half of the twentieth century, humanitarianism and, later,

human rights became a measure of international efforts to establish a more peaceful world order.

Etymology goes some way to providing a chronology for the changing political status of

"humanitarianism" in this international history and explaining the significance of that concept for

the same politics of "peace" invested in the expansion of international laws. "Humanitarianism" entered European languages in the early nineteenth century, as women and men in religious organizations (especially Quakers) took up the cause of abolition, seeking to end slavery through the invocation of a common humanity. By contrast, "pacifism" was coined only a hundred years later, largely in reflection of the growth of international and national organizations committed to promoting peace, particularly through arbitration.[3] Pacifist societies, like humanitarian organizations, quickly moved from the margins to the respectable core of political life, particularly at the heart of the Western empires that were most likely to be involved in wars; at the same time, women and men assumed distinctive roles that reflected dominant gendered separate spheres ideology. This ideology, as it was articulated and negotiated through the long nineteenth century, commonly associated femininity with an intrinsic pacifism and "humanity" (identifying women with motherhood), and masculinity with the inclination to war (to the extent of identifying men with soldier-citizenship).[4] Even though Addams noticed subtle shifts in masculinity, men and women regularly negotiated polarized conceptions of their gender difference, whether they were advocating policies and practices or seeking legitimacy for their activism. We can see this gendering process working in exclusivist ways when the male members of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society decided that the first World Conference of Abolition, held in London in June 1840, was to be an event run by men for men, even though women had long been at the forefront of organized efforts to abolish slavery.[5]

Addams' description of a new kind of masculine subjectivity also reflects the ways in which, by the latter half of the nineteenth century, pacifism was the formal concern of a new cohort of professionalized male international lawyers, politicians and state bureaucrats, as well as the self-consciously international associations to which they belonged. Most prominent and

enduring among these is the Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) established in 1889 by the French and British parliamentarians Frédéric Passy (1822–1912) and William Randal Cremer (1828–1908) as an organization of statesmen promoting democratic institutions and international government. The IPU became the first permanent forum for political multilateral negotiations. Another example is the French-based *Association de la paix par le droit* (Association for Law and Peace), one of the first peace organizations with an emphasis on international law, which was founded in 1887 and active until World War II. Its founders, among them Passy, believed that peace could be maintained through an internationally agreed legal framework, making use of mediation to resolve disputes.[6] The German Peace Society (*Deutsche Friedensgesellschaft*), founded in 1892, had a similar agenda—during World War I, it had some 10,000 members, making it one of the largest peace organizations. The following year saw the creation of the Austrian Peace Society (*Österreichischen Gesellschaft der Friedensfreunde*), thanks largely to the activism of the Austrian novelist and pacifist Bertha von Suttner (1843–1914), who in 1905 was the first woman to be awarded the Nobel Peace Price.[7]

These various strands of the history of the newly *international* politics of humanitarianism came together after World War I, when Western statesmen created the League of Nations as an intergovernmental organization. The League conceptually and effectively institutionalized pacifism as the business of states and, as importantly, international institutions that were the sum of those states *inter*-national relations.[8] In the 1930s, when the challenge of peace in this new age of internationally negotiated arbitration and disarmament was named "collective security," the assumption was that the collective was the nation-state. But over these same decades, as humanitarianism was reconceptualized as an imperative driving the experiment of international governance, it also led to the creation of international philanthropic and

intergovernmental organizations run by men who established their professional careers in these capacities. After World War II, the objectives of peace and humanitarianism were cemented together in the creation of the United Nations, founded in October 1945 by the UN Conference on International Organization in San Francisco to succeed the League of Nations. When the United Nations General Assembly proclaimed its defining project, the "Universal Declaration of Human Rights," in December 1948, the gendered status of humanitarianism and the project of peace came explicitly to the fore. Two years earlier, the long, drawn-out process of drafting that declaration had led to the controversial segregation of the status of women in relation to human rights—and the creation of a Commission for the Status of Women (CSW). The separate body was demanded by feminists convinced that history had proven the concept of human rights to be intrinsically male-centered, literally *les droits de l'homme*;[9] making sure women were given human rights, they argued, would require the explicit address of women's historically determined situation across the globe.

This chapter tracks developments in the changing conceptions of peace and their connections with a longer history of humanitarianism in the first half of the twentieth century by using gender as an analytical focus and reincorporating it into international history as a specific theme. That focus allows us not only to probe the gender dimensions of peace-thinking and policies in a newly international era, but also to reclaim the specific contribution of women and feminism to the modern conceptualization of international answers to the problem of war, its causes and its consequences. In particular, adding gender restores the international and internationalist contexts of the emerging peace movement and international humanitarianism as well as their changing emphases and forms, both at the League of Nations and the United Nations. In what follows I weave together these different strands of international politics through

18 December 2016

a chronological discussion of the "international turn" that took place before World War I, then the quest for peace during the war, followed by an examination of peacemaking in the interwar period, and, finally, the new international world order established in the aftermath of World War II.

The International Turn

By the turn of the twentieth century, in the context of an expanding public sphere and widening political enfranchisement, statesmen and nonstate actors responded to the threat of increasingly devastating wars fueled by imperial competition and militarization, by seeking support for the codification of international laws and even the idea of a new internationalism.[10] It is in this international framework that we can better see the agency of women and the rising political star of pacifism and humanitarianism as political causes. The landmark events in these intersecting histories were the 1899 and the 1907 peace conferences held at The Hague, Netherlands.[11]

It is relatively well known that the 1899 Hague conference was instigated by Russian Tsar Nicholas II (1868–1918) to encourage the European empires to take steps towards disarmament. Regardless of the tsar's intentions and of the tendency to relegate the conference to the margins of international history, for our purposes the conference was an historical high-water mark, as much because of its processes as its outcomes. It brought together a vast array of state and nonstate actors, not only monarchs and diplomats but also journalists reporting to a wider, mainly Western "public" and women congregating on behalf of a range of humanitarian and pacifist issues, including the importance of international arbitration and the causes of the self-

determination of "subject peoples." The standout figure of the 1899 Hague conference and its follow-up in 1907 was Bertha von Suttner. Her roles in these settings are illustrative of the ways in which, at this time, a woman with exceptional contacts could use her social networks to promote pacifism, establish pacifist societies and even convince Alfred Nobel (1833–96), a Swedish dynamite manufacturer, to fund the Nobel Peace Prize, awarded since 1901.[12] Suttner worked alongside pacifist men such as her compatriot, journalist Alfred Hermann Fried (1864–1921), a cofounder of the German Peace Society, and French statesman Leon Bourgeois (1851–1925) as part of a wider international movement "reflected in congresses and peace societies with transnational links."[13] At The Hague, Suttner was an important presence publicizing the twin causes of disarmament and arbitration. She had promoted these causes in her 1889 bestselling novel *Die Waffen Nieder*, published three years later in English as *Lay Down Your Arms* and translated into sixteen other languages. And she was not alone. In 1899, one million American, European and Japanese members of Universal Women's Alliances for Peace—founded as the International Women's League for General Disarmament in 1896 in Paris—signed a petition presented to the Russian tsar at The Hague.[14] The conservative transatlantic body, the International Council of Women—founded in 1888 in Washington DC and representing 53 women's organizations from nine countries—added to the mix of events a "Standing Committee on Peace and Arbitration" featuring Suttner, who then harnessed these international associations to force the hand of governments and stage the 1907 Hague meeting, this time under the auspices of US President Theodore Roosevelt (1858–1919).[15]

The conference outcomes reflected these same priorities, the introduction of new international laws of war and war crimes conventions. The 1899 Hague Conventions (three main treaties and three additional declarations) established the Permanent Court of Arbitration in The

Hague, but it failed to achieve a reduction of military budgets or a plan for disarmament. The 1907 conference, convened to reexamine the work of 1899 in light of the Russo-Japanese War (1904–05), resulted in a second Hague Convention, this time consisting of twelve signed treaties and a declaration. However, little progress was made at this conference on the subject of disarmament, in part because the two power blocs that fought each other seven years later—the Triple Alliance (Germany, Austria-Hungary and Italy) and the Triple Entente (the United Kingdom, France and Russia)—were already consolidating.[16]

Historians of the Hague conferences have long argued that despite the limited outcomes, these meetings contributed to international humanitarian law and the law on the pacific settlement of disputes. Once we add the involvement of women's associations, we see the extent to which the gatherings at The Hague established crucial precedents for broad public, nonstate involvement in international questions. Even though women had no formal part in either conference, it was "the first time that women's associations lobbied so specifically and widely at a diplomatic multilateral conference."[17]

Also integral to this history were the many organizations and societies that established "international" headquarters (often in Belgium and Switzerland) and sought to capitalize on the international turn in political organization to run regular events. For example, the Universal Peace Congress started in Paris in 1889 was followed by similar events in other cities until 1914. In 1891, this same initiative led to the establishment of the Permanent International Peace Bureau in Berne. Of similar importance was the International Peace Society founded in London in 1880. The membership of these and other organizations was largely male and identified with political progressives. Their leaders cooperated closely, beyond national borders and continents, and across the conceptual borders of internationalist and pacifist liberal causes. As historian

Daniel Laqua notes, the Inter-Parliamentary Union conferences "often shared delegates and the host city with the Universal Peace Congresses, which were the main events of international pacifism."[18] Despite the predominantly male membership of this international peace movement and its organizations, Suttner's singular influence and initiatives did not go unacknowledged by her contemporaries. The joint organ of the Inter-Parliamentary Union and the International Peace Bureau and Peace Society (Vienna), subtitled "A Monthly to Promote the Idea of Peace," and published between 1892 and 1899, was named *Die Waffen Nieder*.[19]

The Hague peace conferences also provide important historical examples of the political weight given by statesmen and political leaders across the European empires (the same sites of escalating militarism) to international arbitration, as the "single most influential strand of internationalism," prior to the outbreak of World War I across Europe and its empires on 28 July 1914.[20] At the turn of the twentieth century, the largest European pacifist organizations, such as the *Association de la paix par le droit* and the *Deutsche Friedensgesellschaft*, emphasized international arbitration practices as the method of peace between states. The international arbitration theme was also the calling card of North American-based pacifist societies, particularly on the east coast of the United States, including the American Peace Society (founded in New York in 1828). This trend in pacifist thought was inextricably linked to the extraordinary rise of international law in the latter half of the nineteenth century. Many of these peace societies had religious origins—in Quaker communities, for example—but their support bases were increasingly drawn from new cohorts of professional international lawyers and, interestingly, bankers.[21]

Given the extent to which militarism persisted in shaping European and imperial political cultures through the first half of the twentieth century, we should not overestimate the extent to

which men and women felt enabled and driven to take up pacifist causes. Nor should we overstate the challenge that internationalist and international-scale pacifist movements posed to dominant gender conventions of masculinity or femininity. Suttner's life and her memoirs reinforced the common nineteenth-century equation of femininity with pacifist and humanitarian inclinations, in opposition to a conventional militarist masculinity. However, as we will see, and as Jane Addams observed, during World War I the growing interest in the prospect of international government provided new foci for these intersecting peace, humanitarianism and gender trends.

The Quest for Peace during World War I

There can be no doubt that the outbreak of war in July 1914 tested the limits of pacifism, in both its idealized forms and institutional practices. However, the war just as quickly brought the simultaneously humanitarian and legal dimensions of earlier international debates about war and peace into play. Other historians in this handbook have addressed the impact of prewar developments on the conduct of warfare, especially the existence of the International Red Cross.[22] We know, too, from the work of Isabel Hull that even though the legal conventions introduced at The Hague that posited a humanitarian approach to conflict had limited effects on the war's brutal course, they were often acknowledged when the warring states made decisions in regard to the kinds of weapons they used and ways in which they treated enemy soldiers.[23] In other words, this new international body of law had become to some degree an accepted part of the lexicon of state behavior in an international political arena. Also helpful for our purposes,

18 December 2016

new historical analyses of the effects of wartime experience on the international organization of humanitarianism and pacifism illuminate the distinctive consequences of these developments for men and women.

As the fronts of this continental military conflict became established, the civilians caught up in that war—as victims of violence or food shortages and displacement—became the object of competing humanitarian activities, much of it organized by British and American governments, including the Food Relief Programs for occupied Belgium and France, started in 1914 and continued until 1919. Both governments collaborated with local national commissions, such as the *Comité National de Secours et d'Alimentation* and the *Comité d'Alimentation du Nord de la France*, which fielded up to 10,000 local groups and more than 70,000 male and female volunteers who organized the distribution of the humanitarian aid. But the most influential international humanitarian aid group was the Commission for Relief in Belgium (CRB), founded in 1914 and chaired by Herbert Hoover (1874–1964), a Quaker engineer and efficient administrator, who in 1917, after the United States had joined the war under President Woodrow Wilson (1856–1924), became the director of the US Food Administration responsible for the food reserves of the US army and its allies.[24] The historian Tammy M. Proctor has argued that a critical part of the story of the involvement of organizations such as Hoover's in humanitarian relief in this period was the question of political legitimacy in the changing arena of international politics, and fundamental to that question was gender. The US government publicized its humanitarian policy in conventional gender terms, granting itself the guise of a fatherly figure, albeit a "surrogate father,"[25] and it also made food aid to war-torn regions the responsibility of "white young men" who "aimed for careers in business or government service." By contrast, British efforts still utilized an older nineteenth-century religious missionary model of

humanitarianism, and British aid workers emphasized the roots of their service as a "maternal spirit of living sacrifice wherein the foreign aid workers, many of them women, trained in social work or medicine provided hands-on, mostly small-scale aid to war sufferers." Ultimately, according to Proctor, relief work in Belgium, Northern France, Germany and Austria was dominated by the newer American government model, "emphasizing efficiency, scientific management and self-help framed with the Wilsonian vocabulary of freedom."[26]

When we shift our attention to the international history of humanitarianism in the Ottoman Empire (which fought on the side of the Central Powers during the World War I), we see gender doing similar ideological work, albeit in historically and geopolitically specific ways. In the "Greater Syrian provinces" (including Beirut) of the Ottoman Empire, local political figures found themselves competing with such international and national humanitarian organizations as Near East Relief and the American Red Cross (the latter had been operating in Beirut since 1915) for the distribution of money, food and work.[27] The stakes of this competition were high since the region was in the throes of a famine so extreme that by the time Allied forces occupied the territory in October 1918, a third of the population had died. Historian Melanie Tanielian has argued that in the face of "disproportional rates of male mortalities" in the Middle East and a crisis of paternity, the Ottoman state attempted to appropriate social services in the region for itself. This was in order to bolster its sovereign authority over the authority of the American men who ran the existing local humanitarian organizations and the American women who were affiliated with the Syrian Protestant College and the American Mission overseeing local volunteers. The Ottoman state's strategy from mid-1915 was to supersede that "international" activity by privileging local female volunteerism through the Syrian Women's Association. Even as male notables ran the local philanthropic societies in Beirut, Arab women

were encouraged to undertake humanitarian work, because it "was seen as unthreatening and incapable of inspiring divergent allegiances." Ironically, the process set in motion by the Ottoman regime in order to compete with the humanitarian presence of international actors was the beginning of "a politicization of women's charities," and unintentionally "inspired a new political consciousness" among the Ottoman women who were given the chance to become agents of humanitarianism.[28]

In the setting of war, women's humanitarian work could constitute a legitimate avenue for their public activity, even in contexts in which their more explicit political agency remained controversial. Among the unintended outcomes of this gendered politics was the fostering of simultaneously national and international feminist aims. We can see that the First World War was a turning point in this regard, too, especially if we compare the earlier generation of women activists represented by Suttner, for whom feminism was separate from pacifism, and those women who during World War I vocally announced their overlapping pacifist, humanitarian and feminist ambitions.[29]

At no time were these links between humanitarianism, pacifism and feminism more in evidence than at the iconic International Women's Peace Congress held in April and May 1915 at The Hague "Peace Palace"—a building constructed using Carnegie funds and lobbied for by the women's organizations present at the 1907 Hague peace conference. The wartime women's congress organized on 28 April 1915 purposely invoked the legacy of the Hague gatherings as much as that of the four earlier International Congresses of Women's Rights held in Paris (1878), London (1899), Berlin (1904), Amsterdam (1908) and Stockholm (1911). In 1915, more than 1,200 female delegates from twelve countries participated and came to The Hague under challenging circumstances, including the 28 Germans who had to cross military frontlines. In the

midst of the spreading wartime, interstate violence, this transnationally linked group of women gathered to petition the leaders of the warring governments for peace, in many cases despite attempts by their governments to stop them.[30] The American economics professor Emily Greene Balch (1867–1961), British journalist Helena Swanwick (1864–1939), German journalist Lida Gustava Heymann (1868–1943), Hungarian pacifist Rosika Schwimmer (1877–1848) and Swedish educator and writer Ellen Key (1849–1926) were among the most well-known women involved in wartime pacifist feminist organizations built out of Northern and Southern, Eastern and Western European constituencies at the 1915 meeting. They all agitated for equal education for women, equal civil rights and female suffrage, but their concepts of feminism differed. Some, such as Heymann, were individual feminists who aimed for equality, while others like Key were relational or "social maternalist" feminists who wanted equal rights but believed in the differences between the sexes. They thought that women, as real or "spiritual" mothers and caregivers, had an important but distinctive role to play in society, politics and culture.[31] Key, for example, engaged the significance of a "new internationalism" (grounded in nationalism) as an important development in progress towards permanent peace, and which made "woman" its specific agent "as mother of humanity," cultivating "a world consciousness […] world citizenship." She posited a salient feminine will, which, when given political expression, would have "as its last and greatest aim: to humanize humanity." Her ultimate goal was to link this cause to the ends of international recognition for women's "equal rights in politics, in nationality, in marriage, and, as parents, equal pay for equal work, and equal moral standard, equal training and opportunities, and the endowment of maternity."[32]

Despite the diverse views of the relevance of gender difference held by participants in the 1915 women's peace congress, their meeting led to unanimous support for the creation of the

International Women's Committee for Permanent Peace, which included in its aims support for a postwar international government that would guarantee both future peace and women's rights. After the Second International Women's Congress for Peace and Freedom in Zürich in 1919, this committee renamed itself as the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF), which still exists today.[33] WILPF feminists from across the Western world invested heavily in the prospect of international government and identified the League of Nations as the means to establish permanent peace and social justice. They shared this investment with other supporters of the three Hague peace conferences in 1899, 1807 and 1915, including male politicians and female pacifists, who all spoke for an enlarged interest in international governance as a vehicle of permanent peace or at least oversight of the worst consequences of war. We see this shift in the wartime organization of League of Nations associations, first in Britain and later in the United States, on the continent (even in the territories of the Central Powers) and across the British Empire.

Feminists such as Swanwick and Balch supported improved political opportunities for women through the promise of a future League of Nations, but the historian Helen McCarthy has shown that the structures and symbolism of the associations, established by political and intellectual male elites in Britain to support the creation of a League of Nations, reinforced a very specific gendering of internationalism. The largest of the League of Nations associations, the League of Nations Union (LNU) formed in October 1918 as a merger of two earlier wartime organizations, the League of Free Nations Association and the League of Nations Society, "mobilised broad sections of the population in support of a collective system of international relations," and they contributed to "the making of a gendered internationalism."[34] Women's organizations participated in the LNU and were encouraged by its executive to do so. However,

the LNU recruited women for their maternal sensibilities, or "instinct of motherhood," as fitting

them for the task of championing the creation of an organization in the interests of a permanent

peace. By contrast, when these societies appealed to a male membership, they connected "the

League message with masculine working class pleasures," and League "union" as a form of

"homosociality."[35] The League itself was represented as a Madonna-style figure, "with a star

suspended like a halo over her modest head-dress."[36]

By the end of World War I, entangled humanitarian and pacifist norms had become the

mainstream rationale for the creation of the iconic male-led international peace-oriented

institution of the twentieth century, the League of Nations. In the interwar as in the wartime

conceptualization of international government, the history of men and women in relation to that

institution and its practices differed fundamentally, despite feminist demands for equal

participation and rights for women in the international sphere of politics and government.

Peacemaking 1919 and After

Historians of peacemaking in 1919 have long focused on questions of boundaries and reparations.

For many, the Treaty of Versailles, signed on 28 June 1919 by Germany and the Allied Powers,

inevitably led to new conflicts and the Second World War, because it forced Germany and its

allies to accept the responsibility for causing all the "loss and damage" during the war.[37] The

treaty compelled Germany to disarm considerably (it was allowed a professional army of up to

only 100,000 men and no universal conscription), to make substantial territorial concessions and

pay extensive reparations of 132 billion Marks (then $31.4 billion) to the Entente powers.[38] To

18 December 2016

secure the reparation payments Belgian, British and French troops occupied the highly industrialized Rhineland (1919–30), the neighboring Saar region (1919–35) and, for a shorter period, the Ruhr area (1923–25). The First World War also led to the collapse of the Habsburg Empire and the foundation of several new succession European states, including Austria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Yugoslavia. Russia, which withdrew from war after the October Revolution 1917, lost much of its western frontier to the creation of the new nation-states Estonia, Finland, Latvia, Lithuania and Poland.[39]

For a long time, the far-reaching effects on sovereignty of the peace of 1919 led scholars to neglect the other part of the peacemaking process: the creation of the League of Nations. Forty-four states signed the League of Nations Covenant on 28 June 1919, and its headquarters was finally established in Geneva in January 1920. Its existence, along with a series of related bodies, including the International Labor Organization and the International Health Organization, became fundamental to a postwar peacemaking agenda that emphasized international government on the principles of disarmament and arbitration. There were divergent views on how to achieve the objective of peace: through economic stability, through the international regulation of arms and codification of warfare practices and even through the inculcation of new subjectivities. These methods were reflected in the organization of the League in sections devoted to not only the reduction of armaments, but also legal, financial and economic, health, transit and communication, mandates, minorities, intellectual cooperation, information and social questions. Once again we find that gender conventions not only shaped the operations of the League of Nations, but, equally importantly, they were a crucial point of controversy at this new international site of pacifist and humanitarian intentions, built on the foundations of an

expanding order of nation-states and the persistent international sway of the imperial powers that

had ended up on the victorious side of the war.

In practice, the League of Nations was an intergovernmental organization dependent on

the decisions and opinions expressed primarily by its council, where the permanent members

Britain, France, Italy and Japan dominated (in the absence of the US, which famously never

joined), and then the member states comprising its assembly. The League did not officially

recognize the petitioning of individuals, although nonstate actors were able to lobby its bodies—

one of the reasons why so many international women's organizations set up home in its physical

proximity in Geneva. While the League's Covenant made special mention of the equal access of

women to positions at the League, it was a male-dominated organization with women taking up

mainly secretarial work. The most prominent exception was the British former-nurse Rachel

Crowdy (1884–1964), who was given administrative responsibility for the Central Committee for

Economic and Social Questions of the League.[40]

The humanitarian issues that made up the work of the social questions committee—

public health and hygiene, the suppression of the traffic in drugs and the white slave trade, the

Advisory Committee of Private Organizations to the High Commissioner for Refugees—were

regarded as the more suitable domains for accommodating women's advice and activism.[41]

Some humanitarian concerns were massaged into the Health Bureau, which dealt with epidemics

and food crises, particularly in postwar Austria, and for which purposes the occasional woman

was also brought on board, such as the American epidemiologist Alice Hamilton (1869–1970).

The "serious" legal and political work of the League for fostering peace was viewed as the

natural field of men employed within its bureaucracy or appointed as delegates to its

disarmament committees, despite the organized attempts by women to be included on those

specific committees. The League's single disarmament subcommittee continued with the work of utilizing international law and arbitration in the interests of peace and refused female participation. As historian Andrew Webster has described, the Permanent Advisory Commission on Armaments was entirely composed of military officers who were appointed by and responsible to their respective governments (and general staffs) rather than to the League itself.[42]

Despite the formal exclusion of women, the culmination of the League's disarmament efforts, the 1932 World Disarmament Conference in Geneva, was only successful as an example of the continuing importance of nonstate actors, including some women, in keeping crucial questions of peace as well as humanitarianism not only alive, but broadly conceived. The Geneva conference saw no substantial or few binding outcomes except the ratification of the poison gas agreement, but it marked the apex of women's organized international pacifist ambitions.[43] There were many groups agitating in this period for peace, for example, the *Ligue des mères et educatrices pour la paix*, founded in 1928 and claiming 65,000 members in 1932. One of the especially active organizations was the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF), which was able to organize high profile peace pilgrimages and a petition bearing six million signatures that was presented to the disarmament conference delegates.[44] The failures of the petition and of the long-winded conference (which went on until 1934!) provoked some WILPF women to consider dropping "women's" from their title and claiming default responsibility for peace—since there was no men's equivalent.[45]

Of course, interwar pacifism and humanitarianism was not the sole domain of League of Nations coordinated efforts in Geneva. Men were to be found in the halls of the Permanent Court of International Justice, which resided in the Peace Palace in The Hague as an international court attached to the League of Nations from 1922 to 1946. The court became the home to

international lawyers tasked with adjudicating intrastate disputes. Back in Geneva, the mission of the International Labor Office, since 1919 an agency of the League of Nations, was rationalized in terms of the pertinence of social and economic justice (and humanitarianism) to the ends of peace, similar to the League-based mandate system of oversight of the territories of the defeated powers.[46] These missions too were fundamentally constituted as the masculine business of imperial powers. The historian Francesca Piana notes that state delegates to the International Committee of the Red Cross, eventually housed across the road from the League offices, were almost exclusively men.[47]

It is an historical truism that the League of Nations famously failed at its central task: the maintenance of peace through international disarmament. However, as historians are now noting, the League was much more successful in the interwar decades in the humanitarian brief of its social questions section, albeit within the prevailing imperial context; "humanitarian issues exercising female campaigners at the League," stretched "from the suppression of the 'Mui Tsai' system in Hong Kong to the welfare of native populations in the mandated territories."[48] It is also true, as Helen McCarthy adds, that "many women—including those active in the League of Nations Unions—appeared willing to accept that their 'natural' arena for action lay in the League's humanitarian and auxiliary work." In the context of the League's institutionalization of women's humanitarian activities, a "social-maternalist tradition" was reconstituted "on a global level."

In the interwar years, women activists in the international arena of pacifism and humanitarianism made the most of the new nonnational spaces for public engagement opened up by the League and its related institutions, including the Health Bureau and the International Labor Organization. The WILPF, the Women's Disarmament Committee and other women's

organizations simultaneously used Geneva as a base to promote their feminist agendas. In spite of their best efforts, they often ended up disillusioned by the League's seemingly impermeable gendered structures. The British pacifist and feminist Helena Swanwick, who was for a brief period seconded to a British League delegation, argued, "Men were in all places of power. They alone were diplomats and foreign ministers and financiers and the manufacturers of munitions and editors and leader-writers." She observed that women at the League were treated as if they were "predestined" to deal with issues concerning "Opium, Refugees, Protection of Children, Relief after Earthquakes, Prison Reform, Municipal Cooperation, Alcoholism, Traffic in Women."[49] To the extent that the war had inspired a new internationalist masculinity, as Jane Addams described, in the postwar era it had limited repercussions for an expanded view of feminine agency—even as women's willingness to take on social and humanitarian questions garnered new international status for refugee, trafficking and other humanitarian concerns. These gender tensions in the new international politics of humanitarianism and peace would become more visible during and after World War II.

Peace in the Minds of Men during and after the 1940s

The number of military and civilian casualties that resulted from World War II was devastatingly higher than the earlier world war; approximately 29 million civilians and 26 million soldiers died. This was the setting after 1945 in which peace was to be restored and Europe reconstructed, with its millions of displaced persons—for example, the Nazis had bought 11.3 million people to Germany during the war as slave labourers—who survived the war and had to be returned home

or find a new one. There were threats of epidemics, particularly typhus, and food crises—for the moment the newly reconstituted international community left the non-European world to fend for itself. Managing those crises and reconstruction became the task of new intergovernmental bodies, working at times in consultation with nongovernmental peace activists and bodies with humanitarian concerns. At the center of much of this humanitarian activity and coordination of nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) was the United Nations, established on 24 October 1945 by 51 member states. What was also new was the imperative that now drove that activity, the concept of "human rights," with obvious humanitarian resonance. Just as the UN was the practical arm of this humanitarian focus, its ideological arm was the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) established on 16 November 1945, in order to ensure peace by cultivating "the minds of men."

For the purposes of understanding how the challenge of peace and the concept of humanitarianism had changed by the end of World War II, along with the distinctive roles of men and women in that history, it is worth considering the gathering of the allied nations in San Francisco in April 1945. The purpose of that famous meeting, the United Nations Conference on International Organization (UNCIO), was to thrash out a charter for a new United Nations Organization to succeed the League of Nations and improve on that failed model in order to ensure future peace. In San Francisco, delegates from all over the world gathered. When it came to the contribution of the men and (some) women representing Northern and Western European states, they charged that women's difference, their "insight and equipment," made them especially suited to UN peace work.[50] Despite this insistence on the political relevance of gender difference, as historian Celia Donert has pointed out, the UN Charter was "the first international declaration to refer to the equal rights of women as well as men in support of fundamental

human rights and peace, and against the 'scourge of war,' which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind."[51]

For a brief moment in 1945, it seemed as if the strands of humanitarian, pacifist and feminist activism had finally been brought together at this apogee in the history of internationalism. Yet, even then, veteran international feminists such as Gertrude Baer, the secretary of the Executive Committee of the WILPF, still feared that women might once again "be used only for research and consultation and in dealing with social and economic questions, with health, industry, education and so on," as in the past, rather than find their places in "offices which manipulate the master levers, where the purposes and methods of public action are determined."[52] Indeed, at UNESCO, where male bureaucrats conceptualized peace as a question of subjectivities in the "minds of men," women's rights were specifically not of interest. UNESCO's first director-general, the British evolutionary biologist and eugenicist Julian Huxley (1887–1975), chose to promote more peaceful societies by tackling the problem of race discrimination at the expense of requests to also focus on women's equal rights.[53]

Then there was the persistently conventional quasi segregation of men and women in the new international institutions. There were never very many women involved in the setting up of the UN, despite their clamoring for involvement. Indeed, in the early years of the UN system, there was an actual decline in the number of women in key positions in the UN secretariat as well as among the UN delegates. Not only was the overall number "insignificant,"[54] Deborah Stienstra has concluded that "[t]he practice of gender relations embedded in the League of Nations became the model for the United Nations."[55] Where there were women, their status was often exceptional, as it had been at the League. The one high-ranking woman in the UN secretariat was appointed on a temporary basis in 1949, to the social affairs bureaucracy. This

position put Alva Myrdal (1902–86), an extremely well-connected Swedish sociologist, feminist and Social Democrat, briefly in charge of the human rights bureaucracy as it deliberated a Statement on Race—her male colleagues made it known she was not welcome.[56] In gender terms, earlier discussions among the UN Human Rights Committee (HRC) were more promising, in so far as its collection of state delegates reflected some changes since the League period. It was chaired by the American politician, diplomat and activist, Eleanor Roosevelt (1884–1962), wife of US President Franklin D. Roosevelt (1882–1945), and included the Indian feminist and social activist Hansa Jivraj Mehta (1897–1995) as the official representative of the newly independent Indian government. Mehta was active in all three sessions of the HRC responsible for drafting the iconic 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR). Throughout she promoted an agenda similar to the proposals of the French law professor and judge René Samuel Cassin (1887–1976), also on the committee: that individuals as well as states be allowed to petition the Human Rights Commission; that the Commission be enabled to take action on petitions (and not just make abstract pronouncements on rights); and that a bill on human rights should become part of the Charter and a fundamental law of the UN. All three propositions were defeated.

Mehta, in contrast to Roosevelt, also supported the creation of a separate body to deal with the status of women on the basis that it would act as a corrective to the weak state of women's access to human rights relative to men.[57] In 1946 the UN's Third Committee created the Sub-Commission on the Status of Women as part of the Human Rights Committee, which met for the first time in 1947. It was quickly promoted to an independent body, the UN Commission on the Status of Women (CSW), that I have already mentioned. This became a functional commission of the UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), with a focus on political rights and civil equality, even as its emphasis on "status" denied the "rights" focus of

the original committee. The CSW is now recognized as having been "instrumental in promoting women's rights, documenting the reality of women's lives throughout the world and shaping global standards of gender equality and the empowerment of women."[58] However, in more immediate terms, it was not able to prevent the UDHR from reflecting historically specific gender norms, particularly in regard to the place of men and women in families.[59] For example, the CSW, led by Mehta, was not able to have the interests of children and mothers separated in order to emphasize women's intrinsic rights as individuals. Instead, the UDHR proclaimed by the United Nations General Assembly in Paris on 10 December 1948, essentially yoked the needs of mothers and children together in Article 25 (2): "Motherhood and childhood are entitled to special care and assistance. All children, whether born in or out of wedlock, shall enjoy the same social protection."[60]

Over this same period, international women's organizations—often with NGO consultative status—were also working with international organizations within the UN institutional network and outside its domains to achieve peace by other means. Celia Donert has argued that the definitive shifts in how women organized for peace in the wake of the Second World War—from "the middle-class elitist pacifism of the interwar years towards broad-based peace movements that defined peace in terms of social justice and not merely the absence of war"—was to a significant extent the work of feminists from Eastern European states.[61] In most cases these women belonged to the largest feminist organization of the period, the Women's International Democratic Federation (WIDF) founded in 1945 in Paris by representatives from 40 countries (albeit sponsored by the Soviet Union). The founding president was the French left-feminist intellectual Eugénie Cotton (1881–1967).

The WIDF propagated four interrelated principles, namely antifascism, lasting peace, women's rights and better conditions for children. Its statutes specified that the organization's goals were: active participation in the struggle for the complete annihilation of fascism; shared action to organize women in all countries of the world to defend their rights and to achieve social progress; the protection of public health and in particular the physical and mental health of children; and strengthening the friendship and unity among women in the whole world.[62] A peace campaign launched by the WIDF and communist women's organizations in Eastern and Western Europe during the Korean War (1950–53) exemplifies the transnational practices used by women activists in their campaigns for women's rights and the way in which national interests and political loyalties affected these campaigns, above all through the close connection between discourses of women's equality and those of peace in international propaganda. The focus of the WIDF peace campaign was a brochure entitled "We Accuse," the result of a fact-finding mission to Korea by WIDF women from 18 countries in the spring of 1951, just as UN troops had halted the surprisingly successful Sino-North Korean winter offensive. This brochure claimed to reveal evidence of atrocities committed against civilians by US forces in Korea, including the use of germ warfare, and it formed the centerpiece of the international propaganda efforts for the East German and Czechoslovak women's organizations in 1951. By this time, the Cold War was having an effect on the membership of the WIDF and the views of its members, many of whom now branded the older WILPF as "fascist" and even tried to undermine its UN NGO consultative status.[63]

The threats of nuclear war and biological warfare meant that women still organized transnationally on behalf of peace and women's rights, even crossing Cold War ideological lines. However, Donert argues that in the space of international relations, "[w]omen's rights were

swiftly embedded in Soviet and East European cultural diplomacy 'in defence of peace' as the ideological contest with the West intensified in 1947."[64] Staking out claims to the representation of peace and social justice issues was now an important source of political legitimation "demonstrating the mass mobilization of socialist womanhood to both international and domestic publics," as in the 1950 Stockholm peace petition by the World Peace Council, calling for an absolute ban on nuclear weapons and signed by 273,470,566 people (with its unintentional echoes of the WILPF 1932 petition). The main supporters of the campaign were the women's organizations of Eastern Europe. Interestingly, the "social-maternalist" model of femininity remained pertinent even in these communist-inspired peace campaigns. Networks built at the 1955 "World Congress of Mothers for the Defence of their Children against War, for Disarmament and Friendship between the Peoples" in Lausanne, initiated by the WIDF, [65] led to a delegation of 14 German women visiting China for four weeks in 1956. Eight came from the German Democratic Republic and six from the Federal Republic of Germany; of these, two were members of the Social Democratic Party, one a member of the peace movement and three were members of the Communist Party. In 1958, the women's "Caravan of Peace" for nuclear disarmament, initiated by the British socialist Dora Russell (1894–1986), traveled through Eastern Europe.[66] At the UN's Committee for the Status of Women, votes split on Cold War lines, so that a 1955 Soviet proposal to the UN General Assembly for a nuclear weapons ban in order to halt the international arms race was rejected by "Western" women. On one side stood supporters of the Soviet Union's position of disarmament, and on the other, pro-US critics of "peace defined narrowly as the absence of war, 'without guarantees for personal freedoms, protection of human rights or realisation of social justice.'"[67]

We should note then that the Cold War may have nuanced differences in approaches to the problem of peace, but it also augured a familiar pattern of the gendering of international organizations and norms in the field of peacemaking and the taming of warfare, with little significant difference between East and West gender practices. By this time, too, a "US model" of humanitarianism had become the international norm for not only aid work, but *development* assistance justified on the grounds of both pacifism and humanitarianism: namely, the idea that provision of new economic opportunities would ensure the perpetuation of peace and the fulfillment of the West's moral obligations to the colonial world. In her role as head of the Social Sciences Division at UNESCO (which she took up as a demotion after her year at the UN), Alva Myrdal personally rejected that grand-scale US development model, although she was not able to sway the overall direction of UNESCO programs. She had engaged international institutions in the mid-twentieth century on the view that at that moment in time peace could only be achieved if the world's marginalized (and here she meant both women and the colonized) were given new economic opportunities and social justice. "Development," including industrialization on the Swedish model, had to be adapted to local circumstances with respect for the "human" and women's rights. It was only in the 1990s, however, with the formulation of the concept of "human security" that the UN system began to enact policies that echoed Myrdal's views. Human security belatedly focused on women as crucial to the promotion of peace and collective security, on the assumption of the traditional family responsibilities assumed by women. Within the UN structure itself, the departments most comfortable with the election of women executives or spokespersons remains the Office of Human Rights or Women's Issues.

Conclusion

Seen through the lens of gender, the history of peace and the new international politics of humanitarianism in the first half of the twentieth century tells a familiar story about the persistence of so-called "bourgeois" gender norms since at least the nineteenth century. This is in part because over the same century, the modern nation-state model that rehearsed the political importance of gender difference, with men in public roles and women delegated to the private, was also the foundation of international thought.

Some women may have felt able to participate in humanitarian work and on behalf of peace over this same period as an extension of their private roles as "mothers," but as a consequence they often took on substantial public roles. However, as humanitarian work and pacifist objectives assumed mainstream status in the burgeoning sphere of international and intergovernmental institutions, the gender hierarchy that informed the reality of nation-state politics was repeated in international politics. We should not be surprised to discover that a highly gendered pattern of connections between humanitarian work and the creation of international organizations was repeated in the East and the West over the course of the first half of the twentieth century. As we have seen, Cold War case studies suggest that in the second half of the twentieth century, in both Eastern and Western settings, gender conventions in humanitarian practices remained structurally and rhetorically significant for the consolidation of both state and international politics. Historian Francesca Piana has described "diplomacy, the military, science, and the missionary" as "the spaces from which humanitarianism moved towards professionalization, and women played a growing role in a relative or even segregated capacity."[68] In particular, rescuing women and children from anti-egalitarian societies became a

standard argument for the international intervention of Western states and nonstate organizations in the East. For historian Emily S. Rosenberg, "modernization and humanitarian uplift, often in the form of liberating downtrodden women both at home and abroad," and the rhetorical representation of Western gender norms as a core necessity of "civilized" nations, were hallmarks more specifically of American exceptionalism.[69]

It is also true that the rise of new international institutions and the expansion of international thinking in relation to the challenges of peace and humanitarianism provoked some change over time. At various moments, alternative masculinities were imagined in relation to the politics of internationalism, and women's rights became associated with the prospect of human rights; women sought active roles as agents of humanitarianism and peace, not just its subjects. Historians are increasingly taking account of the influence of international law and the experiment of international governance on what we already know about gender and the nation state. The evidence we have so far points in the main to parallels between the international institutionalization of humanitarian practices and the professionalization of other spheres of female agency and service. This process tended to marginalize the abilities of women as agents even as women and children were the focus of humanitarian activism; meanwhile international law grew as a masculine domain of practice. There is still more research to be done if we are to understand how international politics, including the humanitarian and pacifist ambitions that predominantly shaped that politics in the early part of the twentieth century, affected the everyday lives of individuals in very different political and social circumstances, or the opportunities that an international arena of activism made uniquely available, including the possibilities for women's political agency. We are only at the beginning of a history of the

complex political and social significance of the new international politics that characterized the twentieth century.

---

[1] Jane Addams, "The Revolt Against War," in *Women at The Hague: The International Congress of Women and Its Results*, ed. Mercedes M. Randall (New York: Garland Publishing, 1972), 55–81, 60, 62.

[2] See also the chapters by Jean Quataert on "Changing Modes of Warfare and the Gendering of Military Medical Care in Continental and Colonial Wars, 1850s–1920s," and by Robert A. Nye on "Mobilization for War: Gendered Military Cultures in Nineteenth-Century Western Societies" in this handbook.

[3] Daniel Laqua, "Pacifism in Fin-de-Siècle Austria: The Politics and Limits of Peace Activism," *The Historical Journal* 57, no. 1 (2014): 199–214, 200.

[4] See the chapter by Quataert in this handbook.

[5] See Abigail Green, "Humanitarianism in Nineteenth Century Context: Religious, Gendered, National," *The Historical Journal* 57, no. 4 (2014): 1157–1175; and Clare Midgely, "British Anti-Slavery and Feminism in Transatlantic Perspective," in *Women's Rights and Transatlantic Antislavery in the Era of Emancipation*, ed. Kathryn Kish Sklar and James Brewer Stewart (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2007), 121–139.

[6] Sandi Cooper, *Patriotic Pacifism: Waging War on in Europe, 1815–1914* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), and "Pacifism in France, 1889–1914: International Peace as a Human Right," *French Historical Studies* 17, no. 2 (1991): 359–386; and Jacques Bariéty and Antoine

18 December 2016

Fleury, eds., *Mouvements et initiatives de paix dans la politique internationale, 1867–1928* (Zurich: Peter Lang, 1987).

[7] Brigitte Hamann, *Bertha von Suttner: A Life for Peace* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1996).

[8] Daniel Laqua, "Inside the Humanitarian Cloud: Causes and Motivations to Help Friends and Strangers," in *Ideas, Practice and Histories of Humanitarianism*, ed. Daniel Laqua and Charlotte Alston, special issue of *The Journal of Modern European History* 12, no. 2 (2014): 175–185, 175; Katharina Rietzler, "Experts for Peace: Structures and Motivations of Philanthropic Internationalism in the Interwar Years," in *Internationalism Reconfigured: Transnational Ideas and Movements between the World Wars*, ed. Daniel Laqua (London: I.B. Tauris, 2011), 45–65; Amalia Ribi, "'The Breath of a New Life?' British Anti-Slavery Activism and the League of Nations," in ibid., 93–113; and Francesca Piana, "Towards the International Refugee Regime: Humanitarianism in the Wake of the First World War" (Ph.D. thesis, Geneva: Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies, 2013).

[9] See for example, Glenda , "René Cassin: Les droits de l'homme and the Universality of Human Rights, 1945–1966," in *Human Rights in the Twentieth Century*, ed. Stefan-Ludwig Hoffmann (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 107–124; idem, "Women, Feminisms, and Twentieth Century Internationalisms." in *Internationalisms: A Twentieth Century History*, ed. Glenda Sluga and Patricia Clavin (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 61-84; and Allida Black, "Are Women 'Human'? The UN and the Struggle to Recognize Women's Rights as Human Rights," in *The Human Rights Revolution: An International History*, ed. Akira Iriye and Petra Goedde (Oxford University Press, 2012), 133–158.

[10] See Glenda Sluga, *Internationalism in the Age of Nationalism* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press), 11–44. As historians of humanitarianism have shown, states too increasingly responded by this time to the call of humanitarianism and its international dimensions, whether as a response to natural disasters or war itself.

[11] See also the chapter by Ney in this handbook.

[12] Laqua, "Pacifism"; Bertha von Suttner, *Memoirs of Bertha von Suttner: The Records of an Eventful Life* (Boston: Ginn, 1910); and Sandi Cooper, "Pacifism, Feminism and Fascism in Interwar France," *International History Review* 19, no. 1 (1997): 104–114.

[13] Laqua, "Pacifism," 200.

[14] Bob Reinalda, *Routledge History of International Organizations: From 1815 to the Present Day* (London: Routledge, 2009), 67.

[15] Leila J. Rupp, "Constructing Internationalism: The Case of Transnational Women's Organizations, 1888–1945," *American Historical Review* 99, no. 5 (1994): 1571–1600, 1573–1575.

[16] See Robert A. Nye, "The Duel of Honor and the Origins of the Rules for Arms, Warfare, and Arbitration in The Hague Conferences," paper given at War Peace and International Order? The Legacies of the Hague Conferences of 1899 and 1907, Auckland, 19 April 2016; Shabtai Rosenne, ed., *The Hague Peace Conferences of 1899 and 1907 and International Arbitration: Reports and Documents* (The Hague: Asser Press, 2001); Maartje Abbenhuis, *An Age of Neutrals: Great Power Politics, 1815–1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 145–148; David Caron, "War and International Adjudication: Reflections on the 1899 Peace Conference," *American Journal of International Law* 94, no. 4 (2000): 4–30; Arthur Eyffinger,

The 1899 Hague Peace Conference: "The Parliament of Man, The Federation of the World"
(The Hague: Kluwer, 1999); Cooper, "Pacifism in France"; and Roger Chickering, *Imperial Germany and a World Without War: The Peace Movement and German Society*, *1892–1933*
(Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975).

[17] Sandi E. Cooper cited in Reinalda, *Routledge History,* 67.

[18] Reinalda, *Routledge History*, 203.

[19] Ibid., 213.

[20] Mark Mazower cited in Laqua, "Pacifism," 204.

[21] See Warren F. Kuehl, *Biographical Dictionary of Internationalists* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1983).

[22] See the chapter by Quataert in this handbook, and "Gendered Medical Services in Red Cross Field Hospitals during the First Balkan War and World War I," in *Peace, War, and Gender from Antiquity to the Present: Cross-Cultural Perspectives*, ed. Jost Dülffer and Robert Frank (Essen: Klartext Verlag, 2009), 219–233.

[23] Isabel Hull, *A Scrap of Paper: Breaking and Making International Law during the Great War* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2014).

[24] Francesca Piana, "The Dangers of 'Going Native': George Montandon and the International Committee of the Red Cross, 1919–1922," *Contemporary European History* 25, no. 2 (2016): 253–274; and Daniel Maul, "American Quakers, the Emergence of International Humanitarianism and the Foundation of the American Friends Service Committee 1890–1920," in *Dilemmas of Humanitarianism in the Twentieth Century*, ed. Johannes Paulmann (Oxford: Oxford University Press, forthcoming).

---

[25] Tammy M. Proctor, "An American Enterprise? British Participation in US Food Relief Programmes (1914–1923)," in *Humanitarianism in the Era of the First World War*, ed. Branden Little, special issue of *First World War Studies* 5, no. 1 (2014): 29–42; see also Daniel Maul, "The Politics of Neutrality: The American Friends Service Committee and the Spanish Civil War 1936–1939," in *Humanitarianisms in Context, Histories of Non-State Actors, from the Local to the Global*, ed. Kevin O'Sullivan and Matthew Hilton, special issue of *European Review of History/Revue européenne d'histoire* 23, no. 1–2 (2016): 82–100.

[26] Proctor, "An American Enterprise?," 29.

[27] Melanie Tanielian, "Politics of Wartime Relief in Ottoman Beirut (1914–1918)," in *Humanitarianism*, ed. Little, 69–82.

[28] Ibid., 69.

[29] Sluga, *Internationalism*, 35; and Laqua, "Pacifism," 209.

[30] It was originally known as the International Women's Committee for Permanent Peace (IWCPP). In the postwar, both the Allied women suffragists and the WILPF supported the creation of an international government and the values of national self-determination as a corollary to their distinctive feminist aims. However, during the war, only the WILPF openly and actively promoted these values; see Sluga, ""Women, Feminisms, and Twentieth Century Internationalisms."

[31] On social maternalism, see Seth Koven and Sonya Michel, "Womanly Duties: Maternalist Politics and the Origins of Welfare States in France, Germany, Great Britain, and the United States, 1880–1920," *American Historical Review* 95, no. 4 (1990): 1076–1108.

[32] Ellen Key, *War, Peace and the Future: A Consideration of Nationalism and Internationalism,*

and of the Relation of Women to War (London: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1916)*, 17, 18.

[33] Other women in the UDC included Phillip Snowden, Charles Trevelyan, and Lady Margaret Sackville. See, Helena M. Swanwick, *Builders of Peace: Being Ten Years History of the Union of Democratic Control* (London: Swarthmore Press, 1924), 56. See also Helen McCarthy, "The Lifeblood of the League? Voluntary Associations and League of Nations Activism in Britain," *Internationalism Reconfigured*, ed. Laqua, 187–208; and Marie Sandell, "'A Real Meeting of the Women of the East and West': Women and Internationalism in the Interwar Period," in ibid., 161–188. Keith Watenpaugh cites Helena Swanwick calling for the League to involve more "women from the East'"; see Watenpaugh, "The League of Nations' Rescue of Armenian Genocide Survivors and the Making of Modern Humanitarianism," *American Historical Review* 115, no. 5 (2010): 1315–1339.

[34] Helen McCarthy, *The British People and the League of Nations Democracy, Citizenship and Internationalism, 1918–45* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011), 182.

[35] Ibid., 185, 186.

[36] Ibid., 196.

[37] Of course this argument has been challenged by Christopher Clark in *The Sleepwalkers: How Europe Went to War in 1914* (New York: Penguin, 2014).

[38] Margaret MacMillan, *Peacemakers: Six Months that Changed the World* (New York: Random House, 2001).

[39] Ibid.

[40] See Daniel Gorman, *The Emergence of International Society in the 1920s* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 52; and Susan Pedersen, "Women and the 'Spirit of

Geneva'" (unpublished manuscript, 2015).

[41] See Stephanie A. Limoncelli, *The Politics of Trafficking: The First International Movement to Combat the Sexual Exploitation of Women* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2010).

[42] Andrew Webster, "Merchants of Death: Law, Disarmament and Internationalism," in Sluga and Clavin, *Internationalisms*, ed. Sluga and Clavin, 13–22.

[43] See Richard Price, "A Genealogy of the Chemical Weapons Taboo," *International Organization* 49, no. 1 (1995): 73–103.

[44] See Gertrude Bussey and Margaret Tims, *Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 1915–1965: A Record of Fifty Years' Work* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1965), 34–52 and 94–102; and Jill Liddington, *Road to Greenham Common: Feminism and Anti-Militarism in Britain since 1820* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1991), 148. For a useful introduction to the feminist historiography of internationalism see Francesca de Haan, "Eugénie Cotton, Pak Chong-Ae, and Claudia Jones: Rethinking Transnational Feminism and International Politics," *Journal of Women's History* 25, no. 4 (2013): 174–189.

[45] Catherine Foster, *Women for All Seasons: The Story of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1989), 18.

[46] See Susan Pedersen, "Metaphors of the Schoolroom: Women Working the Mandates System of the League of Nations," *History Workshop Journal* 66, no. 1 (2008): 188–207.

[47] Francesca Piana, "The Professionalization of Humanitarianism in the Interwar Period," paper given at Dealing with Disasters: An International Perspective, 1870–2000, Oxford, England, 9–11 September 2013; and Philippa Lesley Hetherington, "Between Moscow, Geneva and Shanghai: The League of Nations and the Traffic in Women of Russian Origin, 1920–1937"

(unpublished manuscript, UCL School of Slavonic and East European Studies, London 2015).

[48] McCarthy, *The British People,* 194. "Mui Tsai" means "little sister" in Cantonese and describes young Chinese women who worked as domestic servants in China, or in brothels or affluent Chinese households in traditional Chinese society.

[49] Ibid., 193.

[50] Lilian Pascoe-Rutter, "A Further Report from London," *Equal Rights*, March–April 1946, 12.

[51] Celia Donert, "Women's Rights in Cold War Europe: Disentangling Feminist Histories," *Past and Present* 218, suppl. 8 (2013): 178–202, 178.

[52] Gertrude Baer, "Women on all Fronts," *Equal Rights*, March-April 1945, 26. See also Marilyn Lake, "From Self-Determination via Protection to Equality via Non-Discrimination: Defining Women's Rights at the League of Nations and the United Nations," in *Women's Rights and Human Rights: International Historical Perspectives*, ed. Patricia Grimshaw et al. (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001), 254–271, 263; Glenda Sluga, "National Sovereignty and Female Equality: Gender, Peacemaking, and the New World Orders of 1919 and 1945," in Karen Hagemann et al., eds., *Frieden—Gewalt—Geschlecht: Friedens- und Konfliktforschung als Geschlechterforschung*, ed. Karen Hagemann et al. (Essen: Klartext, 2005), 166–183.

[53] Sluga, Glenda, "UNESCO and the (One) World of Julian Huxley," *Journal of World History*, 21, no. 3 (2010): 393–418.

[54] "Women in the United Nations," *Roshni: Journal of the All India Women's Conference*, June 1949, 30; see Glenda Sluga, "'Spectacular Feminism': The International History of Women, World Citizenship and Human Rights," in *Women's Activism: Global Perspectives form the 1890s to the Present*, ed. Francisca de Haan et al. (London: Routledge, 2103), 44–58, 56.

[55] Deborah Stienstra, *Women's Movements*, *Women's Movements and International Organizations* (London: St. Martin's Press, 1994), 79.

[56] See Glenda Sluga, "The Human Story of Development: Alva Myrdal at the UN, 1949–1955," in *International Organizations and Development, 1945–1990*, ed. Marc Frey et al. (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 46–74.

[57] The chair of the sub-commission on the status of women was Bodil Begtrup, the chairman of National Council of Women of Denmark, but otherwise European women were relatively absent in the debates around and the setting up of a separate commission on the status of women.

[58] UN Women, Commission on the Status of Women, <http://www.unwomen.org/en/csw> (14 November 2015).

[59] Johannes Morsink, *The Universal Declaration of Human Rights: Origins, Drafting and Intent* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999), 93, 118. See Articles 23 and 25 of the Declaration, which refer to "himself and his family."

[60] The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Article 25(2), <http://www.un.org/en/universal-declaration-human-rights/> (3 December 2015).

[61] Donert, "Women's Rights," 191; see Haan, "Eugénie Cotton," 174, 175.

[62] *Congrès International des Femmes; Compte Rendu des Travaux du Congrès Qui S'est Tenu À Paris du 26 Novembre au 1er Décembre 1945* (Paris: Fédération démocratique internationale des femmes, 1946), 381–389.

[63] Donert, "Women's Rights," 189.

[64] Ibid., 190.

[65] See Sluga, " "Women, Feminisms, and Twentieth Century Internationalisms" ; and Eugénie

Cotton, *World Congress of Mothers for the Defence of their Children against War, for Disarmament and Friendship between the Peoples* (n.p.: Women's International Democratic Federation, 1955).

[66] Donert, "Women's Rights," 196.

[67] Ibid., 198.

[68] Piana, "The Dangers," [n.p].

[69] Emily S. Rosenberg, "Rescuing Women and Children," *Journal of American History* 89, no. 2 (2002): 456–465, 459; Barbara Metzger, "Toward an International Human Rights Regime during the Inter-War Years: The League of Nations' Combat of traffic in Women and Children," in *Beyond Sovereignty: Britain, Empire and Transnationalism, c.1880–1950*, ed. Kevin Grant et al. (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), 54–79; and Daniel Maul, *Human Rights, Development and Decolonization. The International Labour Organization, 1940–70* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012).