

Feminist empiricists argue however, that due to androcentrism and men's domination of the field, women have been denied access. The male bias has also limited the field of study as well by determining the subjects that merit exploration.

Therefore, according to a feminist empiricist, the method is fine but has just failed according to its own standard. Therefore feminist empiricists argue that the approach just needs to be 'corrected' by eliminating the male bias. This is achieved by making women in international relations visible by retrieving and inserting their experiences and increasing women's participation in the political realm.

There are two ways to address androcentrism in international relations and the approach taken depends on how one understands the nature of women's exclusion.<sup>17</sup> The first approach calls for the inclusion of women in a method of direct participation, derisively known as the "add-women-and-stir" approach. These feminists argue that there are barriers that have precluded women's participation. The second argues that women were always there, but that the androcentric bias has rendered women and their activities invisible. From this perspective then, the objective is to expand the categories of inquiry and make the women who were already there visible.<sup>18</sup> In the case of international relations, this has meant feminist struggles have been engaged in increasing women's participation in academia, the military, and government, as well as efforts to widen the scope of inquiry to identify women's experiences of international politics, including armed conflict. Many accounts in this capacity document women's involvement in warmaking and peacemaking.<sup>19</sup>

Critics of this approach argue that feminist empiricism fails to account for power; or, socially imposed or constructed identities that situate categories, including women, in unequal conditions. Therefore, liberal feminists' acceptance of the empiricist methodology means that inequalities which are embedded in structures are left untouched by the presence or inclusion of women.

### **Standpoint Feminism**

A second approach is a more radical epistemology which argues that all international relations are gendered social practices. International relations theory, according to standpoint feminism, is not objective but instead a masculine construct which directly serves male interests. It is also radical feminists who have engaged the twin topics of war and peace. Unlike liberal feminists, however, radical feminists are not particularly interested in rendering women visible in the process. They instead emphasize the differing attitudes towards war and peace which they claim exist between men and women. They argue that women are more peaceful and nurturing, as opposed to men who are

---

<sup>17</sup> This distinction between liberal feminists is further explored in Whitworth, (1994), op. cit., pp. 12-16

<sup>18</sup> Whitworth, (1994), op. cit., pp. 14

<sup>19</sup> See Jeanne Vickers, "Achieving Visibility" in **Women and War**, London and New Jersey: Zed Books, 1993. pp. 104-117.