MARK PEARCEY

THE EXCLUSIONS OF CIVILIZATION

Indigenous Peoples in the Story of International Society

PUBLIC SCHOOL

The Palgrave Macmillan History of International Thought

Series Editors

Brian Schmidt
Carleton University,
Department of Political Science

David Long
Carleton University, Norman Paterson
School of International Affairs

Aims of the Series
The Palgrave Macmillan History of International Thought book series (HIT) publishes scholarly monographs and edited collections on the intellectual, conceptual, and disciplinary history of international relations. The aim of the series is to recover the intellectual and social milieu of individual writers, publicists, and other significant figures in either the field of International Relations or international political thought more broadly, and to assesses the contribution that these authors have made to the development of international theory. HIT embraces the historiographical turn that has taken place within International Relations as more and more scholars are interested in understanding both the disciplinary history of the field, and the history of international thought. Books that historically analyze the evolution of particular ideas, concepts, discourses, and prominent, as well as neglected, figures in the field all fit within the scope of the series. HIT is intended to be interdisciplinary in outlook and will be of interest to specialists and students in International Relations, International History, Political Science, Political Theory, and Sociology.

More information about this series at
http://www.springer.com/series/14419

Mark Pearcey

The Exclusions of Civilization

Indigenous Peoples in the Story of International Society

palgrave
macmillan

Mark Pearcey
Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario, Canada

To my daughter, Abigail

Series Editor Foreword

As Editors of the Palgrave Macmillan History of International Thought series, we aim to publish the highest quality research on the intellectual, conceptual, and disciplinary history of international relations. The books in the series assess the contribution that individual writers—academics, publicists and other significant figures—have made to the development of thinking on international relations. Central to this task is the historical reconstruction and interpretation that recovers the intellectual and social milieu within which their subjects were writing. Previous volumes in the series have traced the course of traditions, their shifting grounds or common questions, exploring heretofore neglected pathways of international theory and providing new insight and refreshed context for established approaches such as realism and liberalism. The series embraces the historiographical turn that has taken place within academic international relations with the growth of interest in understanding both the disciplinary history of the field and the history of international thought. A critical concern of the series is the institutional and intellectual development of the study of international relations as an academic pursuit. The series is expressly pluralist and as such open to both critical and traditional work; work that presents historical reconstruction or an interpretation of the past, as well as genealogical studies that account for the possibilities and constraints of present-day theories.

The series is interdisciplinary in outlook, embracing contributions from international relations, international history, political science, political theory, sociology and law. We seek to explore the mutually constitutive triangular relationship of international relations, theory and history. We

take this to mean the appreciation of the importance of the history in the theory of international relations, of theory in the history of international relations, and even of international relations in the history of international thought! In this last case, we hope that the series can become more broadly intercultural also, including scholarship from outside Europe and North America as well as delving into more of the non-Western context of the development of international relations theory, though we acknowledge that the Eurocentric/ethnocentric character of the field is presently mirrored in its disciplinary history.

Mark Pearcey's book examines the important, although largely overlooked, evolving relationship between international society and indigenous peoples. In doing so, his book fulfills many of the aims of the series. He argues that the Eurocentricism of international relations, especially the mythical story it tells about the Peace of Westphalia and its ingrained state-centric bias, has led to an uncritical acceptance of the expansion of international society narrative. This narrative, which is central to the work of the English School, has also, according to Pearcey, resulted in obscuring the role of a European discourse on civilization in substantiating colonial and imperial endeavours. Central to his critical examination of the concepts of civilization and international society is the argument that while the process of expansion obviously involved the inclusion of some, it entailed the exclusion of others. Pearcey shifts the focus away from the usual state-centric focus of international relations to consider indigenous peoples. He carefully examines the historical and contemporary relations of these non-state actors with the society of states.

Drawing on the insights of postcolonial theory, he shows that the unequal 'exclusion through inclusion' of indigenous peoples within sovereign states and under domestic law has underpinned the relations between states and indigenous peoples from the time of the Spanish conquest to the present. Forcibly included within sovereign states, indigenous peoples are rendered invisible to international law and society. The European discourse on civilization played a key role in constituting the institutions that define the relations between indigenous peoples and international society, persisting through the colonial, imperial, and even (in modified form) into postcolonial period up to today.

Pearcey's ability to integrate theoretical and historical analysis with the aim of achieving critical insights is on display throughout the book. Although he is sharply critical of some aspects of the English School's

work on civilization and the expansion of international society, Pearcey is interested in finding a way to realize the School's critical potential, returning to the work of Martin Wight and engaging with the arguments on international society made by Barry Buzan, Edward Keene, Antony Anghie and Paul Keal. *The Exclusions of Civilization* is an erudite historical investigation, a solid basis for understanding the challenge that indigenous peoples face in global politics today and a guide to rethinking the relationship of indigenous peoples and the international society of states.

Notes

1. At the time of writing an Algonquin land claim is being negotiated that involves the Ontario side of the Ottawa-Gatineau region. Details of this land claim can be found here: Government of Ontario, "The Algonquin Land Claim," Government, *Government of Ontario*, (2016), https://www.ontario.ca/page/algonquin-land-claim#section-0.
2. My use of term 'global space' is discussed in more detail in Chap. 2.
3. The Canadian Museum of History's homepage can be accessed here: Canadian Museum of History, "Canadian Museum of History," *Canadian Museum of History*, accessed May 17, 2016, http://www.historymuseum.ca/.
4. At the time of writing, the Canadian Museum of History is in the process of renovation for a new exhibit titled, The Canadian History Hall. More information can be found here: Canadian Museum of History, "The Canadian History Hall," *Canadian Museum of History*, accessed May 17, 2016, http://www.historymuseum.ca/event/the-canadian-history-hall/.
5. In this book I have placed this turn of phrase ('exclusion by inclusion') in shudder quotes for two interrelated reasons. First, to reflect the fact that this turn of phrase has been employed elsewhere with specific relevance for international relations; for example, see: Eva Hartmann, "The Educational Dimension of Global Hegemony," *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 44, no. 1 (September 2015): 89–108; David Lloyd, "Settler Colonialism and the State of Exception: The Example of Palestine/Israel," *Settler Colonial Studies* 2, no. 1 (2012): 59–80; Mark Pearcey, "Sovereignty, Identity, and Indigenous-State Relations at the Beginning of the Twentieth Century: A Case of Exclusion by Inclusion," *International Studies Review* 17, no. 3 (September 2015): 441–454; Second, to reflect the fact that others have explored the idea behind it, even if they do not use this exact turn of phrase; for example, see: Tanja E. Aalberts, "Rethinking the Principle of (Sovereign) Equality as a Standard of Civilisation," *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 42, no. 3 (June 2014): 767–789; Antony Anghie,

Imperialism, Sovereignty and the Making of International Law, vol. 37, Cambridge Studies in International and Comparative Law (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005); Brett Bowden, *The Empire of Civilization: The Evolution of an Imperial Idea*, (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2009); Prasenjit Duara, "The Discourse of Civilization and Decolonization," *Journal of World History* 15, no. 1 (March 2004): 1–5; Prasenjit Duara, "The Discourse of Civilization and Pan-Asianism," *Journal of World History* 12, no. 1 (Spring 2001): 99–130; John M. Hobson, *The Eurocentric Conception of World Politics: Western International Theory, 1760–2010* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012); John M. Hobson, *The Eastern Origins of Western Civilisation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004); Naeem Inayatullah and David L. Blaney, *International Relations and the Problem of Difference*, vol. 1, Global Horizons (New York: Routledge, 2004); Paul Keal, *European Conquest and the Rights of Indigenous Peoples: The Moral Backwardness of International Society*, vol. 92, Cambridge Studies in International Relations (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003); Martti Koskenniemi, *The Gentle Civilizer of Nations: The Rise and Fall of International Law 1870–1960*, Hersch Lauterpacht Memorial Lectures (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002); James Tully, *Strange Multiplicity: Constitutionalism in an Age of Diversity*, The John Robert Seeley Lectures (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995); R.B.J. Walker, *Inside/outside: International Relations as Political Theory*, vol. 24, Cambridge Studies in International Relations (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993); Ayşe Zarakol, *After Defeat: How the East Learned to Live with the West*, vol. 118, Cambridge Studies in International Relations (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

6. Turan Kayaoglu, "Westphalian Eurocentrism in International Relations Theory," *International Studies Review* 12, no. 2 (June 2010): esp. 204–209.

7. Hedley Bull and Adam Watson, "Introduction," in *The Expansion of International Society*, ed. Hedley Bull and Adam Watson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984), 6; See also: Keal, *European Conquest and the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*, 92: 33.

8. Bull and Watson, "Introduction," 2.

9. My telling of a "connected history" draws on the respective works of Gurminder K. Bhambra and Sanjay Subrahmanyam and is discussed in more detail in Chap. 2; see: Gurminder K. Bhambra, "Talking among Themselves? Weberian and Marxist Historical Sociologies as Dialogues without 'Others,'" *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 39, no. 3 (May 2011): 667–81; Gurminder K. Bhambra, "Historical Sociology, International Relations and Connected Histories," *Cambridge Review of*

International Affairs 23, no. 1 (March 2010): 127–43; Gurminder K. Bhambra, *Rethinking Modernity: Postcolonialism and the Sociological Imagination* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), esp. 30–33, Conclusion; Sanjay Subrahmanyam, *Explorations in Connected History: Mughals and Franks* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2005); Sanjay Subrahmanyam, *Explorations in Connected History: From the Tagus to the Ganges* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2005); Sanjay Subrahmanyam, "Connected Histories: Notes towards a Reconfiguration of Early Modern Eurasia," *Modern Asian Studies* 31, no. 3 (July 1997): 735–62.

10. For a wider discussion of Eurocentrism in international theory that includes a specific discussion of the 1945–1989 period (a period of time that witnessed the initial publication of *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics*, 1977, and *The Expansion of International Society*, 1984), see: Hobson, *The Eurocentric Conception of World Politics*, esp. 319–327.

11. Inayatullah and Blaney, *International Relations and the Problem of Difference*, 1: 85.

12. Karena Shaw rightly notes, "the literature of Indigenous politics within international relations comprises a rather slim file." Karena Shaw, *Indigeneity and Political Theory: Sovereignty and the Limits of the Political*, vol. 1, Routledge Issues in Contemporary Political Theory (London: Routledge, 2008), 63; Though "slim," it is not non-existent; for example, see: David Bedford and Thom Workman, "The Great Law of Peace: Alternative Inter-Nation(al) Practices and the Iroquoian Confederacy," *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* 22, no. 1 (March 1997): 87–111; J. Marshall Beier, ed., *Indigenous Diplomacies* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009); J. Marshall Beier, "Introduction: Indigenous Diplomacies as Indigenous Diplomacies," in *Indigenous Diplomacies*, ed. J. Marshall Beier (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), 1–27; J. Marshall Beier, "Inter-National Affairs: Indigeneity, Globality and the Canadian State," *Canadian Foreign Policy Journal* 13, no. 3 (2007): 121–131; J. Marshall Beier, *International Relations in Uncommon Places: Indigeneity, Cosmology, and the Limits of International Theory* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005); Yale D. Belanger, "The Six Nations of Grand River Territory's Attempts at Renewing International Political Relationships, 1921–1924," *Canadian Foreign Policy Journal* 13, no. 3 (2007): 29–43; Neta C. Crawford, "A Security Regime among Democracies: Cooperation among Iroquois Nations," *International Organization* 48, no. 3 (Summer 1994): 345–385; Roger Epp, "At the Wood's Edge: Toward a Theoretical Clearing for Indigenous Diplomacies in International Relations," in *International Relations-Still an American Social Science? Toward Diversity in International Thought*, ed. Robert M.A. Crawford and Darryl S.L. Jarvis, SUNY Series in Global Politics (Albany: State University of New York

Press, 2001), 299–324; Keal, *European Conquest and the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*; Benedict Kingsbury, "'Indigenous Peoples' in International Law: A Constructivist Approach to the Asian Controversy," *The American Journal of International Law* 92, no. 3 (July 1998): 414–457; Robert Lee Nichols, "Realizing the Social Contract: The Case of Colonialism and Indigenous Peoples," *Contemporary Political Theory* 4, no. 1 (February 2005): 42–62; Franke Wilmer, *The Indigenous Voice in World Politics: Since Time Immemorial*, vol. 7, Violence, Cooperation, Peace (Newbury Park: Sage Publications, 1993).

13. Kayaoglu, "Westphalian Eurocentrism in International Relations Theory," esp. 204–209.

14. For a similar perspective, see: J. Ann Tickner, "Dealing with Difference: Problems and Possibilities for Dialogue in International Relations," *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 39, no. 3 (May 2011): 607–618; See also: Arlene B. Tickner and Ole Waever, eds., *International Relations Scholarship around the World*, Worlding Beyond the West (New York: Routledge, 2009).

15. For a wider discussion on deepening international relations' engagement with non-Western perspectives, see: Amitav Acharya, "Dialogue and Discovery: In Search of International Relations Theories Beyond the West," *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 39, no. 3 (May 2011): 619–637; Amitav Acharya and Barry Buzan, "Why Is There No Non-Western International Relations Theory? An Introduction," *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific* 7, no. 3 (September 2007): 287–312; See also: Tickner, "Dealing with Difference"; Tickner and Waever, *International Relations Scholarship around the World*.

16. Timothy Dunne, "Colonial Encounters in International Relations: Reading Wight, Writing Australia," *Australian Journal of International Affairs* 51, no. 3 (1997): 309–323.

17. This point is the first of several "sensitivities" that Shilliam identifies for "an anti- or post-colonial engagement by the Western Academy with non-Western thought." See: Robbie Shilliam, "The Perilous but Unavoidable Terrain of the Non-West," in *International Relations and Non-Western Thought: Imperialism, Colonialism and Investigations of Global Modernity*, ed. Robbie Shilliam, Interventions (London: Routledge, 2011), 21.

18. Carsten-Andreas Schulz, "Civilisation, Barbarism and the Making of Latin America's Place in 19th-Century International Society," *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 42, no. 3 (June 2014): esp. 840–844; Broadly speaking, my use of the term "orthodox" echoes what others have referred to as the "classical," "conventional" and/or "orthodox" English School. For example, see: Barry Buzan and Richard Little, "The Historical Expansion of International Society," in *Guide to the English School in*

International Studies, ed. Cornelia Navari and Daniel M. Green, Guides to International Studies (Chichester: Wiley Blackwell, 2014), 59–75; Tim Dunne, "The English School," in *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations*, ed. Christian Reus-Smit and Duncan Snidal, Oxford Handbooks of Political Science (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 267–285; Edward Keene, "The Standard of 'Civilisation', the Expansion Thesis and the 19th-Century International Social Space," *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 42, no. 3 (June 2014): 651–673.

19. Buzan and Little, "The Historical Expansion of International Society," esp. 60–64.

20. For another perspective on China and Japan in the story of international society, see: Shogo Suzuki, *Civilization and Empire: China and Japan's Encounter with European International Society*, The New International Relations (London: Routledge, 2009), esp. 12–20.

21. For example, see: Barry Buzan and George Lawson, *The Global Transformation: History, Modernity and the Making of International Relations*, vol. 135, Cambridge Studies in International Relations (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015); Keal, *European Conquest and the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*; Edward Keene, *Beyond the Anarchical Society: Grotius, Colonialism and Order in World Politics*, LSE Monographs in International Studies (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002); Suzuki, *Civilization and Empire*; For a constructivist perspective, see: Zarakol, *After Defeat*.

22. Molly Cochran, "The Ethics of the English School," in *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations*, ed. Christian Reus-Smit and Duncan Snidal, Oxford Handbooks of Political Science (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), esp. 291–293.

23. Dunne, "The English School," 267.

24. The spirit of Haida Gwaii is a sculpture by Bill Reid of the Haida nation; see: Tully, *Strange Multiplicity*, 17.

25. Ibid., 25–26.

26. Epp, "At the Wood's Edge," 313.

27. For a wider discussion on the "perils of representing the non-West," see: Shilliam, "The Perilous but Unavoidable Terrain of the Non-West," esp. 15–18.

28. With great appreciation, I would like to acknowledge a number of works that proved central to the conceptual development of this book; see: Anghie, *Imperialism, Sovereignty and the Making of International Law*; Bhambra, *Rethinking Modernity*; Bowden, *The Empire of Civilization*; Hedley Bull, *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics*, 3rd ed. (New York: Columbia University Press, (1977) 2002); Hedley Bull and Adam Watson, eds., *The Expansion of International Society* (Oxford:

Clarendon Press, 1984); Barry Buzan, *From International to World Society? English School Theory and the Social Structure of Globalisation*, vol. 95, Cambridge Studies in International Relations (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004); Gerrit W. Gong, *The Standard of 'Civilization' in International Society* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984); Inayatullah and Blaney, *International Relations and the Problem of Difference*; Keal, *European Conquest and the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*; Keene, *Beyond the Anarchical Society*; Ronald Niezen, *The Origins of Indigenism: Human Rights and the Politics of Identity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003); Subrahmanyam, "Connected Histories: Early Modern Eurasia"; Suzuki, *Civilization and Empire*; Robert A. Williams, Jr., *The American Indian in Western Legal Thought: The Discourses of Conquest*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990).

PREFACE

In September 2007, I moved to Ottawa, Canada, to embark on my doctoral studies at Carleton University. Like many capital cities, Ottawa is replete with large and well-funded museums that detail the history of the country, in this case, Canada's. One of those museums is the Canadian Museum of History, which sits across from Canada's parliament buildings, in Gatineau, Quebec. Apart from the clear symbolism of the museum's location, straddling the Ontario-Quebec border (long considered the division between English and French Canada), the museum sits on Algonquin lands. That is where the Canadian Museum of History sits, on land that now forms the Ottawa-Gatineau region. That land is historically complex and politically contentious; it is evidence of Europe's imperial expansion and the legacies of that history.[1] Although no one, at least to my knowledge, would advocate for the imminent departure of Ottawa-Gatineau's citizens, or the demolishment of the Canadian Museum of History, the existence of both reminds us of a colonial history that often escapes the empirical and theoretical interests of disciplinary international relations. In fact, it could be argued that that history has been effaced by a disciplinary tendency to overlook the much less attractive aspects of Europe's imperial expansion and to downplay the legacies that that expansion handed down for indigenous peoples. None of this is to deny the important role Europe played in the constitution of the global space[2] or to suggest that the beneficiaries of that history (such as the inhabitants of Ottawa-Gatineau, myself included) should not call Ottawa-Gatineau home. What it does suggest is a need to reflect critically on the processes that led to where we are today and to engage more thoughtfully with their consequences. For example, it

is worth noting that the former name of the Canadian Museum of History was the Canadian Museum of Civilization, a name that provokes all sorts of interesting questions about the meaning of civilization and its relationship to Canada's historical constitution. In fact, as visitors to the Canadian Museum of Civilization entered its main galleries, they rode an escalator down to the Grand Hall (and still do today). Featured in the Grand Hall are exhibitions on the indigenous peoples of Canada that engage with their historical pasts and contemporary presents.[3] The reason this is interesting from the perspective of both international and Canadian history is that it begs the question, would any of those exhibitions have been featured in a museum of civilization until quite recently?

Since the onset of Spanish colonialism in the Americas, at the absolute latest, European powers have rationalized their expansion through a civilizational discourse, a discourse that warrants intervention in the lives of those they deem uncivilized. In light of that, there is a certain irony to the fact that the Canadian Museum of Civilization featured indigenous peoples in the Grand Hall, as indigenous peoples were long regarded by European, and later Western powers, to be in a state of civilizational pupillage. In that respect, interestingly, it is also worth noting that as visitors scaled up the Canadian Museum of Civilization, they were introduced to exhibits that chronologically depicted the arrival of Europeans and the emergence of the Canadian state.[4] In fact, the appearance of those exhibits seemed to coincide with the gradual disappearance of exhibits on indigenous history; it was almost as if the exhibits on indigenous history were being effaced by the appearance of exhibits on European history. I draw attention to this because it helps serve as a metaphor for much of what is argued in what follows—specifically, that Europe's imperial expansion resulted in a process of 'exclusion by inclusion,' whereby indigenous peoples were gradually subsumed within the boundaries of European empires, only to be excluded from meaningful participation within the global space. Although this turn of phrase ('exclusion by inclusion') is not often used in the international relations literature, the idea itself is not new. A critical body of literature has emerged with a central concern with the complex relationship between insider and outsider relations, including the exclusionary dynamics of inclusion.[5] This literature is especially important in this book, because it helps us to understand why indigenous peoples and their political histories have been widely overlooked by disciplinary international relations. As is argued in the coming chapters, this is in part because of a conventional account on the Peace of Westphalia

that places a priority on the sovereign state, laying the foundations for an orthodox account of the evolution and expansion of international society that valorizes European international society.[6]

In my opinion, that account of the expansion is epitomized by the joint and respective works of Hedley Bull and Adam Watson on the evolution and expansion of international society; *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics* by Bull, *The Expansion of International Society* coedited by Bull and Watson and to a lesser extent, *The Evolution of International Society: A Comparative Historical Analysis* by Watson (which was more interested in the evolution of regional societies, European and non-European alike). Although I will leave the details of my criticism of these texts for the chapters to come, suffice it to note here that one of my chief concerns is that Bull and Watson avoided a sustained engagement with non-Europeans' political history until about the twentieth century, focusing instead on European history and blinding themselves to the intersections and interconnections of both in the process. While that might appear to be a strong indictment of their work, it should be noted from the outset that my criticisms are absolutely not meant to downplay or discredit Bull and Watson's contributions to the field. As any reader of one of their texts will quickly discover, Bull and Watson were meticulous in their line of argumentation, rich in historical detail and often much more nuanced in their treatment of international history than is usually given credit. In fact, Bull and Watson did not necessarily see their account as one that depicted the projection of European institutions into the non-European world, but rather as one interested in the relationship between *evolution* on the one hand and *expansion* on the other.[7] And, given that the expansion of European empires was necessarily marked by their encounter with non-European peoples, we might even go one step further and conclude that Bull and Watson implicitly acknowledged the constitutive role of non-Europeans in the formation of today's international society (something that becomes much more explicit in their treatment of decolonization during the mid-twentieth century).

The problem with taking this reading at face value, I think, is that Bull and Watson's account of the evolution and expansion of international society comes from a very particular perspective. Overtly Eurocentric (something Bull and Watson associate with "the historical record"),[8] it is an account that depicts European international society as the source and subsequent centre of contemporary modernity in international relations, without paying much attention to the role of non-Europeans in the

constitution of it. And, while I am sympathetic to the fact that Bull and Watson were interested in the relationship between evolution and expansion, I am not wholly convinced that this did much to prevent them from describing the story of international society as anything but the ultimate triumph of European institutions; in particular, the role of these institutions in ordering anarchy via the evolution and expansion of European empires. Instead, I believe that a better way to understand the Bull and Watson account—without diminishing its contributions—is to treat it as one part of a much more complicated history; that is, as a specific account that tells us a great deal about the European side of the story, but much less about the non-European side and how these two sides interacted. In light of this, we might want to think about (re)telling the story of international society's evolution and expansion in line with what Gurminder K. Bhambra and Sanjay Subrahmanyam respectively refer to as a "connected history."[9] And, in these respects, to take heed of critical scholarship that reminds us of the links between mainstream international relations theory and the imperial and Eurocentric discourses that underpin it.[10]

To re-emphasize the point above, this critical reflection on the works of Bull and Watson should not be construed as an attempt to obfuscate their important insights and trail-blazing work (after all, this book would not have been possible without their pioneering scholarship!). But, it is intended to provoke some critical reflection on a narrative that has proven deeply influential for our understanding of international history and, in the process, concealed "connected histories" that would help broaden our understanding of this subject matter. Indeed, the theory and practice of international relations has evolved from an imperial past that has dealt with the Other by excluding it through processes of homogenization. Reproduced in mainstream scholarship on the evolution and expansion of international society, this has impeded us from a more comprehensive understanding of our origins. As Naeem Inayatullah and David L. Blaney so poignantly observe, "IR fails to herald a unique contribution to social theory because it persistently avoids and denies the historical problem from which it surfaced, namely the problem of what to do about cultural difference."[11] It is with this view in mind that the chapters of this book unfold, tendering an alternative account on the evolution and expansion of international society that does not so much seek to do away with the orthodox account, but rather to retell it as a "connected history" that must engage more comprehensively with the role of a European discourse