

RACE AND RACISM IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Confronting the global colour line

A solid orange rectangle followed by the word "INTERVENTIONS" in white capital letters on a black background.

INTERVENTIONS

edited by
ALEXANDER ANIEVAS,
NIVI MANCHANDA AND
ROBBIE SHILLIAM

RACE AND RACISM IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

International Relations, as a discipline, does not grant race and racism explanatory agency in its conventional analyses, despite such issues being integral to the birth of the discipline. *Race and Racism in International Relations* seeks to remedy this oversight by acting as a catalyst for remembering, exposing and critically re-articulating the central importance of race and racism in international relations.

Departing from the theoretical and political legacy of W. E. B. Du Bois's concept of the 'colour line', the cutting-edge contributions in this text provide an accessible entry point for both international relations students and scholars into the literature and debates on race and racism by borrowing insights from disciplines such as history, anthropology and sociology where race and race theory figure more prominently; yet they also suggest that the field of International Relations is itself an intellectual and strategic field through which to further confront the global colour line.

Drawing together a wide range of contributors, this much-needed text will be essential reading for students and scholars in a range of areas including postcolonial studies, race/racism in world politics and international relations theory.

Alexander Anievas is a Leverhulme Early Career Research Fellow at the Department of Politics and International Studies, University of Cambridge.

Nivi Manchanda is a PhD candidate at the Department of Politics and International Studies at the University of Cambridge.

Robbie Shilliam is Reader in International Relations at Queen Mary, University of London.

Interventions

Edited by:

Jenny Edkins, Aberystwyth University and Nick Vaughan-Williams,
University of Warwick

'As Michel Foucault has famously stated, "knowledge is not made for understanding; it is made for cutting." In this spirit the Edkins–Vaughan-Williams Interventions series solicits cutting edge, critical works that challenge mainstream understandings in international relations. It is the best place to contribute post disciplinary works that think rather than merely recognize and affirm the world recycled in IR's traditional geopolitical imaginary.'

Michael J. Shapiro, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, USA

The series aims to advance understanding of the key areas in which scholars working within broad critical post-structural and post-colonial traditions have chosen to make their interventions, and to present innovative analyses of important topics.

Titles in the series engage with critical thinkers in philosophy, sociology, politics and other disciplines and provide situated historical, empirical and textual studies in international politics.

Critical Theorists and International Relations

*Edited by Jenny Edkins and Nick
Vaughan-Williams*

Ethics as Foreign Policy

Britain, the EU and the other
Dan Bulley

Universality, Ethics and International Relations

A grammatical reading
Véronique Pin-Fat

The Time of the City

Politics, philosophy, and genre
Michael J. Shapiro

Governing Sustainable Development

Partnership, protest and power at
the world summit
Carl Death

Insuring Security

Biopolitics, security and risk
Luis Lobo-Guerrero

Foucault and International Relations

New critical engagements
*Edited by Nicholas J. Kiersey and
Doug Stokes*

International Relations and Non-Western Thought

Imperialism, colonialism and
investigations of global modernity
Edited by Robbie Shilliam

Autobiographical International Relations

I, IR
Edited by Naeem Inayatullah

War and Rape

Law, memory and justice
Nicola Henry

Madness in International Relations

Psychology, security and the global
governance of mental health
Alison Howell

Spatiality, Sovereignty and Carl Schmitt

Geographies of the nomos

Edited by Stephen Legg

Politics of Urbanism

Seeing like a city

Warren Magnusson

Beyond Biopolitics

Theory, violence and horror in world politics

François Debrix and Alexander D. Barder

The Politics of Speed

Capitalism, the state and war in an accelerating world

Simon Glezos

Politics and the Art of Commemoration

Memorials to struggle in Latin America and Spain

Katherine Hite

Indian Foreign Policy

The politics of postcolonial identity

Priya Chacko

Politics of the Event

Time, movement, becoming

Tom Lundborg

Theorising Post-Conflict Reconciliation

Agonism, restitution and repair

Edited by Alexander Keller Hirsch

Europe's Encounter with Islam

The secular and the postsecular

Luca Mavelli

Re-Thinking International Relations Theory via Deconstruction

Badredine Arfi

The New Violent Cartography

Geo-analysis after the aesthetic turn

Edited by Sam Okoth Opondo and

Michael J. Shapiro

Insuring War

Sovereignty, security and risk

Luis Lobo-Guerrero

International Relations, Meaning and Mimesis

Necati Polat

The Postcolonial Subject

Claiming politics/governing others in late modernity

Vivienne Jabri

Foucault and the Politics of Hearing

Lauri Siisiäinen

Volunteer Tourism in the Global South

Giving back in neoliberal times

Wanda Vrasti

Cosmopolitan Government in Europe

Citizens and entrepreneurs in postnational politics

Owen Parker

Studies in the Trans-Disciplinary Method

After the aesthetic turn

Michael J. Shapiro

Alternative Accountabilities in Global Politics

The scars of violence

Brent J. Steele

Celebrity Humanitarianism

The ideology of global charity

Ilan Kapoor

Deconstructing International Politics

Michael Dillon

The Politics of Exile

Elizabeth Dauphinee

Democratic Futures

Revising democracy promotion

Milja Kurki

Postcolonial Theory

A critical introduction

Edited by Sanjay Seth

More than Just War

Narratives of the just war and military life

Charles A. Jones

Deleuze & Fascism

Security: war: aesthetics

Edited by Brad Evans and Julian Reid

Feminist International Relations

'Exquisite Corpse'

Marysia Zalewski

The Persistence of Nationalism

From imagined communities to urban encounters

Angharad Closs Stephens

Interpretive Approaches to Global Climate Governance

Reconstructing the greenhouse

Edited by Chris Methmann, Delf Rothe and Benjamin Stephan

Postcolonial Encounters in International Relations

The Politics of Transgression in the Maghreb

Alina Sajed

Post-Tsunami Reconstruction in Indonesia

Negotiating normativity through gender mainstreaming initiatives in Aceh

Marjaana Jauhola

Leo Strauss and the Invasion of Iraq

Encountering the Abyss

Aggie Hirst

Production of Postcolonial India and Pakistan

Meanings of partition

Ted Svensson

War, Identity and the Liberal State

Everyday experiences of the geopolitical in the armed forces

Victoria M. Basham

Writing Global Trade Governance

Discourse and the WTO

Michael Strange

Politics of Violence

Militancy, International Politics, Killing in the name

Charlotte Heath-Kelly

Ontology and World Politics

Void Universalism I

Sergei Prozorov

Theory of the Political Subject

Void Universalism II

Sergei Prozorov

Visual Politics and North Korea

Seeing is Believing

David Shim

Globalization, Difference and Human Security

Edited by Mustapha Kamal Pasha

Imagining World Politics

Sihar & Shenyra, A Fable for Our Times

L.H.M. Ling

International Politics and Performance

Critical Aesthetics and Creative Practice

Edited by Jenny Edkins and

Adrian Kear

Memory and Trauma in International Relations

Theories, Cases, and Debates

Edited by Erica Resende and

Dovile Budryte

Critical Environmental Politics

Edited by Carl Death

Democracy Promotion

A Critical Introduction

Jeff Bridoux and Milja Kurki

**International Intervention in
a Secular Age**

Re-enchanting Humanity?

Audra Mitchell

**The Politics of Haunting and Memory
in International Relations**

Jessica Auchter

**European-East Asian Borders in
Translation**

Edited by Joyce C.H. Liu and

Nick Vaughan-Williams

**Genre and the (Post)Communist
Woman**

Analyzing Transformations of the Central
and Eastern European Female Ideal

Edited by Florentina C. Andreescu and

Michael Shapiro

Studying the Agency of being Governed

Edited by Stina Hansson, Sofie Hellberg and

Maria Stern

Politics of Emotion

The Song of Telangana

Himadeep Muppidi

Ruling the Margins

Colonial Power and Administrative Rule
in the Past and Present

Prem Kumar Rajaram

**Race and Racism in International
Relations**

Confronting the Global Colour Line

Alexander Anievas, Nivi Manchanda and

Robbie Shilliam

**The Grammar of Politics and
Performance**

Edited by Shirin M. Rai and Janelle Reinelt

**War, Police and Assemblages of
Intervention**

Edited by Jan Bachman, Colleen Bell

and Caroline Holmqvist

**Re-Imagining North Korea in
International Politics**

Problematizations and Alternatives

Shine Choi

This page intentionally left blank

RACE AND RACISM IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Confronting the global colour line

*Alexander Anievas, Nivi Manchanda
and Robbie Shilliam*

First published 2015
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

And by Routledge
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 2015 Alexander Anievas, Nivi Manchanda and Robbie Shilliam for selection and editorial matter; individual contributors for their contributions.

The right of Alexander Anievas, Nivi Manchanda and Robbie Shilliam to be identified as editors of this work has been asserted by him in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patent Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Trademark notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Race and racism in international relations : confronting the global colour line / edited by Alexander Anievas, Nivi Manchanda and Robbie Shilliam.

pages cm. -- (Interventions)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

1. International relations--Social aspects. 2. Racism--Political aspects. 3. Race--Political aspects. I. Anievas, Alexander, editor of compilation. II. Manchanda, Nivi, editor of compilation. III. Shilliam, Robbie, 1969- editor of compilation.

JZ1251.R34 2015

327.1089--dc23

2014017962

ISBN: 978-0-415-72434-0 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-0-415-72435-7 (pbk)

ISBN: 978-1-315-85729-9 (ebk)

Typeset in Bembo
by Taylor & Francis Books

CONTENTS

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	xi
1 Confronting the global colour line: an introduction <i>Alexander Anievas, Nivi Manchanda and Robbie Shilliam</i>	1
PART I	
Conceptualising the international relations of race and racism	17
2 Hidden in plain sight: racism in international relations theory <i>Errol A. Henderson</i>	19
3 Through, against, and beyond the racial state: the transnational stratum of race <i>Debra Thompson</i>	44
4 'Good governance' and 'state failure': the pseudo-science of statesmen in our times <i>Branwen Gruffydd Jones</i>	62
5 Re-embedding the global colour line within post-1945 international theory <i>John M. Hobson</i>	81

- 6 Against race taboos: the global colour line in philosophical discourse 98
Srdjan Vucetic

PART II
International practices of race and racism 115

- 7 Colonial violence: race and gender on the sugar plantations of British Guiana 117
Randolph B. Persaud
- 8 A postcolonial racial/spatial order: Gandhi, Ambedkar, and the construction of the international 139
Sankaran Krishna
- 9 The cold war, American anticommunism and the global 'Colour Line' 157
Richard Seymour
- 10 Race, racialisation and rivalry in the international legal order 175
Robert Knox

PART III
Reflections on the global colour line 193

- 11 What would it mean to transform international relations? 195
David Roediger
- 12 Unwriting and unwhitening the world 202
Charles W. Mills
- Index* 215

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The editors would like to acknowledge the support of series editors Jenny Edkins and Nick Vaughan-Williams, and Peter Harris and Craig Fowlie at Routledge. The editors also thank the anonymous reviewers for their kind and constructive comments. The editorial team at the *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* worked hard to make possible the special issue on 'Confronting the Global Colour Line', wherein earlier versions of some of the chapters in this book first appeared. Finally, the editors would like to extend their heartfelt thanks to the contributors to this book for their intellectual and personal generosity.

This page intentionally left blank

1

CONFRONTING THE GLOBAL COLOUR LINE

An introduction

Alexander Anievas, Nivi Manchanda and Robbie Shilliam

Race, racism and international relations

Kenneth Waltz may have surprised many of his contemporaries when, in the influential 1979 publication *Theory of International Relations*, he chose V. I. Lenin to be his key interlocutor.¹ Rather than consign Lenin's significance to moral or ideological realms, Waltz claimed that the Bolshevik had provided one of the first theories of international relations in the twentieth century with his considerations on imperialism. Waltz could also have looked closer to home. There, an African American sociologist called W. E. B. Du Bois had published a thesis (1915) on the imperial determinants of the First World War one year before Lenin. Waltz might have also consulted more closely the pages of *Foreign Affairs*, the pre-eminent US journal on the science of foreign policy. In its pages, in 1925, Du Bois also published an article entitled "Worlds of color" that revisited a statement he had made over twenty years earlier:

The problem of the twentieth century is the problem of the color-line – the relation of the darker to the lighter races of men in Asia and Africa, in America and the islands of the sea (Du Bois 1961, 23).

In "Worlds of color", Du Bois (1925, 423) proposed that the "present Problem of Problems", namely, the global structure of the exploitation of labour, needed to be re-envisioned with respect to the "dark colonial shadow" cast by European empires. Undertaking a comparative analysis of these empires, Du Bois (1925, 423) noted that modern imperialism wore a "democratic face" at home and a "stern and unyielding autocracy" in the colonies. Du Bois argued that the denial of democracy in the colonies hindered its complete realisation in Europe. "It is this", he suggested to Western foreign policy makers, "that makes the colour problem and

the labor problem to so great an extent two sides of the same human tangle” (Du Bois 1925, 442). Ten years later, Du Bois (1935) wrote again for *Foreign Affairs* and delivered a prognosis that the Italian/Ethiopian war would further inflame the global colour line. In these ways and more, Du Bois illuminated the crucial significance of race and racism as fundamental organising principles of international politics; axes of hierarchy and oppression structuring the logics of world politics as we know it.

Though questions of race and racism have been often side-lined to the margins of contemporary IR, such issues were in fact integral to the birth of the discipline. IR was founded, in large part, as a policy science designed to solve the dilemmas posed by empire-building and colonial administration facing the white Western powers expanding into and occupying the so-called ‘waste places of the earth’, as the Global South was commonly referred to by contemporaries (see Schmidt 1998; Long and Schmidt 2005; Vitalis 2005; Bell 2013). Thus, within the Anglo-Saxon nations, and particularly the US and UK, the field of IR took flight around such issues as empire, imperialism and inter-racial relations (Barkawi 2010). The discipline’s ‘founding’ journal, *Foreign Affairs*, first published in 1922 by the highly influential Council on Foreign Relations, had previously gone under the title *Journal of Race Development* (Vitalis 2010). Additionally, South African scholar Charles Manning, Montague Burton Professor of International Relations at LSE between 1930 and 1962, was also a jurisprudential advocate of race administration both in terms of the mandates system of the League of Nations and, later, South African apartheid (Suganami 2001, Manning 1964). However, aside from Du Bois, a cadre of black academics in the United States including Ralph Bunch also engaged with these imperial discourses on race in this early period of the discipline’s history (Vitalis forthcoming; Henry 1995). Outside of academic halls, of course, many anti-colonial writers from across the globe were publishing cognate tracts critical of empire and race administration (see, for example, Polsgrove 2009).

Post-World War II IR scholars occasionally discussed the importance of race and racism, especially in reaction to – or in the context of – liberation movements and Third World challenges to the West (see Isaacs 1969; Bull 1979; Vincent 1984; Mazrui 1968, Shepherd and LeMelle 1970; Rosenau 1970). But race and racism seem to have receded in the subsequent years, especially with regard to the many re-narrations of the discipline’s foundation and history that took place during the post-Cold War period. According to James Mittleman (2009, 100), a search of paper titles presented at the annual meetings of the International Studies Association (ISA) shows that the words ‘race’, ‘racism’, ‘racialised’ and ‘racist’ appear in only 0.37 per cent of these titles (80 of 21,688 titles). Further, a search for the same words in article titles appearing in ISA’s premier journal, *International Studies Quarterly*, between January 2000 and December 2007 reveal a finding of 0 per cent (0 of 260 titles). Indeed, one might presently speak of IR’s ‘racial aphasia’ – a ‘calculated forgetting’ obstructing ‘discourse, language and speech’ (Krishna 2001; Thompson 2013).

Nevertheless, a number of scholars have seriously challenged the systematic ‘silence and evasion’ (Vitalis 2000, 333) over their own imperial-racial origins of IR

so as to more adequately confront issues related to race and racism in world politics (see, for example, Vitalis, 2005, 2010; Schmidt 1998; Long and Schmidt 2005; Hobson 2012). These recent works have been part of a wider resurgence of studies that elucidate the many ways in which ‘prevalent constructions of race have shaped visions and practices of international politics, thus helping to sustain and reproduce a deeply unjust stratified global order’ (Bell 2013, 2). Thus, scholars of IR have begun to once again confront the problem of the global colour line identified by Du Bois but curiously dispatched from the centre of the discipline. The ground re-covered in a relatively short time has been impressive: for example, scholars have questioned the complicity of mainstream IR’s key theoretical resources, moral calculus, and categories to racialised or racist assumptions to examining past and contemporary practices of ‘racialisation’ and racial identity formation to analysing the deep historical interconnections between imperial practices and the production of racialised categories; they have drawn attention to the notions of ‘backward/inferior’ and ‘advanced/superior’ races as well as geopolitical identities such as the ‘Anglo-Saxon powers’; and they have traced the myriad ways that race, gender and class intertwine in the making of world order (see, respectively, Persaud and Walker 2001; Grovogui 1996; Malik 2000; Hobson 2012; Watson 2001; Persaud 2001; Shilliam 2006, 2009; Suzuki 2009; Doty 1996; Vucetic 2011; Bell 2012; Persaud and Walker 2001; Chowdhry and Nair 2004; Agathangelou and Ling 2004).

Though explicitly racial tropes and conceptualisations of world order have been largely (though not entirely) eliminated from mainstream discourses in the post-World War II era, questions concerning the extent to which race and racism continue to subliminally structure contemporary world politics, in both material and ideological ways, remain as significant as ever. For example, inspirations from postcolonial theory have enabled scholars to elucidate the intimate interconnections between orientalist/racial frameworks of analysis and processes of grand strategy making, interstate conflict and war (Barkawi and Stanski 2012; Barkawi and Brighton 2013). This work complements, and brings into the present, efforts in American History to explicate the influence of domestic racism on US foreign policy (for example, LeMelle 1972; Anderson 2003). Additionally, as Branwen Gruffydd Jones has argued (2008), despite the formal transcendence of racism in modern institutions of world order, global inequalities in power and wealth retain a fundamentally racialised character produced through centuries of colonial dispossession. Examining and explaining such racialised structures of global power, inequality, oppression and violence in the contemporary world is indeed a topic in need of further research.

Our intention in putting together this edited volume is that it should act as a further catalyst for remembering, exposing and critically re-articulating the central importance of race and racism in the field of IR. In what follows we lay out in a little more detail the legacy of Du Bois and what we wish to take from it, focusing especially on the theoretical and political content of his concept – the “colour line”. We will then use this discussion as a heuristic device with which to clarify the contemporary disciplinary challenges of IR when confronted with a research

agenda of race and racism. Finally, we will position the various chapters vis-à-vis this confrontation with the global colour line.

The global colour line as a research agenda

As suggested above, Du Bois' response to the causes of World War I and the prospects of world peace were systematically framed through a consideration of the political effects of race-thinking and race-ordering. For Du Bois (1925, 502), the war was no aberration of European civilisation but its clearest expression, and the main causes of European greatness – overseas expansion and colonial aggrandisement – were also the very causes of the war. “It is the duty of white Europe”, opined Du Bois (1925, 503) sardonically, “to divide up the darker world and administer it for Europe’s good”. So long as these practices remained the mainstay of post-war European global governance, prospects for peace were dim. “Above all”, Du Bois (1925, 512) pleaded, “industry must minister to the wants of the many and not to the few, and the Negro, the Indian, the Mongolian and the South Sea Islander must be among the many as well as Germans, Frenchmen and Englishmen”.

Du Bois' argument resonated with Marxist theory. But it was the thoughts and experiences of enslaved Africans in North America and the impact of their struggle for liberation that formed the key inspiration for his “international theory” of the colour line. Indeed, Du Bois had not only spent long periods teaching but also living with and learning from the black peoples of the South (see Holt 2013). Indeed, the term “colour line” was not Du Bois' invention but already part of the grammar of debate over the reconstruction of the US South after the emancipation proclamation. Before Du Bois, Frederick Douglass (1881) was arguing for the elimination of the colour line, while his opponents predicted the end of civilisation if that were to happen. A fuller reproduction of his famous statement in the 1903 publication, *The Souls of Black Folk*, testifies to these influences:

The problem of the twentieth century is the problem of the color-line – the relation of the darker to the lighter races of men in Asia and Africa, in America and the islands of the sea. It was a phase of this problem that caused the Civil War; and however much they who marched South and North in 1861 may have fixed on the technical points, of union and local autonomy as a shibboleth, all nevertheless knew, as we know, that the question of Negro slavery was the real cause of the conflict (Du Bois 1961, 23).

Du Bois (1961, 123) was convinced that, with regard to the phenomenon of “race contact”, the US South was “as fine a field for such a study as the world affords” and he saw nothing provincial in its recent history. After all, the Haitian Revolution had fundamentally shaken the worldwide “trade in men”, putting the Southern system under notice; Native Americans were being driven from their lands as the plantation system pushed ever westwards; and after the civil war a new breed of

capitalist was sweeping down from the North to “woo this coy dark soil”, accompanied by Russian Jews and other migrants of the Old World hoping to claim a stake in the old plantation lands (see, for example, Du Bois 1961, 89, 95, 103). Mingling in the South, all these peoples and struggles had their fate entwined through the attempt to answer one question: after emancipation, “what shall be done with the Negroes?” (Du Bois 1961, 23).

Du Bois was adamant that it was black peoples who, by deserting and undermining the plantation economy during the civil war, had forced this question onto the agenda (for example, Du Bois 1961, 29; and in general, Du Bois 1995). The Freedmen’s Bureau, a “government of millions of men” erected “at the stroke of a pen”, sought to substantiate the new freedom by providing education, law courts and property for Southern blacks on an equitable footing with past slaveholders and privileged whites. But, Du Bois recounted, the Bureau was scuppered by entrenched Southern interests, to be replaced by a purely formal assurance in the fifteenth amendment of the Constitution that no one could be denied the right to vote based on race, colour or previous state of servitude (Du Bois 1961, 40). In this climate Du Bois argued that freed blacks could not accept administration by Southern patriarchs. And he directed the same argument towards the prospects of “the darker races of the world”, who would also have to be meaningfully included in global governance of the post-World War I era (Du Bois 1996a, 556).

Crucially, Du Bois did not only comment upon or mount a political campaign against the global colour line; he also built a research agenda around it. Specifically, his theoretical explorations of the colour line were founded on the precept that “lived experience” – to use a Fanonian trope (Fanon 1986, ch. 5) – was productive of knowledge claims. In his address before the American Negro Academy in 1897, Du Bois (1996b, 43) posed an existential question: “What ... am I? Am I an American or am I a Negro? Can I be both?” Reminiscing on his childhood, Du Bois recounted that at some point he realised that he was “different from the others ... shut out from their world by a vast veil” (Du Bois 1996c, 16). This is the problem pursued in Du Bois’ *Souls of Black Folk*. Even in the post-emancipation era, the legal, material and psychological constitutions of the American polity still forbid the Negro from becoming an inhabitant of its protective and enabling skein. Unable to inhabit the American world in “true self-consciousness” as an American, the Negro had to see him- or herself through “the revelation of the other world”. The double – rather than self – consciousness that the Negro inhabited was traumatic, giving rise to “two unreconciled strivings” (Du Bois 1961, 17).

Hence, Du Bois’ episteme of the global colour line was built around the heuristic of the “veil”, which he had garnered from African spiritual retentions and Biblical grammar as well as other more mainstream sources (for a discussion of the term see Schrager 1996). The veil seems to perform a double function in Du Bois’ writings: it symbolises the lived experience of racism and also is responsible for generating thought about this experience. In being Black, the veil was something that was always worn. Covered in the veil, descendants of enslaved Africans were marked as existential problems for a coherent polity and a common humanity

(Du Bois 1961, 15; Du Bois 1996a, 539). Being black, one could not rise above the veil except in death, in moments of spiritual ecstasy, in psychological withdrawal, or perhaps in artistic abstraction.² Yet second, in a quotidian sense, being black was to *have* to sense life *through* the veil. In this respect, the veil was also a “thought-thing”, “intangible, tenuous, but true and terrible” (Du Bois 1996a, 607). And those born with it were paradoxically “gifted with second-sight in this American world” (Du Bois 1961, 16).

By invoking the veil, Du Bois was explicating what might nowadays be called “border-thinking” (Dussel 1985; Mignolo 2000). Du Bois’ episteme would have to make relational sense of the colour line – we are this because you are that, and vice versa – whereas a white episteme had the privilege of methodological individualism – we are this, while you are that.³ In this respect, apprehended from behind the veil, one of the most grievous effects of the colour line was the erasure of any relational apprehension of power, hierarchy and division and a denial of the agency of those living behind the veil:

Lions have no historians, and therefore lion hunts are thrilling and satisfactory human reading. Negroes had no bards, and therefore it has been widely told how American philanthropy freed the slave (Du Bois 1996a, 551).

What is more, Du Bois was adamant that the lion’s story would reveal not just the agency of the enslaved and the wretched within their own liberation, but how the colour line was constituted through multiple dimensions – geographical, political, economic, psychological, spiritual and social – and that its dismantling would have to match this multi-dimensionality.⁴

As with all other aspects of his writings, these considerations connect to Dubois’ musings on global governance in the aftermath of World War I and the wider question of the “darker races of men”, which we have engaged with above. However, sometimes Du Bois travelled the colour line to its foreign coordinates and his experiences there also influenced its theorisation. Before he wrote the *Souls of Black Folk* Dubois had undertaken two formative years of graduate study at the University of Berlin (see Barkin 2000). Du Bois’ later musings on the Warsaw Ghetto in 1952 are especially instructive. Returning to the destroyed city after the Second World War, he suggested that a clearer understanding of the “Jewish problem” had afforded him a “real and more complete understanding of the Negro problem” and that he no longer conceived of slavery and caste as separate conditions (Du Bois 1996d, 472). Du Bois publically challenged himself, despite his North American experiences, to apprehend race as “no longer even solely a matter of color and physical characteristics” but one that “cut across lines of color and physique and belief and status”. As a matter of “cultural patterns and perverted teachings”, the problem of race “reached all sorts of people” (Du Bois 1996d, 472; see also Rothberg 2001).

Nevertheless, it remains an open question as to whether Du Bois’ episteme holds a more universal applicability; i.e. whether it could be directly related to the lived

experience of caste in India, or Japanese imperialism in Manchuria (see, for example, Slate 2011; Mullen and Watson 2005). And while Du Bois politics were certainly not narrowly North American – he remained throughout his life a Pan-Africanist and an informal internationalist socialist – nevertheless, the core of his praxis was cultivated specifically to address the colour line created through slavery in the United States. Moreover, although Du Bois consistently argued that the struggle of women’s suffrage was integral to the struggle against the colour line (see Yellin 1973), his object of inquiry remained primarily the antagonism between the black and white man.

We propose, then, that the utility of revisiting Du Bois’ work lies less in the claim that it provides an off-the-shelf theory of international relations and more in the fact that it signals a rich and venerable research agenda for the interrogation of international relations through an episteme that focuses upon the operations of race and racism. This episteme rests upon three key propositions. First, world order is constitutively – and not derivatively – structured, re-structured and contested along lines of race. Second, when world order is conceived in this way, the sites of analysis – geographical, social, economic and intellectual – shift; some sites might be unfamiliar to IR and common sites might be rendered unfamiliar. And third, as suggested by Du Bois, the proposition that the power that is exercised through the global colour line has woven through it modalities other than race, strictly speaking, especially those of capitalism, patriarchy and (inter-)state development and (neo-)imperial rule.

The global colour line as a research agenda for IR

As we have noted above, there presently exists a relatively small but very active community of scholars in IR whose work, although not necessarily using an episteme of the “veil”, still resonates with key theoretical and substantive issues identified by Du Bois in his explication of the global colour line. We would like to contextualise this scholarly community – to which we claim affiliation – within the critical and politically focused research agenda signalled by Du Bois in opposition to the still dominant race-science/race-thinking of imperial global governance (with all its derivatives and iterations) that he decried. What is more, retrieving, deepening and extending this research agenda in IR impel us to garner insights and inspirations from other disciplines that have been relatively more sensitive and responsive to the multiple ways in which race-thinking is deeply imbricated in all modern social formations.

For this purpose, the lessons provided by anthropology may be germane to IR. As an academic field of enquiry long dedicated to the study of the Other, anthropology has for some time now confronted its Eurocentric past and made an about-turn in its dealings with the racialised logics of knowledge production and its hitherto largely unproblematised – albeit highly problematic – ontological assumptions. Historically, anthropology played a key role in the creation and promulgation of the centrifugal “racial worldview” (Smedley 1993) that developed in

Europe and had spread around the world by the late nineteenth century. This racial worldview, based as it was on biological determinism, sought to distinguish the civilised from the savage and barbaric, thus creating a racial hierarchy on an ostensibly scientific foundation. Such a worldview was conjoined to the practices of slavery, colonialism and discrimination on the basis of skin colour and phenotype (Asad 1973). But as Moses and Mukhopadyay (1997) argue, anthropology grew as a discipline and also ‘participated actively in subsequent challenges to the racial worldview, collaborating to dismantle the very ideological edifice [it] helped create’.

This critical reorientation has important antecedents. It was Franz Boas, a contemporary of Du Bois, who in the early twentieth century pioneered the critique of the typological rendering of race common to anthropological studies. Boas (1938) opposed the ideational holism at the root of “culture” and also “scrupulously severed the connections of race from culture” (Wolf 1992). Previously “race” had been the accepted organising principle of human difference, one that hierarchically compartmentalised humanity into five or six “types” on the basis of skin tone. The introduction of “culture” as an analytic category distinct from, and more meaningful than “race”, heralded a new era of anthropological scholarship, led to a wholesale refashioning of the discipline, and was key in debunking the then popular ideologies of scientific racism and social Darwinism.

Boas’s intellectual influence is evident in the UNESCO Statement on Race (1950/51). Announcing a new era in human understanding after the terrors of war and irrationalities of genocide, the main purpose of the statements was to separate the “biological fact” of race from its “social myth” (Montagu 1972, 10). More recently the insightful work of Lee Baker (1998), Johannes Fabian (2002), James Ferguson (1990, 2006, 2010) and Faye Harrison (1995), among others, on the “crisis of representation”, the imperial and racial constructs of time and space, the emergence of “international development” as a racist enterprise, and the persistent forms of social inequalities structured along racial lines, have furthered Boas’ legacy. Clearly, anthropology has been able to undertake a fundamental – if contested – review of its own disciplinary reliance upon – and involvement in crafting – a racial worldview. And in principle there is no reason why IR cannot embark on the same fundamental reassessment.

Yet it is not merely anthropology that can teach us. Scholars in history, philosophy, sociology, cultural studies, comparative literature, media studies, feminist theory and even linguistics (for the latter see Searle 1983 and Pennycook 1998) have all taken the question of race more seriously than IR and have generated an immense body of work – often multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary – that tackles the construct and problematique of race in diverse and exciting ways. For example, scholars have undertaken genealogies of racism (Lattas 1987; McWhorter 2009) highlighting the workings of white supremacy as a cohesive political system of thought conceptually on par with other “isms” like liberalism and fascism (Mills 1994; Taylor 2013) as well as in the formation of class consciousness (Roediger 1999). Others have theorised the race–power nexus by presenting the notion of

“racial projects” that assign meaning to human bodies and distribute social goods based on “racial formation”, that is “the sociohistorical process by which racial categories are created, inhabited, transformed, and destroyed” (Omi and Winant 1994, 55; see also Winant 2001; Wing 2000; Ferreira Da Silva 2007; Dikotter 2008). These sensibilities are also evident in critiques of the global “development project” (Duffield 1996; White 2002). Feminists, meanwhile, have explicated in great detail the seminal relationship of gender and sex to race (see, for example, Moraga and Anzaldúa 1983; Andersen and Collins 1998; and in IR, Chowdhry and Nair 2004). Crucially, scholars have brought to the fore the ironic predicament of knowledge generation, which in Rey Chow’s words is that “theoretically sophisticated studies of the wretched of the earth tend to be undertaken by those in the most wealthy and prestigious institutes” (2006, 11). What these studies all have in common is an acute cognisance of the explanatory agency – and substantive complicity – of race and racism in all spheres of human activity, including academic knowledge production.

Nevertheless, fundamental issues remain with regard to the analysis of race. For example, more recently, anthropology’s default position has perhaps become one of “race avoidance” (Mullings 2005, 670), embracing a no race policy and focusing instead on questions of ethnicity. Some might say that anthropology has lulled itself into a complacent belief that the “post-modern” era is also a “post-racial one”. Ironically, the very severance of race from culture that Boas had so painstakingly undertaken might have simply led to the reification of the latter. Certainly, the defeat of the biological argument at UNESCO did not necessarily arrest the transfer of race determinism into the realm of culture and ethnicity (see, for example, Lentin 2005; Gilroy 2000, 32–9). While initially introduced as a non-hierarchical means of conceptualising human diversity, culture and ethnicity are now essentialised and racialised in less obvious but more insidious ways (Ansell 1997; Balibar 1991; Bonilla-Silva 2003). Furthermore, by exposing racism as “a misconstrued attitude based on misleading, pseudoscientific information” (Lentin 2005, 388) new scholarship could be in danger of relegating questions of race to the individualised domain of ignorance and irrational prejudice.

It is in this conjuncture that we place the contribution of this edited volume. We support the voices that have already demanded that IR take its legacies of race and racism seriously. Moreover, given that IR’s disciplinary straitjacket is weakening – with the rigid demarcations and stark dichotomies between “inside” and “outside”, “politics” and “economics” and the “personal” and “political” collapsing – the imperative to think about the relevance of race to world politics both historically and contemporaneously has become all the stronger. Additionally, we contend that IR could occupy a strategically distinct position in academia through which to facilitate examination of the link between race as a structuring principle and the transnational processes of accumulation, dispossession, violence and struggle that emerge in its wake. For example, we would suggest that not only is the emergence of the nation-state, and capitalist modernity as a project more generally, inextricably linked to racial logics, the very persistence of these logics is evident in

contemporary liberal humanitarian intervention, nation-building and modern forms of slavery and trafficking. Thus, rather than talk of a post-racial world of theory or practice, we prefer to strategically reengage with the argument made by Du Bois that the problem of the twenty-first century is equally the problem of the colour line, albeit in shifting social constellations and physical geographies.

Although many of IR's concepts and concerns are increasingly being called into question, the new terms and vocabulary often remain embedded within the same racialised logics that they claim to displace or, at the very least, dispense with. Once the world-historical significance of race is recognised it becomes easy to see how ideas that are now ubiquitous in IR discourse, such as the notions of "rogue" or "failed" states and "small" or "new" wars, spring out of the familiar ontological assumptions that gave us the democratic peace theory, balance of power, and anarchy. This recognition also places focus upon the unambiguously racist implications of new technologies of war, of which drones and counterinsurgency campaigns are perhaps the most prominent examples. Finally, a confrontation with the global colour line sheds light on those global practices of boundary-making and border controls that mimic in explicit detail practices of colonial cartography, based as they were on white supremacist ideals. Arbitrary visa regimes, immigration controls and liberal modes of transnational incarceration are all testament to the institutionalisation of racism on a global scale. Indeed, the enshrining and reification of such exclusionary practices is the *modus operandi* of international relations.

As a final word of caution, it is undeniable that self-reflexivity often comes with the danger of falling into the trap of self-referentiality, a problem particularly palpable for IR, which remains caught up in its rather restricted grid of intelligibility. And scholars have, in point of fact, warned and been warned of invoking the "race, class, sex" mantra uncritically. One way to deal with such concerns is to recognise the need for the "destabilization of epistemic ground" (Chow 2006), away from what Charles Mills (1997) has called an "epistemology of ignorance" to an episteme that centres race and its interlocking modalities of especially patriarchy and capitalism across multiple dimensions – political, economic, cultural, psychological, etc. Confronting the global colour line requires us to both incorporate and move beyond the identity/difference nexus and to thereby no longer ride roughshod over the enduring concerns of Du Bois and other cognate thinkers.

Organisation of the book

We finish this introduction by situating the contributions to this book as part of the confrontation with the global colour line that we have argued defines our research agenda. And we organise the book around two key disciplinary challenges that this confrontation prompts.

The first is to support and extend a reflective exercise akin to that undertaken by anthropology. That is, we must excavate and assess the extent to which received themes, concepts and theories commonly used in IR are indebted to the racial constitution of world order. To address this challenge we must avoid, as we have

already suggested, rhetoric and overly simplified charges of complicity, and instead unfold and reveal the warp and weft of the discipline, including its theoretical/conceptual stock. In this respect we must also provide some alternative theoretical/conceptual tools that are more adequate for our stated research agenda. The chapters in the first section of the book all contribute to this reflective exercise.

In Chapter 2, Errol Henderson directs his critique at the very heart of IR theory: realism and liberalism, two of the most prominent paradigms of the discipline. He examines the extent to which these major paradigms of world politics, despite their ostensible oppositionality, are in fact orientated by racist – primarily, white supremacist – precepts that inhere within their foundational construct, that of anarchy. Henderson maintains that due to the centrality of anarchy and other racially infused constructs within these prominent theories, white supremacist precepts are not only associated with the origins of the field, but have an enduring impact on IR theory, and continue to influence contemporary theses ranging from neorealist conceptions of the international system, liberal democratic peace claims, and even constructivist debates. Henderson's chapter therefore exposes the deep complicity of IR at a theoretical level in the maintenance of the global colour line.

Debra Thompson moves this reflection on IR's constitutive categories and concepts from "anarchy" to the "transnational". In Chapter 3, she argues that, though race is most commonly associated with domestic politics, the concept itself was born in the transnational realm. Thompson analytically sharpens Du Bois' poetic ascription of the formatively global nature of the colour line. She conceptualises race as a system of global power relations that has changed over time, manifests differently across space, and exists on multiple analytical levels. Drawing from the insights of IR, comparative politics and critical race theory, Thompson argues that race is a transnational norm or idea that can independently affect both domestic policy outcomes and relations among nation-states. Thompson then explores several promising avenues of research in the exploration of the varied manifestations of race in international and domestic realms and identifies continuing challenges and future research agendas in the comparative and international study of race.

In Chapter 4, Branwen Gruffydd Jones directs attention to a key category deployed in IR theory and policy-making – the "failed state". Jones tackles the way in which current international policy discourse routinely characterises the condition of African states in terms of either "good governance", on the one hand, or fragility and failure, on the other. This conceptual vocabulary and analytical approach has become entrenched within the public imagination more broadly, and is reproduced in academic analysis, largely without serious questioning or critique. Jones argues that although ostensibly free from explicitly racialised tropes, the failed state discourse employs a conceptual vocabulary that is rooted in racialised international thought. Carrying forward the early twentieth-century critiques that we have mentioned above of IR as a science of race administration, Jones testifies to the importance of questioning "common sense" concepts deployed in IR by

contextualising them within a much longer genealogy of imperial discourse about Africa and other non-European societies.

John Hobson's chapter extends an argument that he makes in his recent book, *The Eurocentric Conception of World Politics*, that seeks to conceptually differentiate Eurocentrism – or what he calls “Eurocentric institutionalism” – from scientific racism. In this respect, Hobson picks up on Boas' problematique that we have noted above – that is, the post-World War II movement of racial determinism from the language of biology to that of culture. Hobson's chapter demonstrates how this movement was implicated in disciplinary IR as well. In contrast to claims by liberal scholars in IR who see a benign discourse of racial tolerance and cultural pluralism following the defeat of scientific racism, Hobson excavates an alternative discourse at work – that of “subliminal Eurocentric-institutional intolerance”. The chapter therefore demonstrates the importance of carefully sifting through the various registers and sources of argumentation in IR in order to better understand the multi-valiant influence of “race thinking” on the discipline.

Similar to Hobson, Srdjan Vucetic takes a step into philosophies of race in order to undertake a careful reading of the use and deployment of concepts that might help scholars in IR cultivate an episteme sensitive to race and racism. In Chapter 6, Vucetic brings focus to bear on the “race taboo” that ironically undermines the lived experience of racism everywhere. He argues that the allegedly compelling and increasingly popular argument of eliminating “race” as a category of thought suffers from one major shortfall: it erases the theoretical and philosophical basis for anti-racist politics that is supposed to have motivated scholarship in the first place. Vucetic reflects on the continuities and changes in the ways the category of race has been deployed via three debates in the philosophy of race: the semantic, the ontological and the normative. Ultimately making a case for the use of categories of racialisation and racialised identity over the category of race, Vucetic suggests that IR theorists would do well to mine tools from the burgeoning literatures on racial habits and racial cognition.

The second challenge prompted by a confrontation of the global colour line is to re-affirm and critically extend the example set by Du Bois; that is, to demonstrate the explanatory potential of substantive analyses of the global colour line. Here the challenge is to contribute alternative insights into the constitution, contestation and re-constitution of a racialised world order. In this respect, some of the work undertaken would have to revisit theoretical and empirical terrain that is familiar to the IR discipline in order to make it unfamiliar; yet other work would dwell on sites and issues that have never been familiar to IR. By undertaking both sets of work it would be possible to more adequately address – but not be constrained by – the existing epistemic frames of IR. The chapters in the second section of this edited volume all demonstrate such potential.

In Chapter 7, Randolph Persaud introduces an unfamiliar site to IR – the plantations of British Guiana – and unfamiliar peoples – indentured women who were widely abused, maimed and murdered there. Persaud is keen to examine the routine forms of colonial governance and the quotidian nature of violence that

accompanied them. To this end, Persaud turns to the post-abolition sugar economies and argues that the social and political relations governing accumulation were restructured so as to maintain violent control over the new indentured labour force. Crucially, Persaud demonstrates the implication of gender in the colour line, as well as the ways in which this line is demarcated violently. This violence structured not only the relationship between the plantocracy and the indentured but also the relationship between indentured women and men.

Sankaran Krishna works with a reasonably familiar figure in IR – Mohandas Gandhi – but places him in a rather unfamiliar geo-cultural constellation – South Africa/India. In Chapter 8, Krishna argues that in his early years in South Africa, Gandhi completely internalised certain racist ideas and assumptions regarding the inferiority of Africans. Gandhi subsequently deployed this postcolonial rendition of racial and spatial order in his encounters with the Dalit leader Bhim Rao Ambedkar in the 1930s. Krishna exposes how this racial/spatial order was evident at the UN World Conference Against Racism held in 2001, when the Indian government successfully deflected efforts by India's Dalits to have casteism equated with racism or untouchability discussed as part of the proceedings. Krishna's chapter suggests that Du Bois's colour line cannot only be painted in the primary tones of black and white.

In Chapter 9, Richard Seymour returns us to a familiar historical site in IR: the Cold War. Nevertheless, Seymour makes this site unfamiliar by arguing that the impact of race in the Cold War has been largely neglected. In this respect, Seymour historically extends Du Bois's analysis of the colour line to make better sense of the signal global confrontation of the later twentieth century. Seymour examines the extent to which anticommunism can be understood as a form of racial practice, involved in helping to organise global racial orders as part of hegemonic strategies on the part of imperialist states, above all the United States. The chapter thereby illustrates the many crises and equivocations produced in US foreign policies by the impact of rival, incompatible racial projects on its commitment to the institutions of white supremacy in the global South and in the Deep South, culminating in a crest of defeats for white supremacy and reversals for the US globally.

In Chapter 10, Robert Knox brings our attention to a popular current issue in IR scholarship: military intervention. Recently, questions of empire and imperialism have caused the racialised nature of military interventions to come to the fore. But what is perhaps less well known is the role of international law in these debates. The self-described Third World Approaches to International Law (TWAIL) movement has become increasingly concerned with mapping these connections between empire, race, war and law. Knox provides a sympathetic critique of these approaches by exploring the changing nature of the legal justifications advanced for the use of force. Similarly to Hobson, Knox elides an easy rhetoric of race and racism and captures the dynamic and shifting nature of the global colour line by arguing that, contrary to a reified causal notion of "race", current interventions are embedded in the broader dynamics of international capitalism and the rivalries it throws up.

The book finishes with reflective chapters from two eminent non-IR scholars. David Roediger comments on the book project from the perspective of a historian of labour struggles who has been a seminal force in cultivating the concept of “whiteness” through his drawing out of the racial dimensions of labour struggles. And Charles Mills provides reflections from the perspective of a philosopher who has challenged his all-too-abstract discipline to engage seriously with the “racial contract” and the structures of white supremacy. These commentaries signal the fact that IR scholars have much to learn from cognate work in other fields; yet they also suggest that the field of IR is itself an intellectually and strategic field through which to further confront the global colour line.

Notes

- 1 Our thanks to Errol Henderson, Srdjan Vucetic and Sankaran Krishna for their very helpful critical comments.
- 2 See, for example, Du Bois’ autobiographical comments in Du Bois (1996a, 489; 1961, 156).
- 3 “He hears so little that there almost seems to be a conspiracy of silence” (Du Bois 1961, 135).
- 4 Du Bois investigates the relationality of all these dimensions in Chapter 9 (Du Bois 1961, 114–32).

Bibliography

- Agathangelou, Anna M. and Ling, L. H. M. (2004) The House of IR: From Family Power Politics to the *Poiesis* of Worldism. *International Studies Review*, 6 (4), 21–49.
- Anderson, Carol (2003) *Eyes Off the Prize: The United Nations and the African American Struggle for Human Rights, 1944–1955*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Andersen, Margaret L. and Collins, Patricia Hill (eds) (1998) *Race, Class and Gender: An Anthology*. London: Wadsworth.
- Ansell, Amy Elizabeth (1997) *New Right, New Racism: Race and Reaction in the United States and Britain*. Washington Square, NY: New York University Press.
- Asad, Talal (1973) *Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter*. New York, NY: Humanities Press.
- Balibar, Étienne (1991) Is There a ‘Neo-Racism’? In Balibar, É. and Wallerstein, I. (eds) *Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities*. London: Verso, 17–28.
- Barkin, Kenneth D. (2000) “Berlin Days” 1892–94: W. E. B. Du Bois and German Political Economy. *Boundary 2*, 27 (3), 79–101.
- Boas, Franz (1938) *The Mind of Primitive Man*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo (2003) *Racism without Racists: Color-blind Racism and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in the United States*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Chowdhry, Geeta and Nair, Sheila (2002) *Power, Postcolonialism and International Relations: Reading Race, Gender and Class*. London: Routledge.
- Douglass, Frederick (1881) The Color Line. In Lowell, J. R. (ed.) *North American Review*, 132. Available at: <http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/toc/modeng/public/DouColo.html>.
- Du Bois, W. E. B. (1915) African Roots of War. *The Atlantic Monthly*, 115 (5), 707–14.
- (1925) Worlds of Color. *Foreign Affairs*, 3 (3), 423–44.
- (1935) Inter-Racial Implications of the Ethiopian Crisis: A Negro View. *Foreign Affairs*, 14 (1), 82–92.
- (1961) *The Souls of Black Folk*. New York, NY: Crest Books.
- (1995) *Black Reconstruction in America*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

- (1996a [1920]) Darkwater: Voices from Within the Veil. In Sundquist, E. J. (ed.) *The Oxford W. E. B. Du Bois Reader*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 483–623.
- (1996b [1897]) The Conservation of the Races. In Sundquist, E. J. (ed.) *The Oxford W. E. B. Du Bois Reader*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 37–8.
- (1996c [1900]) To the Nations of the World. In Sundquist, E. J. (ed.) *The Oxford W. E. B. Du Bois Reader*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 625–7.
- (1996d [1952]) ‘The Negro and the Warsaw Ghetto’. In Sundquist, E. J. (ed.) *The Oxford W. E. B. Du Bois Reader*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 469–73.
- Dussel, Enrique (1985) *Philosophy of Liberation*. Translated by A. Martinez and C. Morkovsky. New York, NY: Orbis Books.
- Fanon, Frantz (1986) *Black Skin, White Masks*. London: Pluto Press.
- Gilroy, Paul (2000) *Against Race: Imagining Political Culture Beyond the Color Line*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Henry, Charles P. (1995) Abram Harris, E. Franklin Frazier, and Ralph Bunche: The Howard School of Thought on the Problem of Race. *National Political Science Review*, 5, 36–56.
- Holt, Thomas C. (2013) ‘A Story of Ordinary Human Beings’: The Sources of Du Bois’s Historical Imagination in Black Reconstruction. *South Atlantic Quarterly*, 112 (3), 419–35.
- Manning, Charles A. W. (1964) In Defense of Apartheid. *Foreign Affairs*, 43 (1), 135–49.
- Mignolo, Walter (2000) *Local Histories/Global Designs: Coloniality, Subaltern Knowledges, and Border Thinking*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Montagu, Ashley (1972) *Statement on Race*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mullen, Bill V. and Watson, Cathryn (2005) ‘Introduction: Crossing the World Color Line. In Mullen, Bill V. and Watson, Cathryn (eds) *W. E. B. Du Bois on Asia: Crossing the World Color Line*. Jackson, MS: University Press of Mississippi, vii–xxvii.
- Persaud, Randolph and Walker, R. B. J. (2001) Apertura: Race in International Relations. *Alternatives*, 26 (4), 373–6.
- Polsgrove, Carol (2009) *Ending British Rule in Africa: Writers in a Common Cause*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Rothberg, Michael (2001) ‘W. E. B. Du Bois in Warsaw: Holocaust Memory and the Color Line, 1949–52. *The Yale Journal of Criticism*, 14 (1), 169–89.
- Rosenau, James N. (1970) *Race in International Politics: A Dialogue in Five Parts*. Denver, CO: University of Denver Press.
- Schrager, Cynthia D. (1996) Both Sides of the Veil: Race, Science, and Mysticism in W. E. B. Du Bois. *American Quarterly*, 48 (4), 551–86.
- Shepherd, G. W. and LeMelle, T. J. (1970) *Race among Nations: A Conceptual Approach*. Lexington, MA: Heath Lexington Books.
- Slate, Nico (2011) Translating Race and Caste. *Journal of Historical Sociology*. 24 (1), 62–79.
- Suganami, Hidemi (2001) C. A. W. Manning and the Study of International Relations. *Review of International Studies*, 27 (1), 91–107
- Vitalis, Robert (forthcoming). *The End of Empire in International Relations*.
- Yellin, Jean Fagan (1973) Dubois’ Crisis and Woman’s Suffrage. *The Massachusetts Review* 14 (2), 365–75.
- Watson, Hilbourne (2001) Theorizing the Racialization of Global Politics and the Caribbean Experience. *Alternatives*, 26 (4), 449–83.
- White, Sarah (2002) Thinking Race, Thinking Development. *Third World Quarterly*, 23 (3), 407–19.
- Winant, Howard (2001) *The World is a Ghetto: Race and Democracy since World War II*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Wing, A. Katherine (2000) *Global Critical Race Feminism: An International Reader*. New York, NY: New York University Press.