Kincaid’s and Mutua’s fundamental purposes are similar: they’re attempting to interrogate the basic underlying biases found in corpora which are traditionally taken to be devoid of ideology. In Kincaid’s case, she is questioning the objectivity and completeness of history; Mutua is concerned with the fundamentally Western essence of contemporary human rights discourse. Further, both are concerned with the Eurocentric perspectives centered by the historical developments of their respective fields in particular.

Mutua addresses this explicitly in *Savages, Victims, and Saviors,* writing that the “human rights corpus, though well-meaning, is fundamentally Eurocentric.” (Mutua 204). He elaborates, addressing later the origin of such prejudice, stretching “back to at least … the rise of the modern state in Europe,” (Mutua 208), claiming that the first iteration of the human rights movement arose from “that state’s monopoly of violence and the instruments of coercion,” (Mutua 208). In this way, he establishes the scope of the discourse that he is challenging, raising the stakes to span several centuries and cultures. He also then declares his own spot in the conversation, differentiating himself from other critiques of the human rights corpus in his desire to “address an international phenomenon and not a municipal, distinctly American question,” (Mutua 2019). In his essay, Mutua progresses in establishing his project of bettering the state of human rights ideology by establishing the presence of a problem before moving onto the roots of such a problem and his position in the discourse addressing the issue.

Kincaid is more subtle in her own dialogue with other historians and scholars, addressing them indirectly through the insufficiency that she finds in her personal view of history. In particular she uses phrases that appear to be pulled from traditional teachings of history such as “in 1492, Christopher Columbus discovered the New World,” (Kincaid 1), which is a direct address of other works in the same topic as her, and then shows her dissatisfaction: “I am not yet in the picture, I have not yet

made an appearance, the word "discover" does not set off an alarm” (Kincaid 1). This pattern gets repeated throughout *In History,* which forms Kincaid’s critique of the field of history.