


ENLIGHTENMENT AGAINST EMPIRE

SANKAR MUTHU



ENLIGHTENMENT AGAINST EMPIRE

Sankar Muthu

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS

PRINCETON AND OXFORD

Copyright © 2003 by Princeton University Press

Published by Princeton University Press, 41 William Street,
Princeton, New Jersey 08540

In the United Kingdom: Princeton University Press, 3 Market Place,
Woodstock, Oxfordshire OX20 1SY

All Rights Reserved

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Muthu, Sankar, 1970–

Enlightenment against empire / Sankar Muthu.

p.cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

eISBN 9781400825882

1. Imperialism. 2. Political science—Europe—History—18th century. 3. Enlightenment. I. Title.

JC359.M87 2003

325'.32'01—dc212002042717

British Library Cataloging-in-Publication Data is available

This book has been composed in Galliard

Printed on acid-free paper. ∞

www.pupress.princeton.edu

Printed in the United States of America

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

For my parents

After the city or town comes the world, which the philosophers identify as the third level of human society. They begin with the household, progress to the city, and come finally to the world. And the world, like a gathering of waters, is all the more full of perils by reason of its greater size. First of all, the diversity of tongues now divides man from man. . . . It is true that the Imperial City has imposed on subject nations not only her yoke but also her language, as a bond of peace and society, so that there should be no lack of interpreters but a great abundance of them. But how many great wars, what slaughter of men, what outpourings of human blood have been necessary to bring this about! Those wars are now over; but the misery of these evils has not yet come to an end.

(Augustine)

Contents

Acknowledgements

One Introduction: Enlightenment Political Thought and the Age of Empire

Enlightenment Anti-imperialism as a Historical Anomaly

Synopsis

Two Toward a Subversion of Noble Savagery: From Natural Humans to Cultural Humans

Noble Savagery in Montaigne's "Of Cannibals"

Lahontan's Dialogue with a Huron

New World Peoples in Rousseau's Conjectural History

Diderot and Bougainville's Voyage

Diderot's Tahiti: Appropriating and Subverting Noble Savage Theory

The New World as a Device of Social Criticism: The Overlapping and Rival Approaches of

Diderot and Rousseau

The Dehumanization of Natural Humanity

Three Diderot and the Evils of Empire: The Histoire des deux Indes

The General Will of Humanity, the Partial Incommensurability of Moeurs, and the Ethics of

Crossing Borders

On the Cruelties Unleashed by Empire in the Non-European World

Trading Companies and Conquest: On Commerce and Imperial Rule

The Disastrous Effects of Empire upon Europeans

Europe: Not a Civilization Fit for Export

Four Humanity and Culture in Kant's Politics

Humanity as Cultural Agency

Cultural Freedom and Embedded Reason

From Humanity to Personality

Kant's Social Criticism: The Vulnerability and Commodification of Cultural Agency

Humanity as Dignity

Noumenon as the Curtailment of Metaphysics

Aesthetic Humanity: The Opportunities and Injustices of 'Civilized' Sociability

Humanity as Cultural Agency in Political Context: Combating State Paternalism

Humanity as Cultural Agency in a Philosophy of History: Kant's Narrative of Hope

Five Kant's Anti-imperialism: Cultural Agency and Cosmopolitan Right

Self-Cultivation, Pluralism, and Cultural Freedom

Anthropological Diversity: From Race to Collective Freedom

Anti-imperialism and Cosmopolitan Right

An Unusual Social Contract Doctrine

Six Pluralism, Humanity, and Empire in Herder's Political Thought

Generalizations, Contingency, and Historical Judgement

The Flux of History

On the Horizons of Knowledge and Universal Standards

Early Thoughts on National Communities

'Humanity' as Philosophical Anthropology

Conceptualizing Human Diversity: Sedentary versus Nomadic Societies

Beyond Empire and toward International Justice: 'Humanity' as a Moral Ideal

Seven Conclusion: The Philosophical Sources and Legacies of Enlightenment Anti-imperialism

Pluralizing 'the' Enlightenment

Universal Dignity, Cultural Agency, and Moral Incommensurability

Notes

Works Cited

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The initial research for this book was made possible as a result of generous funding by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. I also thank the Mellon Foundation for a dissertation completion grant. The Center for European Studies at Harvard University provided me with an intellectually stimulating and elegant environment for my last two years of dissertation research and writing and also for the spring semester of 2000, while I was on a research leave from the New School. While at the Center, I enjoyed spirited discussions with dozens of faculty associates, visiting scholars, and graduate student affiliates; I thank in particular Tom Ertman, Josep Fradera, Stanley Hoffmann, Susan Pedersen, Dana Villa, and Patrick Weil. I would also like to acknowledge the wonderful staff there, especially Abby Collins, Lisa Eschenbach, Anna Popiel, George Cumming, and Sandy Selesky.

Once as fellow students and now as colleagues, I am very fortunate to have the intellectual advice and friendship of Arash Abizadeh, Gary Bass, Ben Berger, Chris Brooke, Peter Cannavò, Mark Duckenfield, Sam Ewing, Michael Ferguson, Jim Fuerst, Mala Htun, Nancy Kokaz, Karun Mantena, Jason Niedleman, and Tim Shah. I especially want to thank Patchen Markell and Andy Sabl both for their friendship and for countless conversations about the variety of issues that I discuss in this book. I would also like to single out the original ‘6 Marie gang’: Libra Hilde, Jamie Jones, Paul Talcott, and Kim Reimann, as well as Geoff Herrera, for their support and laughter. I am indebted to all my friends from Canada and from college for their camaraderie.

Presentations at a variety of conferences and colloquia helped me to sharpen my arguments and provided welcome opportunities to reflect upon thoughtful criticisms; many thanks to all those who offered comments on my research. I thank Morris Kaplan for many conversations and for his invitation to give a lecture at SUNY-Purchase. Ian Shapiro kindly invited me to present at the Yale Political Theory Colloquium. I also thank David Johnston for his support and an invitation to present my work at the Faculty Seminar in Social and Political Thought at Columbia University. I benefited from many discussions after having presented a paper at a conference on ‘Europe and Empire’ at the Center for European Studies at Harvard University. Thanks also to the participants of ‘The Enlightenment and Its Legacies’ conference, sponsored by the Center for the Study of Political Thought, at Yale University, and especially to Richard Falk for his perceptive comments there. I am indebted as well to questions and suggestions that I received on a panel about liberalism and rights at the International Society for the Study of European Ideas conference in Bergen, Norway. I thank Anthony Pagden, J.G.A. Pocock, Alan Ryan, and Bernie Yack for participating in a panel that I organized about ‘Pluralizing “the” Enlightenment’, as part of the 1999 American Political Science Association conference in Washington, D.C.; I learned much from their papers and comments. Alan Patten offered illuminating questions about my chapter on Herder at a panel on Enlightenment political thought and nationalism, organized by Patricia Nordeen, at the 2002 APSA conference in Boston.

At two conferences, I presented papers based on the research for my next book on Enlightenment debates about transnational commerce and globalization, but the thoughtful commentary I received there helped me in my final revisions for this book. I thank Kirstie McClure for inviting me to the conference on ‘Inside/Outside Constitutionalisms: Rights, Revolutions, Empires, c. 1640–1848’ at the Clark Center of the University of California at Los Angeles, and for her cogent questions and comments. While at the Clark Center, I had many

valuable conversations with J.G.A. Pocock, who offered encouragement and much erudite advice. I thank Erik Bleich, Stephane Dufoix, and Patrick Weil for inviting me to present a paper at a conference on “The Legacy of Colonization and Decolonization in Europe and the Americas”, sponsored by the Centre d’ Étude des Politiques Immigration, d’Intégration et de Citoyenneté (CEPIC) of the Sorbonne (Université de Paris, I).

An early version of some of the arguments that I make in chapter 7 was published as “Enlightenment Anti-Imperialism” in *Social Research*, vol. 66 (1999). “Justice and Foreigners: Kant’s Cosmopolitan Right”, in *Constellations*, vol. 7 (2000), contains a previous version of some parts of chapter 5.

The Graduate Faculty of the New School for Social Research was an exciting intellectual home. Its unusual commitment to interdisciplinary thinking, scholarship, and conversation has been an inspiration for my work. I am indebted to Nancy Shealy’s tireless efforts at forging order out of chaos. I thank my undergraduate students for their enthusiastic interest and lively participation in my seminars on the history of debates over slavery, empire, and international justice, and the excellent graduate students at the New School for innumerable discussions about the issues under study in this book, many of which helped me to refine my arguments. I owe much to all of my New School colleagues, but I especially would like to acknowledge my comrades in the Department of Political Science: Nancy Fraser, Vicky Hattam, Mala Htun, Courtney Jung, Jacob Landynski, Jim Miller, David Plokte, Addie Pollis, Adolph Reed, Jr., and Ari Zolberg. I am also very grateful for the encouragement given to me by my colleagues in the Department of Philosophy, in particular Richard Bernstein, Jay Bernstein, Agnes Heller, Dimitri Nikulin, Charles Taylor, and Yirmiyahu Yovel. I offer a special thanks to my extraordinary junior faculty colleagues across all of the departments at the Graduate Faculty.

Judith Shklar’s exemplary scholarship on Enlightenment political thought, which first drew me to Harvard’s Department of Government, has served as a model for my feeble efforts. As I developed my dissertation prospectus, I received helpful comments from Peter Berkowitz, Daniel Gordon, Bonnie Honig, and Tzvetan Todorov. Linda Zerilli offered constructive comments on an early version of my writings about Diderot’s understanding of Tahiti. I have also gained much from incisive conversations about Enlightenment political thought with Istvan Hont, George Kateb, Gordon Lawson, Steven Lukes, John McCormick, Michael Mosher, Bhikhu Parekh, Corey Robin, and Alan Ryan. Michael Suarez, S.J., has been both a kind friend and has served as an example of scholarly integrity. I am grateful to Melvin Richter and Bernard Yack for having read my book manuscript and for offering insightful advice. In addition, I thank the anonymous readers of my book for their conscientious, detailed, and invaluable commentary. Many thanks to Terence Moore at Cambridge University Press for his generous support of this project. I am indebted to Linda Truilo for her thorough and expert copy-editing and to Maria denBoer for her careful preparation of the index. Ian Malcolm, my editor at Princeton University Press, has been a joy to work with; his excitement about this book and his attention to its every detail have aided me in innumerable ways.

Anthony Pagden, to whom all scholars working on questions about empire in modern political thought are deeply indebted, kindly read the whole manuscript and, over the years, has offered consistently sage advice. Richard Tuck read drafts of many chapters and gave me excellent suggestions over many conversations. At the University of Wisconsin at Madison, Marcus Singer offered encouragement and expert knowledge in moral philosophy and the philosophy of law. At Harvard, Pratap Bhanu Mehta provided a wealth of always intelligent advice on a wide range of

issues in addition to friendly support. Seyla Benhabib, my principal adviser, was enthusiastic about this project from the outset and has shown tremendous care for even the smallest details of my arguments; I have benefited greatly from her insightful and learned advice. It is because of Patrick Riley that I first cultivated a passion for the study of political thought. He has gone above and beyond the call of duty in providing me with an astonishing amount of philosophical advice, scholarly criticism, and good cheer.

My sister and brother-in-law, Uma Muthu and John Vlahoplus, have been a constant source of encouragement and affection. My niece, Phoebe Tharaka Vlahoplus, has also encouraged me by asking repeatedly, “Are you finished your book?” It also gives me great pleasure to thank Lawrence and Mary Pitts for their kind and caring support.

Jennifer Pitts has read virtually every draft of every chapter of this book. She has consistently offered me profound advice as a fellow scholar and political theorist; as my best friend and lifetime partner, she has enriched my life with her compassionate disposition, good humour, and steadfast love.

I owe my parents, Jeya (Rajavel) Muthuchidambaram and Subba Pillai Muthuchidambaram, much more than words can express. I dedicate this book to them.

Introduction: Enlightenment Political Thought and the Age of Empire

IN THE late eighteenth century, a number of prominent European political thinkers attacked imperialism, not only defending non-European peoples against the injustices of European imperial rule, as some earlier modern thinkers had done, but also challenging the idea that Europeans had any right to subjugate, colonize, and ‘civilize’ the rest of the world. This book is a study of this historically anomalous and understudied episode of political thinking. It is an era unique in the history of modern political thought: strikingly, virtually every prominent and influential European thinker in the three hundred years before the eighteenth century and nearly the full century after it were either agnostic toward or enthusiastically in favour of imperialism. In the context of the many philosophical and political questions raised by the emerging relationships between the European and non-European worlds, Enlightenment anti-imperialist thinkers crafted nuanced and intriguingly counter-intuitive arguments about human nature, cultural diversity, cross-cultural moral judgements, and political obligations. This study aims both to pluralize our understanding of the philosophical era known as ‘the Enlightenment’ and to explore a set of arguments and intellectual dispositions that reorient contemporary assumptions about the relationship between human unity and human diversity.

Throughout this book, I use the term ‘Enlightenment’ as a temporal adjective; in this sense of the term, Enlightenment political theory simply refers to the political thought of the long eighteenth century (that is, the late seventeenth to the early nineteenth centuries). As I argue in the concluding chapter, more substantive and conventional understandings of ‘the Enlightenment’ usually occlude more than they illuminate the writings about non-European peoples and empire by eighteenth-century political thinkers. This study, then, is neither a defence of ‘the’ Enlightenment nor an attack upon it, for an investigation of the anti-imperialist strand of eighteenth-century writings is meant to broaden our understanding of Enlightenment-era perspectives, rather than to redescribe ‘the’ Enlightenment or an overriding ‘Enlightenment project’ that ostensibly typified this age of philosophical thought. As with other historiographic terms of convenience, ‘the Enlightenment’ groups together an extraordinarily diverse set of authors, texts, arguments, opinions, dispositions, assumptions, institutions, and practices. Thus, I begin this book with the presumption that we should diversify our understanding of Enlightenment thought.¹ On this understanding, rather than categorizing ‘the’ Enlightenment as such or constructing ideas of a single ‘Enlightenment project’ that one must defend or reject, I take Enlightenment anti-imperialist arguments, which are themselves multifaceted, to represent only some of many, often conflicting, discourses in eighteenth-century moral and political thought.

In the following chapters, I interpret the relationship among theories about the constitutive features of humanity, explanations of human diversity and historical change, and political arguments about European imperialism.² In exploring the rise of anti-imperialist arguments in Enlightenment political thought, I concentrate upon the philosophically robust and distinctive strand of such arguments made by Denis Diderot (1713–84), Immanuel Kant (1724–1804), and

Johann Gottfried Herder (1744– 1803). These thinkers are not usually grouped together; indeed, they could be viewed as fundamentally antithetical, as representing some of the contrasting idea types of eighteenth-century political thought: atheistic materialism, enlightened rationalism, and romantic nationalism. To begin with, such labels grossly distort their actual philosophies. Moreover, as I will argue, viewing these thinkers through the lens of debates about international relations that concerned them deeply, in particular those about the relationship between the European and non-European worlds, brings out the remarkable extent to which their political theories, though obviously unique to be sure, are nonetheless cut from the same cloth.³ Diderot's immense philosophical influence in this period with regard to questions of imperialism explains in part the shared intellectual disposition about the immorality of empire and the related philosophical ideas upon which this disposition often rested: theories of human nature; conceptualizations of human diversity; and the relationship between universal moral and political norms, on the one hand, and a commitment to moral incommensurability, on the other. As we will see, Diderot's anti-imperialist contributions to Abbé Raynal's *Histoire philosophique et politique des établissements et du commerce des Européens dans les deux Indes* [Philosophical and political history of European settlements and commerce in the two Indies], one of the most widely read, 'underground' nonfiction works of the eighteenth century, appear to have left their mark on both Kant and Herder. Behind them all, I will argue, lie Jean-Jacques Rousseau's writings, in particular the two Discourses, which exerted both a negative and a positive influence upon the development of this aspect of Enlightenment thought, for Diderot's, Kant's, and Herder's anti-imperialism rested crucially upon both an appropriation as well as a rejection of particular elements of Rousseau's philosophical anthropology and political thought.

In this chapter, I elaborate the historical and philosophical distinctiveness of Enlightenment anti-imperialist political thought. I also note briefly some of the philosophical sources and legacies of Enlightenment anti-imperialism, which I examine in more detail in the concluding chapter. As I will contend, a number of the conventional distinctions that are deployed by many contemporary political theorists—for instance, between universalism and relativism, or essential and constructed identities—fail to do justice to the arguments made by Enlightenment anti-imperialists, who often treat such supposed opposites as interrelated features of the human condition. A study of Enlightenment anti-imperialism offers a richer and more accurate portrait of eighteenth-century political thought and illuminates the underappreciated philosophical interconnections between human unity and human diversity, and between moral universalism and moral incommensurability.

Enlightenment Anti-imperialism as a Historical Anomaly

Enlightenment anti-imperialist political theory has been the object of far less study than the anti-slavery writings of the same period.⁴ Some of the best contemporary scholarship on slavery details the rising tide of philosophical opinion against it, and the emergence of a humanitarian ethic that provided the concepts and languages that newly formed anti-slavery societies and activists deployed in their controversial, lengthy, and ultimately successful campaigns. In their studies about slavery, David Brion Davis and Robin Blackburn attempt to discern why an institution that is universally decried today underwent no sustained opposition from a critical mass of thinkers and political actors until the eighteenth century.⁵ The same question can plausibly be asked with regard to imperialism, for it is only in the latter half of the eighteenth

century that a group of significant European political thinkers began to attack the imperial and colonial enterprise as such. To be sure, in surveying the philosophical and political debates that followed the European discovery of the New World, one encounters discussions about the hypocrisy of European imperialists, ⁶humanitarian attacks upon the practice of Amerindian slavery and other cruelties perpetrated by the conquistadors in the New World, ⁷and romanticized (though, as I argue in chapter 2, ultimately dehumanizing) accounts of noble savages in travel, literary, and philosophical texts. Before the late eighteenth century, however, those who sympathized with the plight of colonized peoples and those who launched explicit criticisms of Europeans' relations with the non-European world (including the most morally impassioned accounts, such as Bartolomé de Las Casas' arguments against the Castilian crown in the mid-sixteenth century) generally decried the abuses of imperial power, but not the imperial mission itself. Imperial rule, however it may have been perceived and justified (inter alia, in light of religious conversion, the civilizing mission of imperialism, economic and other commercial benefits, or the more rational use of otherwise supposedly wasted natural resources) was widely endorsed even by the most zealous critics of the violence perpetrated by Europeans in the New World.

Truly anti-imperialist political philosophy emerges in the late eighteenth century among a broad array of thinkers from different intellectual and national contexts. A significant group of European political thinkers rejected imperialism outright as unworkable, dangerous, or immoral—for economic reasons of free trade, as a result of principles of self-determination or cultural integrity, due to concerns about the effects of imperial politics upon domestic political institutions and practices, or out of contempt over the ironic spectacle of ostensibly civilized nations engaging in despotism, corruption, and lawlessness abroad. In confronting the steadily expanding commercial and political power of European states and imperial trading companies over the non-European world, the diverse group of thinkers who assailed the injustices and countered the dominant justifications of European imperialism include Jeremy Bentham, Condorcet, Diderot, Herder, Kant, and Adam Smith.⁸ Moreover, such denunciations of what Herder liked to call “the grand European sponging enterprise” were complemented by more specific attacks upon European imperial or quasi-imperial activities in particular regions. Along these lines, the most notable efforts are Edmund Burke's legislative attempts to curtail and to regulate the activities of the East India Company and his lengthy, zealous prosecution of the impeachment of Warren Hastings, a senior East India Company official and the Governor-General of Bengal.⁹ Burke argued that the British had failed to respect the sovereignty of local Indian powers, and had accordingly enriched themselves through illegal and unjust means, contributing not one iota, in his view, to the well-being of Indians themselves. In making such arguments, Burke was not a lone voice in the wilderness; rather, he raised concerns that were shared by a number of his contemporaries, a fact that has been neglected even by incisive scholars who have studied the connections between modern political theory and empire.¹⁰ Of course, such anti-imperialist political thinkers fought an uphill battle, for defences of European imperial rule were still prevalent; the Enlightenment era is unique not because of the absence of imperialist arguments, but rather due to the presence of spirited attacks upon the foundations of empire.

Enlightenment anti-imperialism is understudied most likely because of its failure to take root both in the broader political cultures in which it was presented and in the intellectual writings of later thinkers, including those who in some sense saw themselves as heirs to the tradition of

progressive thinking of the eighteenth century. Here the contrast with anti-slavery writings is especially stark. Anti-slavery writings of the eighteenth century, from Montesquieu onward, provided much of the political language and principles that were used by anti-slavery activists and by newly formed anti-slavery societies; accordingly, the immorality of slavery became a common (though, of course, by no means a universal) presumption of nineteenth-century European social and political thought. Eighteenth-century anti-imperialist arguments, on the other hand, almost always went unheeded, not only by political, religious, and commercial authorities (as one would expect), but also by later political thinkers, including some of the most progressive social and political reformers of the nineteenth century. Those who crusaded against the fraud and oppression of imperial rule and the activities of commercial trading companies were generally ridiculed and ultimately defeated in their efforts. Burke's efforts in the Hastings trial are particularly suggestive of the failed political results of anti-imperialist crusades; Hastings was found innocent, and Burke's refusal to compromise on the India issue damaged his standing not only with his parliamentary colleagues, but also with the press and the general populace.¹¹ And although the French Revolution gave an impetus to eradicating slavery, revolutionary and post-revolutionary France, as Benjamin Constant noted, was firmly committed to a form of imperialism, one of conquest within Europe, in order to spread the ideals and institutions of the revolution.¹² Strikingly, with regard to intellectual opinion, anti-imperialist sentiments largely fell by the wayside as the eighteenth century came to a close. The anti-imperialist writings of the latter half of the eighteenth century failed to rally later thinkers to the cause of exposing imperialist injustices, defending non-European peoples against imperial rule, and attacking the standard rationales for empire. None of the most significant anti-imperialist thinkers of the eighteenth century can be matched with any nineteenth-century anti-imperialist thinker of a comparable stature. By the mid-nineteenth century, anti-imperialist political thinking was virtually absent from Western European intellectual debates, surfacing only rarely by way of philosophically obscure and politically marginal figures.¹³ Indeed, the major European political theorists of the immediate post-Enlightenment period either were ambivalent about European imperialism or were quite often explicitly in favour of it.

Thus, while imperialist arguments surface frequently in eighteenth-century European political debates, this period is anomalous in the history of modern political philosophy in that it includes a significant anti-imperialist strand, one moreover that includes not simply marginal figures, but some of the most prominent and innovative thinkers of the age. In this respect, the nineteenth-century European political and philosophical discourse on empire marked a return to the frequently held imperialist sentiments of pre-Enlightenment political thought. While the dominance of languages of race and nation in the nineteenth century was new, the virtual consensus about the necessity and justice of imperialism among European political thinkers recalls the pre-Enlightenment discourse on empire. It is perhaps by reading popular nineteenth-century political views of progress, nationality, and empire back into the eighteenth century that 'the Enlightenment' as a whole has been characterized as a project that ultimately attempted to efface or marginalize difference, a characterization that has hidden from view the anti-imperialist strand of Enlightenment-era political thought.

Synopsis

The following chapters proceed chronologically, and they are also linked biographically. Rousseau

and Diderot were, for a time, friends who influenced one another's political writings, in particular the texts under study in this book. As Kant himself famously attested, his philosophical commitments and intellectual disposition were deeply shaped by Rousseau's writings. In addition, I will argue that Diderot's most radical political and historical writings appear to have informed Kant's and Herder's anti-imperialism. As is well known, Herder studied under Kant at Königsberg, and held him in great admiration even after Kant had written critical book reviews of the first two installments of Herder's masterpiece, *Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit* [Ideas Toward a Philosophy of History of Humankind]. Approaching some of the philosophically most incisive and innovative currents of eighteenth-century political thought on human diversity and European imperialism reveals the overlapping and intersecting character of such writings and debates. The rapidly proliferating literature about human unity and diversity in the Enlightenment era reflects a cross-fertilization of concepts, arguments, and perspectives from diverse intellectual contexts.¹⁴ Whatever the conclusions and assessments that one draws from their diverse writings, it is clear that many social and political reformers of the eighteenth century saw their efforts as part of a broad, though also a diffuse and contentious, multinational effort. Such a 'Republic of Letters', to use a phrase that was employed often in the eighteenth century, aimed to identify and to check oppression not only within Europe, but often also in light of what a number of eighteenth-century thinkers viewed as Europe's tyranny over other continents. Hence, the specific grouping of thinkers in this book illuminates both a cohesive set of arguments about international justice and cultural pluralism as well as a set of influences, both negative and positive, across national and ideological lines.

The rise of anti-imperialist political theory in the late eighteenth century depended upon far more than a universal ethic that ascribed value or dignity to every human being. In addition to the fact that the indigenous inhabitants of the New World had been considered by many Europeans, from the fifteenth century onward, to be subhuman, it is crucial to note that even when their humanity was accepted, they failed to win recognition as free and self-governing peoples. Within the modern natural right and social contractarian traditions, Amerindians in particular were almost always deployed as empirical examples of pure humans, that is, as beings who inhabit a state of nature and who thus exhibit purely natural qualities, such as natural sentiments or an unmediated knowledge of natural laws and rights. Ironically, however, for reasons that are philosophically revealing and that I will later discuss, the profoundly influential natural right theorists of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, such as Grotius and Vattel, as well as the social critics who celebrated Amerindians as noble savages, categorized Amerindians as the most purely human of humans, while also according them the weakest possible (and sometimes even a nonexistent) moral status in the face of European imperial power. The idea of what it meant fundamentally to be human went through a transformation before an anti-imperialist political theory could emerge. Human nature had sometimes been viewed as a stable category, one that is unchanging and that serves as a foundational essence upon which more ephemeral, particular features of human life (mores, institutions, social practices) are layered. This account came to be replaced—at times, no doubt, unwittingly, but largely in conscious opposition to naturalistic and unitary understandings of human nature—by the view that humanity is marked fundamentally by cultural difference. This is what I will call the view of humanity as cultural agency, which in varying ways animates the thinking of Diderot, Kant, and Herder.

By using the term 'cultural agency', I am not suggesting that Enlightenment anti-imperialists believed that there are different cultures, that non-Europeans are members of distinct cultures,

and that such cultures are of worth equal to that of all other cultures. Enlightenment anti-imperialism is not ‘multiculturalist’ in this conventional (and contemporary) sense because eighteenth-century thinkers did not write of culture in the plural. This was a development that would occur in European writings of the nineteenth century, when ‘cultures’ would begin to signify (some-times only certain) peoples. The Enlightenment anti-imperialists under study in this book, by contrast, believed that human beings are fundamentally cultural creatures, that is, they possess and exercise, simply by virtue of being human, a range of rational, emotive, aesthetic, and imaginative capacities that create, sustain, and transform diverse practices and institutions over time. The fact that humans are cultural agents, according to these writers, underlies the diverse mores, practices, beliefs, and institutions of different peoples. My use of the term ‘cultural’ is only somewhat anachronistic, since the philosophical use of the term ‘culture’ itself in particular to denote some aspect of the differences among humans, emerges in a number of late eighteenth-century German writings. Kultur, like the English ‘culture’, derives from the Latin *cultura*, which referred to cultivation generally and often to agricultural practices, a fact that (as we will see) is by no means unimportant for appreciating some imperial understandings of cultural development. Even in its earliest uses, ‘culture’ was a highly ambiguous term, for it could refer to a particular social or collective lifestyle (usually sedentary and agricultural) or to an aesthetic sensibility that was posited either as an ideal or as a reality that had been achieved by only some peoples or individuals.¹⁵ It could also, however, connote the constitutive features of humankind; in this book, I use the term ‘cultural agency’ in this most expansive sense, in order to indicate those qualities that humans have in common and that also account for many of their differences. The concept of ‘cultural agency’, then, signifies how Enlightenment anti-imperialists anthropologically employed the term ‘culture’ or its near equivalents and analogues. These include the French *mœurs*, which both Rousseau and Diderot employ in the context of theorizing human diversity, and the language of ‘sociability’, under which many eighteenth-century thinkers discussed the varied capacities, activities, and values that today would often be categorized by the word ‘culture’ and its variants.

Diderot, Kant, and Herder were all profoundly influenced by Rousseau’s account of human history and social life, of his conception of humans as free, self-making creatures, whose very freedom creates and perpetuates diverse psychological needs, social inequalities, and political constraints, while also serving potentially as a source for a less unjust society. But they argued, contra Rousseau, that humans are constitutively social and diverse creatures, that they are cultural agents. Thus, they appropriated Rousseau’s social criticism and much of his accompanying account of freedom, but jettisoned his attack on the idea of natural sociability. Diderot, Kant, and Herder all elaborated the view that, to use Edmund Burke’s concise formulation, “art is Man’s nature”.¹⁶ Having appreciated Rousseau’s searing indictment of European mores, social institutions, political power, and economic inequality, they were loathe to recommend European societies as models for other peoples. But they were also unwilling to classify any people or set of peoples as virtually natural, as free from artifice. For them, the art (or culture) that constitutes human practices, beliefs, and institutions is necessarily diverse and also, importantly, in many respects, incommensurable. Consequently, non-Europeans, including nomadic peoples who were often viewed as exotically uncultivated and purely natural, were members of societies that were artful, or cultural; they were simply artful in a different manner, one that could not be judged as intrinsically superior or inferior. At certain moments of Enlightenment thought, as cultural differences came to be viewed as the results produced by

interactions of human freedom and reason with diverse environments—rather than as pathological aberrations from a single true way of life as represented by some set of European mores, practices, and institutions—Europeans' brutal treatment of foreign peoples evoked an outpouring of moral indignation and protest. Intriguingly, as the particularity and partial incommensurability of human lives came to the fore in a number of late eighteenth-century political writings, the moral universalism that occupied a formal, but ultimately hollow, position in earlier political theories became more genuinely inclusive.

In the following chapters, I examine the core philosophical assumptions and arguments that underlie the anti-imperialist political theories of Diderot, Kant, and Herder. In chapter 2, I examine a series of French writings that constitute what in retrospect can be identified as a tradition of noble savage thinking, which exerted an enormous influence upon many eighteenth-century thinkers, including Diderot. Focusing principally upon understandings of 'natural men' in Montaigne, Lahontan, and Rousseau, I then turn toward Diderot's appropriation and subversion of noble savagery in his account of Tahitian society in the *Supplément au Voyage de Bougainville*. Diderot's philosophic dialogue upsets the standard assumptions of noble savagery—most notably the presumption of the existence and philosophical usefulness of 'natural' humans, who were thought to be free, or nearly free, of artifice or culture. Diderot's subversion of noble savagery and his attendant account of humanity as fundamentally cultural would help to ground many aspects of his anti-imperialist political thought. In chapter 3, I analyze Diderot's myriad arguments against empire and conquest in his influential contributions to Raynal's *Histoire des deux Indes*, many of which reemerge in later Enlightenment attacks upon empire. In chapter 4, I examine Kant's understanding of 'humanity' in order to elucidate a key and often misunderstood concept of his political philosophy that has profound consequences for his writings on international and cosmopolitan justice. In Kant's view, humans were not at bottom metaphysical essences from whom one could abstract all social and cultural attachments, but rather they were fundamentally cultural agents. I offer an account of the understandings of reason and freedom that he associated with 'humanity' and I show how this influenced his views of history and society. In chapter 5, I interpret Kant's account of plural values in order to examine how he defends an anti-paternalistic conception of human development. I then turn to his understanding of human diversity and his attacks upon European imperialism in light of his account of humanity and ideal of cosmopolitan justice. In chapter 6, I provide an interpretation of Herder's political thought that emphasizes both its distinctiveness and its deep similarities to Diderot's and Kant's anti-imperialist political philosophies. Underlying Herder's account of pluralism and independent nationalities, I contend, is a nuanced and complex understanding of 'humanity' (*Humanität*) that is at once anthropological, moral, and political. Finally, in the concluding chapter, I present the key philosophical sources and legacies of the strand of Enlightenment anti-imperialism under study in this book. I argue that Diderot's, Kant's, and Herder's incisive and hitherto underappreciated arguments against empire provide us with an opportunity to rethink prevalent assumptions about our understandings of 'the' Enlightenment and about the relationship between human unity and diversity, and between universal moral concepts and pluralistic ethical commitments. Common understandings of 'Enlightenment universalism' fail to come to terms with the complicated and intriguing manner in which Diderot, Kant, and Herder interweave commitments to moral universalism and moral incommensurability, to humanity and cultural difference. Such universal and particular categories in their political philosophies not only coexist, but deeply inform one another. Thus, as I will show, their arguments against empire tre

the affirmation of a wide plurality of individual and collective ways of life and the dignity of a universal, shared humanity as fundamentally intertwined ethical and political commitments.

Toward a Subversion of Noble Savagery: From Natural Humans to Cultural Humans

THE DEVELOPMENT of anti-imperialist political thought in the late eighteenth century is attributable only partly to the development of the natural rights doctrine or, indeed, to any other version of the idea that humans as such deserve moral respect. It is a much noted feature of modern political theory that proponents of egalitarian doctrines of equal rights and liberty regularly flouted such norms when reflecting upon the social and political status of women, nonpropertied males, and those who were deemed foreign or exotic, among others. At times, this reflected a gross inconsistency between prima facie humanistic norms and self-serving or prejudicial arguments that sought to exclude certain categories of humans from having full social, legal, and political standing. This seeming paradox, however, could also follow from the specific characterization of universal principles themselves; as I will argue in this chapter, even on the assumption that non-Europeans or New World peoples were human, particular understandings of humanity were less likely (and, conversely, other understandings were more likely) to undergird political arguments in favour of the rights and liberties of non-European peoples. This tension between moral universalism and the politics of exclusion was overcome to a certain extent by anti-imperialist thinkers who framed the relationship between human nature and cultural pluralism differently from previous thinkers (and from some of their contemporaries); their view that imperial rule was manifestly unjust, and their inclination to defend a variety of non-European peoples against imperial policies and institutions, in part developed out of an understanding of humanity as cultural agency, a view that was distinct from that of a number of their most obvious forebears.

In this chapter, I investigate the philosophical and political assumptions and arguments that made this outlook possible in part by contrasting this view, as we find it in Diderot's understanding of Tahitian society, from the influential image of New World peoples as 'noble savages'.¹ This idealized conception of what were usually taken to be nomadic peoples sought to counter the most pejorative characterizations of foreign peoples as barbaric and fundamentally inferior. As David Brion Davis has plausibly speculated, the celebration of so-called primitives may well have "partially weaken[ed] Europe's arrogant ethnocentrism and create[d] at least a momentary ambivalence about the human costs of modern civilization".² Yet, ultimately, as much as this may have helped to elicit the intellectual groundwork for the humanitarianism of anti-slavery thinking, a rejection of noble savagery was necessary before a more meaningful and substantive moral commiseration with non-Europeans could develop, in particular one that could help to engender an anti-imperialist political philosophy. As I will argue, the peculiar understanding of the relationship between human nature and culture in noble savage writings yielded a virtually dehumanizing exoticism, despite the best intentions of the thinkers who chose to celebrate what they saw as the 'purely natural' specimens of humanity in the New World. In order to understand how Diderot drew upon the mode of social criticism distinctive to the tradition of noble savagery, while also ultimately subverting its core presumptions about the character of New World peoples and indeed of humanity itself, we must first examine the

exponents of this tradition who most shaped the relevant aspects of his intellectual milieu.

The interpretations of New World peoples inherited by eighteenth-century thinkers vary widely and are not reducible to any one doctrine, although theories that were based upon the purported genetic, behavioural, or cultural inferiority of Amerindians were by far the most influential and dominant at the outset of the century, by which time European colonial and imperial activities were well entrenched and steadily expanding. Given its complicated influence upon the group of anti-imperialist thinkers discussed in later chapters, I focus here largely upon the heterodox noble savage literature that, in contrast, celebrated New World peoples as intrinsically pacific and benevolent natural beings, free from the corruption not only of modern life but indeed of culture itself. The sixteenth-century essayist Michel de Montaigne plays a central role in the philosophical history of theorizing Amerindians, although he both de-plays the idea of a noble savage and at times undermines it. While in this respect his writings foreshadow Diderot's view they also reveal the deep philosophical tensions of noble savage theory, which Montaigne never comprehensively or directly explored. These tensions are even more glaring, and consequently the exoticism inherent in noble savagery is thrown into even sharper relief, in the writings of Baron Lahontan. At the turn of the eighteenth century, Lahontan, a French imperial officer who lived in Quebec and studied the Huron, Algonquin, and Iroquois peoples, was among the most influential noble savage theorists in the French tradition. Like other noble savage accounts, Lahontan's writings offer an amalgam of anthropological interpretations and radical social and political criticism. Rousseau's *Discourse on Inequality* is heavily indebted to Lahontan and Montaigne and to this tradition of social criticism in general, which highlighted and elaborated idealized representations of Amerindians from New World ethnography. As with previous attacks on European social practices and political institutions that used the Amerindian as a pure and natural foil, European imperialism itself was never the sustained object of Rousseau's trenchant criticism. Paradoxically, as I argue later, identifying indigenous Americans as purely human resulted ultimately in their dehumanization, making the possibility of any meaningful commiseration with their oppression remote. Nonetheless, the subtlety and power of Rousseau's account of humans as self-making (and self-enslaving) agents shaped the political thought of Diderot, in addition to the writings of Kant and Herder. When the critical features of Rousseau's account of freedom and history were conjoined to a philosophical anthropology that, contra Rousseau, viewed social and cultural differentiation as central to the human condition, it became more likely that at least some thinkers would engage in sustained intellectual assaults upon European state power not only in a domestic or intra-European setting, but also as it was exercised in imperialist ventures abroad. Thus, Rousseau looms over the latter half of the eighteenth century as an ambiguous figure who both impedes and enables the development of anti-imperialist political thought. To understand this better, however, and to appreciate the innovation of thinkers such as Diderot, Kant, and Herder, it is crucial to begin with the account of noble savagery that most informed Rousseau's (and through Rousseau, Diderot's) understanding of New World peoples.

The accounts of many of the earliest encounters between Europeans and Amerindians contain reactions toward New World peoples that implied, or more directly offered, praise for what was perceived to be their 'natural' manner of living. Idealized portrayals of Amerindians in these writings reflect the varied, and at times conflicting, fables about faraway lands and peoples across the seas that shaped the expectations of the late-fifteenth-and early-sixteenth-century explorers, missionaries, and soldiers who travelled to the Americas. Imagined visions of distant

lands occupied by magical creatures, instantiations of mythological ‘wild men’, or members of a golden age who were celebrated in song and in lyrical poetry no doubt helped to occasion moments of what can be described in hindsight as noble savagery.³ To the extent that early accounts contained any positive assessments of Amerindians, they typically offered only fleeting moments of adulation of Amerindians’ rusticity, which could then turn rapidly to outright disgust at what appeared to explorers and settlers as manifestly backward and barbaric appearances and behaviour. Still, these occasional nonpejorative expressions of wonder often became widely circulated and redescribed, eventually forming a vivid image of the Amerindian that served many rhetorical purposes for imperial administrators, church officials, theologians, social critics, and the humanist literati. One of the origins of noble savage sentiments, for instance, can be found in missionaries’ writings that lauded Amerindians’ simple nobility and reasonableness both in an effort to persuade European political authorities that they could be converted and to censure sinful behaviour within modern European societies.⁴ More sustained noble savage accounts, however, broadly attacked Europe’s moral standing—and that of all civilizations—rather than supporting the more conventional social and political aims that inspired many of the isolated fragments of wonder and praise in the earliest travel literature and theological commentaries. The distinction between nature and artifice, which plays such a central role in Montaigne’s influential essay, “Des Cannibales” [“Of Cannibals”] (1578–80), was crucial to such modes of radical social criticism.

Noble Savagery in Montaigne’s “Of Cannibals”

One especially significant instance of the proliferation of noble savagery can be traced to Amerigo Vespucci’s *Mundus Novus* (1503), a letter that became one of the most popular essays on the New World in the sixteenth century.

They have no cloth of wool, linen, or cotton, since they need none. Nor have they private property, but own everything in common: they live together without a king and without authorities, each man his own master. They take as many wives as they wish, and son may couple with mother, brother with sister, cousin with cousin, and in general men with women as they chance to meet. They dissolve marriage

as often as they please, observing no order in any of these matters. Moreover, they have no temple and no religion, nor do they worship idols. What more can I say? They live according to nature, and might be called Epicureans rather than Stoics. There are no merchants among them, nor is there any commerce. The peoples make war among themselves without art or order.⁵

The lack of “art or order” among beings who live simply according to nature is a trope that emerges in nearly every idealized conception of Amerindian life, although the specific manner in which such “natural” lifestyles are presented and explained differ from thinker to thinker. A key philosophical assumption of such portrayals is that a human life could be simply natural (or very nearly so), free from the ‘artificial’, regular social practices and constructed institutions that shape human expectations and form the horizon of possibilities—free, that is, from what would now most often be described as ‘culture’. Montaigne paraphrased Amerigo’s celebrated description, but set it in the context of a more extensive dis-course about the corruption of European societies and the superior excellence of nature’s treasures, which included for him most of the indigenous inhabitants of the New World who had hardly strayed from their “original naturalness” (153).⁶

Montaigne’s essay is often interpreted as an ingenious attempt at complicating the very idea of savagery, for he directly challenges the view that Amerindians are savage in any pejorative sense.⁷ A proper understanding of the term *sauvage*, in his view, shows that Europeans who have altered themselves and their environments are in fact savagely artificial, rather than naturally pure. As Montaigne argues,

Those people [Amerindians] are wild [sauvage], just as we call wild [sauvage] the fruits that Nature has produced by herself and in her normal course; whereas really it is those

- [download The Best Intentions \(Country House Party, Book 2\) pdf, azw \(kindle\)](#)
- [read The Beginning Runner's Handbook: The Proven 13-Week Walk/Run Program](#)
- [click The Unspoken Rules of Getting Hired: 107 Job Hunting Secrets That Employers Do Not Want You To Know pdf, azw \(kindle\)](#)
- [The On-Time, On-Target Manager: How a "Last-Minute Manager" Conquered Procrastination for free](#)
- [read online Cronkite's War: His World War II Letters Home online](#)

- <http://schroff.de/books/The-Best-Intentions--Country-House-Party--Book-2-.pdf>
- <http://bestarthritiscare.com/library/The-Beginning-Runner-s-Handbook--The-Proven-13-Week-Walk-Run-Program.pdf>
- <http://betsy.wesleychapelcomputerrepair.com/library/The-Unspoken-Rules-of-Getting-Hired--107-Job-Hunting-Secrets-That-Employers-Do-Not-Want-You-To-Know.pdf>
- <http://weddingcellist.com/lib/Pharmacology-for-Nurses--A-Pathophysiologic-Approach--3rd-Edition-.pdf>
- <http://betsy.wesleychapelcomputerrepair.com/library/Cronkite-s-War--His-World-War-II-Letters-Home.pdf>