



NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE

Humanities

DIVISION OF EDUCATION PROGRAMS

## Narrative Section of a Successful Application

The attached document contains the grant narrative and selected portions of a previously funded grant application. It is not intended to serve as a model, but to give you a sense of how a successful application may be crafted. Every successful application is different, and each applicant is urged to prepare a proposal that reflects its unique project and aspirations. Prospective applicants should consult the Summer Seminars and Institutes application guidelines at

<http://www.neh.gov/grants/education/summer-seminars-and-institutes>

for instructions. Applicants are also strongly encouraged to consult with the NEH Division of Education Programs staff well before a grant deadline.

Note: The attachment only contains the grant narrative and selected portions, not the entire funded application. In addition, certain portions may have been redacted to protect the privacy interests of an individual and/or to protect confidential commercial and financial information and/or to protect copyrighted materials. The page limit for the narrative description is now **fifteen** double-spaced pages.

Project Title: Enlightenment Thinkers: from Mandeville to Hegel  
Institution: University of Chicago  
Project Director: Paul Cheney  
Grant Program: Summer Seminars and Institutes

## Table of Contents

### **Invisible Bonds – The Enlightenment Science of Society from Mandeville to Hegel**

A Proposal for a three-week NEH Seminar for University and College Teachers

Paul Cheney and Alexander Schmidt

1. Project Narrative	1
a. Intellectual Rationale	2
b. Seminar Organization	3
c. Program of Study	3
d. Translations and Terminology	13
e. Project Faculty and Staff	14
f. Participant Selection	14
g. Project Website and Public Outreach	15
h. Institutional Support	15
2. Budget	
a. Budget	16
b. Budget Justification	18
Appendix A, Syllabus	21
Appendix B, Bibliography	23

1. *Project Narrative*
  - a. **Intellectual Rationale**

We propose a three-week seminar on Enlightenment theories of society and sociability for college and university teachers to be held at the University of Chicago in summer 2018. Our overarching aim is to recover the complexity of Eighteenth-century attempts to theorize the relation between the imaginary, yet very real, (moral) bonds that make up a stable society, and the autonomous individual self. We will accomplish this through a close reading of texts on moral theory, politics, economy, law, and aesthetics. This seminar will appeal to university and college teachers in history, political science, philosophy, and literature interested in the Enlightenment and, more broadly, the development of political philosophy.

Our premise is two-fold. First, the Enlightenment science of society can be understood as a set of overlapping but sometimes contradictory attempts to ground normative arguments for individual autonomy in an evolutionary approach to the human mind and passions; to institutions and economic life; and to the forms of authority appropriate to societies in different stages of moral and material development. Second, this ambitious but incomplete set of Enlightenment projects is ripe with consequences in the twenty first century. We rely more than ever on self-interest, democratic sociability, utilitarianism, as well as free inquiry and debate in the public sphere to provide order in pluralistic societies such as our own; but are these classically enlightened solutions a match for the anomic forces that are destabilizing society and politics in the Western world? The syllabus for this seminar does not raise contemporary questions explicitly, but the conveners are convinced that the proposed organization of the sessions and—more importantly—the prescience of the eighteenth-century thinkers we examine, will bring these themes naturally to the fore. By reasserting the relevance of eighteenth-century social theory to contemporary questions, we hope to reinvigorate the teaching of this subject in the fields of history, political science, philosophy, literature, and other areas. More broadly, this seminar furnishes an example of

the indispensability of the humanities for addressing fundamental questions of social cohesion and organization. Each of the philosophical, economic, literary, and historical texts that we examine in this seminar uses a unique conceptual vocabulary and is on its own the subject of a vast critical literature; thus, three weeks is the minimum time necessary, we believe, to give these texts adequate attention and to set them in productive conversation with one another. We have built a certain amount of repetition into the seminar to assure that we can linger on and revisit central issues.

*b. Seminar Organization*

The seminar will be anchored in the discussion of carefully selected excerpts that are listed in the attached syllabus (**appendix A**). We plan to meet for two hours in the morning to leave time for reading and the discussion of participants' scholarship in the afternoon. In addition to the discussion of the primary readings, each of the seminar participants will be asked to give a 20-30 minute oral presentation that focuses on a piece of critical literature relevant to the seminar's primary reading for the day. These presentations will serve a number of purposes. First, they will help orient the seminar around the participants' interests. A list of relevant secondary literature, based upon the bibliography in **appendix B**, will be distributed to participants; but this list is only indicative. The conveners of the seminar will contact each participant well in advance of the seminar to discuss their interests and which books (or articles) they would like to bring into the discussion. A second purpose is to put the seminar participants in the role of expert and therefore to foster engagement during our daily discussions. Third and finally, in orienting the secondary literature we examine in this seminar around participants' interests, we hope that the seminar as a whole will contribute productively to their scholarly works in progress. In addition to the presentations of secondary work, we will offer seminar participants the opportunity to present draft articles and chapters in one hour afternoon sessions. After consulting with participants, we will

schedule afternoon sessions and establish a timeline for the distribution of drafts. We expect all members of the seminar to read one another's work, but the distribution of work for discussion will be strictly voluntary. Due to time constraints, we will ask participants to limit the length of the drafts they submit to 30 pages.

### **c. Program of Study**

The seminar unfolds in fourteen sessions over three weeks; it is organized around the examination of a number of key texts in (mainly) eighteenth-century social and political thought. One day will be devoted to a public lecture given by Silvia Sebastiani of the Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales in Paris, France, followed by a questions by the audience and a reception (see **section g**). An as yet undetermined number of sessions—probably six—will be devoted to discussing participants' work in progress.

The seminar departs from a set of related questions. What holds society together? Is society the organic expression of our natural self, our material and psychological needs, such as our wish for companionship? Or, rather, is it an artifice erected to mend our antagonistic impulses and enable the peaceful cohabitation of large groups with radically different and fluctuating priorities? Conversely, to what extent is our self socially constituted, and how can it be authentic in a world characterized by a complex division of labor, spiraling needs, and plural values? These questions, we claim, are still recognizably ours, even if many of the eighteenth-century answers are not.

**Session 1: Thomas Hobbes.** Hobbes's challenge to the neo-Aristotelian concept of the city as the teleological end of the good life, especially in *On the Citizen (De Cive)* of 1642, will be the subject of our first session. The problem of what constitutes the psychological, moral, and material bonds of complex political societies arose in the mid-seventeenth century, with the demise of the confessional state and the theocentric concepts of authority that underpinned them. Suppressing the violence of religious warfare meant also

finding plausible alternatives to the problem of social order in the absence of commonly accepted religious beliefs. One influential answer to this problem was provided by Thomas Hobbes. In both *De Cive* and *Leviathan* Hobbes emphasized the role of a strong authoritarian sovereign in creating a union out of a potentially dangerous and antagonistic multitude. In exchange for sovereign protection, subjects agreed to lay aside the religious passions that arose out of individual conscience or communally-held beliefs. Although many eighteenth-century thinkers could approve of Hobbes's ambition to incarnate natural reason as the rule for social order, they deemed Hobbes's answer to be unsatisfactory in ways that helped to set the agenda for the Enlightenment science of society. First, his anthropology of man as a prideful and violence-prone creature who sought society for little beyond safety came to seem thin and potentially dangerous. Second—and similarly—although Enlightenment thinkers generally sought to integrate the premise of individual self-interest into their social schemas, they searched the human soul for other passions that could better account for the gentler, more civilized virtues that they wanted to encourage.

The Enlightened science of society that we will examine in this seminar thus sought more creative solutions to the problem of stability than statism and repressive authority. Rather than seeing the collectivity as opposed to individual freedom, Enlightenment-era philosophers began to examine the multiplicity of ways in which institutions, affective bonds, and capacities of mind could evolve in such a way as to better preserve social order while minimizing the necessity for intrusive, counterproductive exercises of force. Enlightenment thinkers took a keen interest in the ways in which, somehow paradoxically, autonomy was brought about by socialization. Here they came up with an account of modern society which was by no means that of naive Panglosses, putting their faith in the self-organizing workings of “invisible hands,” as has repeatedly been claimed in the critical literature. Instead, as our seminar will emphasize in line with some of the best recent scholarship on eighteenth-century

thought, they were acutely, sometimes despairingly, aware that the socializing mechanisms of public opinion or material dependence created by commerce were anything but stable and had to be constantly re-balanced. Thus, they promoted institutions and social techniques to govern conduct through the formation of the minds and bodies of citizen-subjects – a project for which Michel Foucault coined the term *governmentality*. However, our seminar seeks to go beyond a one-sided Foucauldian emphasis on the quasi-anonymous, often hidden forces of social management. Authors such as Rousseau, Schiller, and Hegel claimed that institutions and social techniques of discipline and education were only legitimate if they restored and secured (original) human freedom on a higher level of culture through the workings of social artifice.

**Session 2: Bernard Mandeville.** The second session will examine the economic and moral theories of Bernard Mandeville, the Dutch-born Englishman who scandalized an entire century of social theorists by proposing that individual vices of greed, pride, and self-love, when taken collectively, produced the inestimable “Publick Benefits” of prosperity, practical knowledge, and polite sociability. Mandeville was, as Adam Smith and others recognized, in many ways a Hobbesian, who emphasized the centrality of political government in managing human passions for the good of society. Thinkers like Frances Hutcheson, Jean-Jacques Rousseau and Smith criticized his cynical anthropology and scoured the human soul for other faculties, such as pity and sympathy, that could explain human behavior better than the self-interest clothed in hypocrisy and self-delusion Mandeville saw everywhere. Yet he was the first to fully understand that the unsociable qualities of human beings were the very material that could create bonds for large, diverse societies. The society that Mandeville posited required, because of its nature, a science of civilized man in order to analyze and direct it.

**Session 3: David Hume.** With these questions in mind, in the **third session** we examine the thought of David Hume, who provided some of the best criticism and reworking

of Mandeville. Hume found Mandeville's claim that morals were the fabricated outcome of prudent managing by clever politicians unconvincing. His account of the ethics of commercial society was linked more explicitly to the philosophical skepticism that laid the basis for Enlightenment-era natural sciences. Newtonian physics denied that it was possible to understand causes in any final sense: we can only describe and model effects. In the same way, Hume rejected that our perceptions of morality had any transcendental basis: human beings approved of what was useful and the rules of justice incarnated as precepts the opinions of the good that emerged out of common life. In this sense, the moral theory that Hume laid out in his *Enquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals* was radically conventional. It was also fundamentally historicist and evolutionary: as human society evolved, social bonds thickened in the context of families, markets, states, and other cooperative institutions. Over hundreds or even thousands of years, the weak force of altruism began to grow and finally prevail over the initially stronger, more direct imperative of self-interest. For Hume, understanding morality was not a question of consulting individual conscience, rational precept or scripture, but the behavior of large groups over time; in this and other senses there is no hard and fast distinction to be drawn between Hume's moral theory and his historical, economic, or political writing: they all described the evolution of the polite, commercial society of Georgian Britain that he saw threatened by religious fanaticism and political partisanship. The goal of this session is to gain a deeper understanding of Hume's linkage between commercial sociability and modern institutions in his notion of justice as an artificial virtue.

**Sessions 4-6: Charles Louis de Secondat, Baron de Montesquieu and Adam Smith.** We resume our exploration of political economy in sessions 4-6 by examining the work of Charles Louis de Secondat, Baron de Montesquieu, and Adam Smith; in both writers, we find influential proponents for the idea that commercial relations engendered freedom and

reduced violence between and within states; but both authors also entertained grave reservations about the political, moral and material effects of the modern economy. In Montesquieu, we see how decisively the commercial revolution of the early modern period transformed Enlightenment political thought. Once commercial prosperity rather than military conquest began to determine the balance of power between states, sovereigns vied with one another over who could furnish merchants and purchasers of state debt with the most regular forms of government and law. The rise of “doux commerce” (gentle or sweet commerce) acted as a civilizing force on European society as a whole and eroded the power of bellicose and arbitrary rulers. Montesquieu’s *Spirit of the Laws* furnished a comparative political sociology that instructed eighteenth-century readers in the forms of prosperity and freedom that could be expected in republics, monarchies and despotic states. If Montesquieu’s *oeuvre* mainly reads like a brief for the virtues of commercial society, it also furnished a set of prescient warnings. International trade, Montesquieu warned, created a set of winners and losers whose respective advantages and disadvantages accumulated over time; at home, an unhealthy amalgamation of the state and its mercantile elites threatened the political freedom that heightened commercial exchanges were supposed to secure.

Building on Mandeville, Hume, and Montesquieu, Adam Smith’s *Wealth of Nations* (WN) furnished a compendium of progressive common sense about the efficacy of markets, including their moral mechanisms, and of their capital role in dissolving the oppressive structures of feudal government all over Europe. We will read the historical sections of the *WN* to understand the stadial theories that underpinned so much Enlightenment historical thought, and how these thinkers saw commerce transforming European manners, government, and material conditions of life. Yet even Adam Smith grew pessimistic toward the end of his life, as he revised the *Theory of Moral Sentiments*, about the durability of middle class values that were supposedly nourished by market society. Behind the veneer of

sympathy, egalitarianism, and industriousness Smith detected a widespread worship of unearned wealth and privilege – and even of violence – that threatened to upend the accomplishments of bourgeois society he had done so much to theorize and to document.

The writings of Mandeville, Smith, Montesquieu, and Hume are hardly devoid of social criticism and foreboding about the outcome of the modern, commercial societies they all championed to some degree. But after our discussion of Smith we will turn to more explicitly critical voices within and about the Enlightenment. We are particularly concerned here with Enlightenment as a form of governmentality: the study of societies from the point of view of efficiency, productivity, and strength. Foucault explored the dark side of this governmentality – what one might call the disciplinary Enlightenment – in his early work on the birth of the prison, while his later work more explicitly focused on the "true" Enlightenment, which placed value upon individual autonomy in thought and action.

**Session 7: Catherine the Great.** In the seventh session our reading of Catherine the Great's *Nakaz* (Instruction), a program for reform she issued to a parliamentary commission in 1767, will lay the basis for considering whether the Enlightenment principally functioned as a refinement on the techniques of power available to early modern states. Catherine's many borrowings from Montesquieu's *Spirit of the Laws* and from the writings of the French Physiocrats—a school of economists who helped to popularize the doctrine of *laissez-faire* and to theorize the notion of "enlightened despotism"—contributed the portrait of an Enlightened ruler pursuing reform for the benefit of her subjects. But Diderot's lengthy response to Catherine's celebrated *Nakaz* pointed out the many inconsistencies in Catherine's program; in so doing, he persuasively argued that enlightened reform without political liberties merely served the old regime logic of *raison d'état*.

**Session 8: Denis Diderot.** In this second session, we will continue our exploration of Diderot as an observer and critic of Enlightenment projects. Louis de Bougainville's

encounters with Tahitian natives in his celebrated *Voyage around the World* (1771) painted the portrait of an innocent people untouched by lust and avarice. Diderot's response to Bougainville's account in many ways repeated the Rousseauist critique of a degenerate European civilization removed from the virtuous impulses of nature. But he went even further than Rousseau, for instance, in suggesting a complete incommensurability between European and non-European societies: these were systems of culture that were unknowable to each other. Ideas of beauty, notions of civilization and even the most basic moral standards were grounded in appeals to "nature" that were so important to Enlightenment *philosophes*, but in his response to Bougainville, Diderot suggest that nature is simply another human idea that is historically contingent. Both sessions 8 and 9 are intended to suggest that the Enlightenment is not a unified project but rather a varied topology of possible positions vis à vis the state and its imperial ambitions; the role of utilitarianism in a just social order; and of the effect of progress on individuals' imagination, pleasure, and moral development.

**Sessions 9 & 10: Jean-Jacques Rousseau.** Sessions 9 and 10 will focus on Jean-Jacques Rousseau, a major contributor in the Enlightenment debate about society. Our first session on Rousseau will have two goals: 1) To understand how he rephrases and reworks the earlier natural law vocabulary, especially that of Hobbes, in his account of the genesis of commercial society and its concomitant ills by drawing on both the *Discourse on Inequality* and the *Essay on the Origins of Languages*; and 2) To understand Rousseau's take on the problem of self-love (*amour-propre*). To what extent was Rousseau's account of the paradoxical effects of amour-propre with its spiraling needs a parody of Mandeville and Montesquieu and their trust in the beneficial management of pride?

Our second session on Rousseau will deal with the implications of life in commercial society for managing our self and our (erotic) relations to others. As Rousseau pointed out from early on, a return to the original state was impossible for modern man. What was needed

was a vision for socialization that would preserve our original freedom under modern conditions, helping us control but not suppress our needs and passions. This is the theme of *Emile* of 1762. We will read this treatise on education together with excerpts from his *Letter to D'Alembert* and from his popular epistolary novel *Julie, or the New Heloise* of 1761.

Rousseau's depiction of commercial society as the offshoot of imaginary needs driven by amour-propre, which create vast social, almost inescapable dependencies and threaten autonomous moral agency, raised shocking questions. Although Rousseau had always emphasized that he did not want to be understood as an advocate of cheap cultural pessimism or primitivism, he was often ridiculed as one among his contemporaries. Rather he wished repeatedly for careful readers who would especially understand his case for social reform instead of revolution.

**Session 11: Immanuel Kant.** This session will focus on Immanuel Kant, whose practical philosophy was decisively shaped by an engagement with Rousseau. In a brilliant stroke Kant summarized the Enlightenment debate about society with the term “unsociable sociability” (*ungesellige Geselligkeit*) in his *Idea for a Universal History with a Cosmopolitan Aim* essay of 1784. For Kant, unsociable sociability described a mechanism of social antagonism grounded in human nature. Its teleological purpose in nature and history was to emancipate humanity from the slumber of animality through a process of civilization spurred by man's less amiable qualities like his desire for wealth, power, and honor. Kant is often viewed as a proponent of an ahistorical moral individualism and universalism. Yet he was keen to emphasize that his project of moralization through reason was impossible without the material and intellectual conditions of commercial society and modern government created by unsociable sociability. Kant agreed with Rousseau that moral evil as well as its cure were essentially social.

**Session 12: Friedrich Schiller.** We turn to Friedrich Schiller in session 12 to engage with the Enlightenment debate about society in the context of the French Revolution. For Schiller, the descent of revolutionary France into terror and global warfare had proven Rousseau's point about the moral corruption of modern monarchies. To achieve a free society a radical transformation of character, through aesthetic experience, was needed; this would restore our full humanity, even under the conditions of competition and the one-sidedness that attends the modern division of labor.

We will discuss Schiller's diagnosis of the failure of a merely political revolution of the Hobbist state, taking full stock of our reading of Hobbes, Mandeville, Rousseau, and Kant. One of our key questions will be about the paradoxical effects of civilization on our ability to live a free and sociable life. In the next step we will analyze Schiller's daring claim that it is the fleeting experience of beauty (and the sublime) that wrenches us from egoism and the narrow concern of social and material dependencies. We will ask to what extent Schiller's concept of the aesthetic character is the aim or merely the means of aesthetic education. Can Schiller's model of socialization function as a surrogate for religion and true morality in modern society?

**Session 13: G.W.F. Hegel.** The concept of ethical life that Hegel elaborates in *The Philosophy of Right* reworks key elements of Schiller's aesthetic state. Both Hegel and Schiller sought a way to get beyond what they viewed as the destructively radical egalitarianism of the French Revolution and of the social philosophy it was based upon. All the while Hegel and Schiller were committed to preserving the enlightened belief in human progress and its insistence upon human autonomy. Hegel's *Philosophy of Right* advertises itself as an apt solution to the many conundrums we will have encountered over three weeks of intensive reading. In it, Hegel offers a surprising distinction between the state and civil society in order to demonstrate how both spheres correspond to the need for different *kinds* of

freedom and agency that are essential to human flourishing: affective, economic, professional, and political. Hegel proposed the norm-giving state as an antidote to the anomie of modern society, but was equally insistent that the state preserve the competition, initiative, and even inequalities inherent in normal social life. Whereas Rousseau and in certain respects Kant viewed society with suspicion because it represented the domain of egotism, dependence, and constraint, Hegel theorized it as the nursery of the human personality. We do not take Hegel as *the* solution to the paradoxes we will have uncovered in this seminar, but he nevertheless provides a particularly systematic and stimulating inventory that is rich with implications for nineteenth-, twentieth- and twenty-first century political philosophy.

#### **Session 14: Plenary discussion: The Enlightenment in the Classroom and the Public Sphere**

We will devote our final session to discussing the findings of the previous three weeks, in an attempt to come to some sort of synthesis--or at least to sketch out a topology of some of the debates that the readings have aroused among the participants. First, we will use this session to draw more explicitly into discussion the ways in which the social and moral theory developed during the Enlightenment relates to our understanding of the issues facing contemporary democracies. It will be of equal interest to weigh the extent to which some of these issues--examples *might* include racial conflict or environmental change--lay largely beyond the horizon of the thinkers we have examined. Second, we will discuss the way in which the participants in this seminar have presented (or envision presenting) the texts, themes and contexts of the seminar in the classroom. This session will explore disciplinary questions, such as what sort of texts and visual artifacts are useful in classrooms led by historians, literary scholars, political theorists and philosophers. We will also debate the value--and drawbacks--of presentism in the classroom; is the contemporary relevance of Enlightenment social thought best asserted indirectly, by teaching students about the way in

which different social theories were developed and employed in their own proper contexts, leaving students to draw their own conclusions? Or does the contemporary relevance of Enlightenment social thought need to be asserted more directly?

***Note on translations and terminology***

The seminar brings together texts originally written (and published) in English, French, German, and Latin. We are aware of the importance of the fine and significant differences between terms in their respective linguistic context, and the limits in rendering key terms of our seminar such as *socialitas*, *amour-propre*, *societas civilis* or Schiller's distinction between *Formtrieb*, *Stofftrieb*, and *Spieltrieb* into contemporary English. Though we will be reading translations in the seminar room, we will address questions of terminology and translation of terms that already puzzled Enlightenment authors, translators, and readers.

***d. Project Faculty and Staff***

***i. Seminar Directors***

**Paul Cheney** is an associate professor of European History at the University of Chicago, the host institution for this Summer Seminar. He is a specialist in the social and political thought of the Enlightenment and is the author of two scholarly monographs. The first, *Revolutionary Commerce: Globalization and the French Monarchy* (2010) deals with many of central themes and authors treated in this seminar; the second, *Cul de Sac: Patrimony, Capitalism and Slavery in French Saint-Domingue* (2017) addresses the role of Enlightenment culture in the colonial context. In addition to his specialty in French history, he has published on the Scottish Enlightenment. He has taught for nearly twenty years on the graduate and undergraduate level on the themes of this proposed Summer Seminar, including courses on the Scottish Enlightenment, the Origins of the Human Sciences, c1700-1848, and The Enlightenment and its Critics from the Eighteenth Century to the Present.

**Alexander Schmidt** is a junior-professor of intellectual history at the Friedrich Schiller University Jena, the only such position in Germany. He has held fellowships at the University of Edinburgh, King's College, Cambridge, Sichuan University, Chengdu and The John U. Nef Committee on Social Thought at the University of Chicago (2015-16). His articles have appeared in *The Historical Journal*, *Modern Intellectual History*, *History of Political Thought* and elsewhere. From 2010 to 2012 Schmidt collaborated with the late Istvan Hont, Eva Piirimäe and other scholars on a project on the eighteenth-century sociability debate. Recently, he has edited together, with Keith Tribe, Friedrich Schiller's *On the Aesthetic Education of Man* for Penguin Classics (2016). At the University of Jena, Schmidt has taught for nearly seven years on themes discussed in the proposed seminar. He has also taught on Enlightenment political thought at Sichuan University in July 2016.

## **ii. Project Staff**

We plan to hire a graduate student part time three months before the start of the seminar to see to publicizing the seminar; collecting applications; corresponding with participants; reproduction and distribution of texts; financial matters; securing seminar space; catering; travel arrangements where necessary; and other matters. This person will be hired full time during the period of the seminar.

## **f. Participant Selection**

Sixteen participants will be drawn from a national pool of applicants and selected by a committee led by Cheney and Schmidt. We will aim for a wide disciplinary mix of participants, and to that end will recruit a third reader (in addition to the directors) from either philosophy or literature. We will ask applicants to submit a CV and to write a 1,000-1,500 word statement describing their reasons for wanting to attend the seminar, their teaching interests and their current research projects. Candidates will be selected based upon their professional excellence; the fit of their scholarly and teaching interests with the seminar; and

with an eye toward disciplinary, institutional (e.g. types of college and university), and geographic diversity. We believe firmly in the idea that NEH seminars should make room for contingent scholars and will gladly meet or surpass the quota of three summer scholars.

**g. Project Website and Public Outreach**

We plan to use an internal web platform maintained by University Chicago Web Services to develop our seminar website; this platform provides faculty, students, and staff the ability to easily build visually appealing websites, blogs, and portfolios at no additional cost. This website will serve three primary functions: 1) A recruitment tool to attract applicants; 2) Dissemination of seminar information including the faculty directors' credentials, seminar syllabus, core readings, and the schedule; and 3) Dissemination of project resources and products. In addition to recruiting through this site and the NEH's site, we will encourage applications by sending notice to e-mail list-serves and discussion groups serving the disciplines of philosophy, history, literature, and political science.

The Website for this course is one form of public outreach; the public lecture by Silvia Sebastiani, on the subject of nature and culture in the Enlightenment, and the reception following is another. We will advertise this talk through the University of Chicago's public events office, neighborhood outlets such as the Hyde Park Herald, and with local cultural institutions such as the Chicago Public Library and the Newberry Library.

**h. Institutional Support**

The Neubauer Collegium at the University of Chicago will provide seminar space for the duration of the program. Participants will be able to use the local wifi to connect to the internet and will have library access. Students who need housing will be able to rent rooms from the International House, located a few blocks from the University of Chicago's central quadrangle. Rooms will be available for between \$1,026 and \$1,330 per month (these are summer 2017 rates) for the entire period of the seminar.



NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE  
**Humanities**

# Budget Form

OMB No 3136-0134  
Expires 6/30/2018

Applicant Institution: *University of Chicago*  
Project Director: *Paul Cheney*

SEMINAR or INSTITUTE	Computational Details/Notes	Project Total
<b>A. PARTICIPANT STIPENDS</b>		<b>\$43,200</b>
Three-week Seminar	16 participants @\$2700	\$43,200
<b>B. OPERATING COSTS</b>		
<b>1. Salaries and Wages</b>		<b>\$13,425</b>
a. Project Co-Director - Paul Cheney		\$ (b) (6)
b. Program Coordinator - Academic Year	\$ (b) (6) /hour at 10 hours/week for 12 weeks	\$ (b) (6)
Program Coordinator - Summer	\$ (b) (6) /hour at 35/hours/week for 3 weeks	\$ (b) (6)
<b>2. Fringe Benefits</b>		<b>\$2,912</b>
26.8% of \$ (b) (6)	Paul Cheney	\$ (b) (6)
7.2% of \$ (b) (6)	Program Coordinator - Summer	\$ (b) (6)
<b>3. Consultant Fees and Honoraria</b>		<b>\$12,250</b>
Project Co-Director - Alexander Schmidt		\$ (b) (6)
Visiting Lecturer - Silvia Sebastiani		\$ (b) (6)
Selection Committee Stipend		\$ (b) (6)

<b>4. Professional Travel and Subsistence</b>		<b>\$11,499</b>
<b>2-Day Director's Meeting</b>		
a. Airfare - Cheney	Domestic flight from CHI to D.C.	\$400
b. Airfare - Schmidt	Intl flight from Germany to D.C.	\$1,200
c. Hotel - Cheney	2 nights at \$242/night	\$484
d. Hotel - Schmidt	3 nights at \$242/night	\$726
e. Per Diem- Cheney	2 days at \$69/day	\$138
f. Per Diem - Schmidt	3 days at \$69/day	\$207
<b>Travel to Seminar Site - Schmidt</b>		
a. Airfare	Intl flight from Germany to CHI	\$1,300
b. Lodging	23 nights at \$150/night	\$3,450
c. Per Diem	23 days at \$74/day	\$1,702
<b>Visiting Lecturer - Sebastiani</b>		
a. Airfare	Intl flight from France to CHI	\$1,300
b. Hotel	2 nights at \$222/night	\$444
c. Per Diem	2 days at \$74/day	\$148
<b>5. Supplies and Materials</b>		<b>\$2,420</b>
Core reading materials	16 sets at \$125/set	\$2,000
Photo-copies	16 at \$20/each	\$320
Postage/Shipping		\$100
<b>6. Services</b>		<b>\$2,640</b>
Website		\$1,440
Refreshments		\$1,200
<b>7. Total of item B only (1 through 6)</b>		<b>\$45,146</b>
<b>C. INDIRECT COSTS</b>	at 49.5% negotiated rate	<b>\$22,347</b>
<b>D. AMOUNT REQUESTED FROM NEH (sum of A, B, &amp; C)</b>		<b>\$110,694</b>

## 2b. Project Budget Justification

### PARTICIPANT STIPENDS

We are requesting participant stipends in the amount of \$2,700 per person for a 3-week seminar. We expect a total of 16 participants for a total request of \$43,200.

### SALARIES AND WAGES

#### ***Project Director***

We request salary support for two project directors, Paul Cheney (University of Chicago) and Alexander Schmidt (University of Jena) in the amount of \$ (b) (6) each. Please see “Consultant” section for budget narrative on Professor Schmidt. Professor Cheney along with his co-director will oversee all aspects of the program, including all arrangements, recruiting and selecting participants, and conducting the residential portion of the program during the summer.

#### ***Program Coordinator***

We request support for one part-time program coordinator, an undergraduate student in History, or related field, for the duration of the project. S/He will coordinate travel arrangements for participants, manage communications, and seminar-related logistics. The coordinator will earn \$ (b) (6) /hour for 10 hours/week for 12 weeks during the spring quarter. For the duration of the summer seminar, the coordinator will earn \$ (b) (6) /hour for 35 hours/week for 3 weeks.

### FRINGE BENEFITS

#### ***Fringe Benefit Rates***

Current fringe benefit rates are 26.8% for full-time staff and 7.2% for part-time staff and student employees.

The following positions have fringe rates of 26.8%: Project Director

The following positions have fringe rates of 7.2%: Summer Program Coordinator

The 26.8% and 7.2% fringe rate can be found on page 1-3 of the attached “College and Universities Rate Agreement” document, August 22, 2016. The fringe benefit rates are “provisional until amended.”

### CONSULTANT FEES & HONORARIA

#### ***Project Director***

We request salary support for Alexander Schmidt, project co-director with Paul Cheney. Professor Schmidt’s primary appointment is with the University of Jena in Leipzig, Germany, as such we are listing him as a consultant.

#### ***Visiting Lecturer***

We request honoraria for Silvia Sebastiani, a visiting lecturer from the Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales in the amount of \$ (b) (6) day for 1 day.

### ***Selection Committee Stipend***

We request a selection committee stipend of \$<sup>(b) (6)</sup> for one faculty member outside of the University of Chicago.

### TRAVEL

#### ***Two-Day Project Director's Meeting in Washington, D.C.***

We request support for one trip to Washington, D.C. for Professor Cheney and Professor Schmidt to attend NEH project director's meeting.

##### **Paul Cheney**

For a two-day trip from Chicago to Washington, D.C., we anticipate roundtrip economy-class airfare at \$400. We expect \$242/night for lodging for 2 nights and \$69 for Meals & Incidental Expenses each day for 2 days.<sup>1</sup>  $\$400 + (\$242 \times 2) + (\$69 \times 2) = \$1,022$ .

##### **Alexander Schmidt**

For a two-day trip from Leipzig, Germany to Washington, D.C., we anticipate roundtrip economy-class airfare at \$1,200. We expect \$242/night for lodging for 3 nights (to account for international travel) and \$69 for Meals & Incidental Expenses each day for 3 days.<sup>2</sup>  $\$1200 + (\$242 \times 3) + (\$69 \times 3) = \$2,133$ .

#### ***Travel to Seminar Site***

We request travel and accommodation support for Alexander Schmidt for the duration of the 3-week seminar. From Leipzig, Germany to Chicago, we anticipate roundtrip economy-class airfare at \$1,300 (takes into account increased airfares during summer months). We expect \$150/night for lodging (short-term housing) and \$74 for Meals & Incidental Expenses each day for 23 days.<sup>3</sup>  $\$1,300 + (\$150 \times 23) + (\$74 \times 23) = \$6,452$ .

#### ***Lecture***

We request travel and accommodation support for Silvia Sebastiani, a visiting lecturer from the Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales to give a public lecture. From Paris, France to Chicago, we anticipate roundtrip economy-class airfare at \$1,300. We expect \$222/night for lodging for 2 nights and \$74 for Meals & Incidental Expenses each day for 2 days.<sup>4</sup>  $\$750 + (\$222 \times 2) + (\$74 \times 2) = \$1,142$ .

### SUPPLIES AND MATERIALS

We request support for 16 sets of materials at \$125 each for a total of \$2,000. Each set will consist of books and other reading materials for the 3-week seminar. We also anticipate \$20 per person in photocopying costs of instructional materials ( $\$20 \times 16 = \$320$ ). We plan to ship reading materials to participants prior to the seminar – we request \$100 for shipping costs.

### SERVICES

---

<sup>1</sup> Per the "U.S. General Services Administration FY 2017 Per Diem Rates": <http://www.gsa.gov/perdiem>

<sup>2</sup> Per the "U.S. General Services Administration FY 2017 Per Diem Rates": <http://www.gsa.gov/perdiem>

<sup>3</sup> Per the "U.S. General Services Administration FY 2017 Per Diem Rates": <http://www.gsa.gov/perdiem>

<sup>4</sup> Per the "U.S. General Services Administration FY 2017 Per Diem Rates": <http://www.gsa.gov/perdiem>

**Website**

We request support for one communications intern to develop and maintain a website for the seminar. The intern will earn \$18/hour for an estimated 80 hours of work for a total of \$1,440.

**Refreshments**

There will be a total of 15 seminar meetings, each one 2 hours long. We will have approximately six 2-hour afternoon sessions to discuss participants' individual projects. In addition, we will have a reception after the public lecture by Silvia Sebastiani; We request a total of \$1,200 for light refreshments and beverages.

**Overhead**

The University of Chicago's federally negotiated indirect cost rate is 49.5% for all on-campus instruction, per the attached "Colleges and Universities Rate Agreement" document, dated August 22, 2016. This information can be found on page 1 of 5. The 49.5% rate is provisional and effective July 1, 2016 until amended.

At 49.5% of Operating Costs, total overhead cost comes to \$22,347.

The total cost of the proposed project budget is \$110,694.

## **Appendix A: Syllabus**

### **WEEK 1**

#### **Session 1: Introduction: The Science of (Un-) Sociable Passions**

(Reading: Hobbes, *On the Citizen*, pp. 21-57 (chs. I-III); 69-74 (ch. V); *Leviathan*, pp. 9-10 (Intro); 37-75 (chs. 6-12); 117-129 (chs. 17-18))

#### **Session 2: The Socialization of Self Love**

(Reading: Mandeville, *Fable of the Bees*, vol. 1, pp. 3-16, 39-57; 323-369; vol. 2, pp. 177-193)

#### **Session 3: The History of Moral Feelings**

(Reading: Hume, *Enquiry*, pp. 13-60, 88-98; *Essays*, pp. 32-41)

#### **Session 4: Civilization and Commerce**

(Reading: Montesquieu, *Spirit of the Laws*, Books 1-2 (complete) pp. 3-21 in edition; Book 20, pp. 231-246)

#### **Session 5: The Market and the Decline of Human Bondage**

(Reading: *Spirit of the Laws*, Books 15-16; Smith, *WN*, pp. 376-427)

### **WEEK 2**

#### **Session 6: Social Classes and Sentiment**

(Reading: Smith, *TMS*, pp. 9-13, 43-66, 78-91, 161-187; *WN*, pp. 13-30)

#### **Session 7: Enlightened Despotism and *Raison d'Etat***

(Reading: *Nakaz* selections (pp. 67-93 in Dmytryshyn ed.) and Diderot "Observations on the *Nakaz* of Catherine the Great," in *Political Writings*, Wolker ed., pp. 81-129)

#### **Session 8: Nature and Culture**

(Reading: Louis de Bougainville, *Voyage Around the World*, pp. 211-41, 249-67 and Diderot, "Supplement to the Voyage of Bougainville," in *Political Writings*, Wolker ed., 35-79)

#### **Session 9: From Speech to Self-Love**

(Reading: Rousseau, *Discourse on the Origin of Inequality*, pp. 131-76, On the Origins of Language 248-81 in cited ed.)

#### **Session 10: The Recovery of Autonomy**

(Reading: Rousseau, *Emile*, bks. 1, 3-4; *Julie, ou la Nouvelle Héloïse* pp. 432-55.)

### **WEEK 3**

#### **Session 11: Unsociable Sociability**

(Reading: Kant, *Political Writings*, pp. 41-53, 108-14, 221-34; *Lectures On Anthropology*, 212-30)

#### **Session 12: Beauty, Freedom and Revolution**

(Reading: Schiller, *On the Aesthetic Education of Man*, pp. 3-37, 68-112)

**Session 13: Institutionalizing Autonomy**

(Reading: Hegel, *Philosophy of Right*, §§ 141-157, 182-218)

**Session 14: Plenary discussion: The Enlightenment in the Class-Room**

## Appendix B

### Bibliography

#### Primary Readings

- Catherine II of Russia, *Nakaz or Instruction to the Legislative Commission of 1767-1768*, in *Imperial Russia*. Ed. Basil Dmytryshyn; New York: Holt, Reinhart and Winston, 1967.
- Diderot, Denis, John Hope Mason, and Robert Wokler. *Political Writings*. Cambridge [England] ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. *Elements of the Philosophy of Right*. Ed. Allen W. Wood, and transl. H. B Nisbet Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. *Political Writings*. Ed. Laurence W. Dickey and transl. H. B. Nisbet Cambridge, U.K. ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Hobbes, Thomas, Richard Tuck, and Michael Silverthorne. *On the Citizen*. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Hobbes, Thomas, and Richard Tuck. *Leviathan*. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Hume, David. *An Enquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals*. Indianapolis: Hackett Pub. Co., 1983.
- Hume, David, and Eugene F. Miller. *Essays, Moral, Political, and Literary*. Indianapolis: LibertyClassics, 1987.
- Kant, Immanuel, and Hans Siegbert Reiss. *Kant: Political Writings*. Cambridge [England] ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Kant, Immanuel, et al. *Lectures On Anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Mandeville, Bernard, *The Fable of the Bees: Or Private Vices, Publick Benefits*, ed. F. B. Kaye, 2 vols. (Indianapolis, 1988).
- Montesquieu, Charles de Secondat, Anne M. Cohler, Basia C. Miller, and Harold Samuel Stone. *The Spirit of the Laws*. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, and Victor Gourevitch. *The Discourses and Other Early Political Writings*. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. *Julie, Or, The New Heloise: Letters of Two Lovers Who Live in a Small Town At the Foot of the Alps*. Ed. Philip Stewart and Jean Vaché. Hanover: Dartmouth College : University Press of New England, 1997.
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, Christopher Kelly, and Allan David Bloom. *Emile, or, On Education: Includes Emile and Sophie, Or, The Solitaries*. Hanover, N.H.: University Press of New England, 2010.
- Smith, Adam, D. D. (David Daiches) Raphael, and A. L. (Alec Lawrence) Macfie. *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*. Indianapolis: Liberty Classics, 1982.
- Smith, Adam, R. H. (Roy Hutcheson) Campbell, and Andrew S. Skinner. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. Indianapolis: Liberty Classics, 1981.
- Schiller, Friedrich. *On the Aesthetic Education of Man in a Series of Letters*. Ed. Alexander Schmidt and translated by Keith Tribe. London: Penguin Classics, 2016.

## Research Literature

- Baier, Annette. *The Cautious Jealous Virtue: Hume On Justice*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2010.
- Baker, Keith Michael. *Condorcet: From Natural Philosophy to Social Mathematics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.
- Baker, K., “Enlightenment and the Institution of Society: Notes for a Conceptual History”, In *Main Trends in Cultural History*, edited by Melching, W. B., Velema, W. E., Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1994, 95-120.
- Berry, Christopher J. *The Idea of Commercial Society in the Scottish Enlightenment*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2013.
- Cheney, Paul. “Constitution and Economy in David Hume’s Enlightenment.” In *David Hume’s Political Economy*, 223–42. London: Routledge, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Revolutionary Commerce: Globalization and the French Monarchy*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 2010.
- Dent, N. J. H. *Rousseau: An Introduction to His Psychological, Social, and Political Theory*. New York, NY, USA: Blackwell, 1989.
- Dent, Nicholas J. H. and Timothy O’Hagan, ‘Rousseau on Amour-Propre’, *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society (Supplementary Volume)*, 72: 1 (1998), 57-74.
- Dickey, Laurence. *Hegel: Religion, Economics, and the Politics of Spirit, 1770-1807*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Duchet, Michèle. *Anthropologie et histoire au siècle des lumières: Buffon, Voltaire, Rousseau, Helvétius, Diderot*. 2nd ed. Paris: Albin Michel, 1995.
- Fermon, Nicole. *Domesticating Passions: Rousseau, Woman, and Nation*. Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1997.
- Fitzgibbons, Athol. *Adam Smith’s System of Liberty, Wealth and Virtue: The Moral and Political Foundations of the Wealth of Nations*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.
- Fleischacker, Samuel. *On Adam Smith’s Wealth of Nations: A Philosophical Companion*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2004.
- Forman-Barzilai, Fonna. *Adam Smith and the Circles of Sympathy: Cosmopolitanism and Moral Theory*. Cambridge, UK ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Foucault, Michel. *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977-78*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. ‘Governmentality’, trans. Rosi Braidotti and revised by Colin Gordon, in Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon and Peter Miller (eds) *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, pp. 87–104. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Haakonssen, Knud. *Natural Law and Moral Philosophy: From Grotius to the Scottish Enlightenment*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Hanley, Ryan Patrick. *Adam Smith and the Character of Virtue*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

- Hirschman, Albert O. *The Passions and the Interests: Political Arguments for Capitalism Before Its Triumph*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1977.
- Hont, Istvan and Michael Ignatieff, ed., *Wealth and Virtue. The Shaping of Political Economy in the Scottish Enlightenment* (Cambridge, 1983).
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Jealousy of Trade: International Competition and the Nation-state in Historical Perspective*. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2005.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Politics in Commercial Society: Jean-Jacques Rousseau and Adam Smith*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2015.
- Hundert, E. J., *The Enlightenment's Fable. Bernard Mandeville and the Discovery of Society* (Cambridge, 1994).
- Jacobs, Brian and Patrick Kain --, et al. *Essays On Kant's Anthropology*. Cambridge, UK ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Muthu, Sankar. *Enlightenment Against Empire*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003.
- Neuhouser, Frederick. *Foundations of Hegel's Social Theory: Actualizing Freedom*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2000.
- Neuhouser, Frederick. *Rousseau's Theodicy of Self-love: Evil, Rationality, and the Drive for Recognition*. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Neuhouser, Frederick. *Rousseau's Critique of Inequality: Reconstructing the Second Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- Otteson, James R. *Adam Smith's Marketplace of Life*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Piirimäe, Eva and Alexander Schmidt, 'Introduction: Between Morality and Anthropology—Sociability in Enlightenment Thought', in *Sociability in Eighteenth-Century Thought*, Special Issue *History of European Ideas* 41 (2015), Eva Piirimäe and Alexander Schmidt (eds.), 571-588.
- Robert Pippin --, et al. *Hegel On Ethics and Politics*. Cambridge, UK ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Pippin, Robert B. *Hegel's Practical Philosophy: Rational Agency As Ethical Life*. Cambridge, UK ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Riedel, Manfred. *Between Tradition and Revolution: The Hegelian Transformation of Political Philosophy*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1984.
- Riskin, Jessica. *Science in the Age of Sensibility the Sentimental Empiricists of the French Enlightenment*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002.
- Robertson, John, *The Case for the Enlightenment. Scotland and Naples 1680-1760* (Cambridge, 2005).
- Rorty, Amélie Oksenberg, and James Schmidt. *Kant's Idea for a Universal History With a Cosmopolitan Aim: A Critical Guide*. Cambridge, UK ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Rosanvallon, Pierre. *Le Capitalisme Utopique*. Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1979.
- Rothschild, Emma. *Economic Sentiments: Adam Smith, Condorcet, and the Enlightenment*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2001.

- Schmidt, Alexander, 'The Liberty of the Ancients? Friedrich Schiller and Aesthetic Republicanism', *History of Political Thought* 30 (2009), 286-314.
- Schmidt, Alexander, 'Sources of evil or seeds of the good? Rousseau and Kant on needs and the arts and sciences', *Responses to Rousseau: Reaction and Interpretation from the Eighteenth Century to the Present*, ed. Avi Lifschitz, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2016), 33-55.
- Schneewind, J. B. (Jerome B.). *The Invention of Autonomy: A History of Modern Moral Philosophy*. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Smith, Stephen B., *Hegel's Critique of Liberalism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989.
- Tom Sorell --, et al. *Leviathan After 350 Years*. Oxford : New York: Clarendon ; Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Spector, Céline. *Montesquieu. Pouvoirs, Richesses et Sociétés*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 2004.
- Strauss, Leo. *Natural Right and History*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953.
- Taylor, Charles, *Hegel and Modern Society* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 1979)
- Wokler, Robert, and Bryan Garsten. *Rousseau, the Age of Enlightenment, and Their Legacies*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012.
- Wood, Allen W. *Kant's Ethical Thought*. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Zammito, John H. *Kant, Herder, and the Birth of Anthropology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002.