This interdisciplinary conference, co-sponsored by the University of Sydney, the University of Western Sydney and the New York-based Consortium for Intellectual and Cultural History, explored the entangled histories of human rights and imperialism from the nineteenth century to the present.

MARCO DURANTI (University of Sydney) opened the conference by asking the participants to reflect on commonalities and continuities between the history of imperialism and the history of human rights. New research in these fields has highlighted the polygenesis and polyvalence of imperial and human rights discourses. Rather than be satisfied with deconstructing triumphalist and teleological grand narratives in favour of more critical and fragmented historical accounts, scholars should embrace interdisciplinary collaboration as a means of constructing broader explanatory frameworks and considering the normative implications of their findings. Recent scholarship has illustrated how imperialism generated systemic human rights violations, created obstacles to the development of international human rights regimes and gave rise to transnational movements to end human rights abuses. The existing scholarly literature has yet to engage, however, in a sustained investigation of how empire served as an ideational framework for the genesis of international human rights norms, institutions and organizations, just as the language of human rights legitimated imperial conquest and rule. SAMUEL MOYN (Columbia University) explained the organizational principle behind the conference, noting that it began with the premise that international human rights and imperial projects were as much symbiotic as antithetical. The conference papers traced how empire became a prism through which human rights discourses were refracted and an arena of contestation between local, imperial and global rights idioms. And insofar as the papers illustrated the positive connection between human rights and empire, they also showed how much work was required to sever the two so that human rights could assume what many scholars consider their obvious critical relationship to empire.

In the first session, which theorised the relationship between human rights and empire, JOHN KEANE (University of Sydney) argued that the disintegration of the Nazi Germany’s European empire and the recasting of formal overseas imperial rule in the immediate aftermath of the Second World War led to a Copernican shift in the conception of democracy. No longer was democracy concerned with the mob nor unquestioningly naïve. Rather it turned to the problem of ruling and matters concerning the arbitrary use of power. And it is in this shift that Keane attributes the roots of ‘monitory democracy’ developed as the remedy to unbridled power and the need for state accountability. NIKOLAS KOMPRIDIS (University of Western Sydney) explored the idea of humanity and the ‘right to be human’ supposed by human rights discourse and derived from the Western humanist tradition. Invoking the writings of Hannah Arendt and Frantz Fanon, Kompridis argued for a rethinking of human rights around the ‘right to be human’. He highlighted the vacancy in human rights history of an explication of what and who is human. In discussion, GLENDA SLUGA (University of Sydney) noted that in the debates in the late 1940s about human rights, the question of what it
meant to be human was prominent as rights talk shifted from the ‘rights of man’ (droits de l'homme) to a more inclusive vision of humanity.

The second session considered whether anticolonialism was a human rights movement. BONNY IBHAWOH (McMaster University) argued that human rights and decolonisation were a ‘two-way street’ of ideas. Focusing on the human rights dimensions of anticolonialism in British Africa, he demonstrated that human rights are not always invoked in normative and objective ways, and thus it is impossible to impose a singular human rights narrative. Using the example of the vernacularisation of human rights, Ibhawoh called for increased subaltern and micro-studies in human rights scholarship. ROLAND BURKE (La Trobe University) contended that many postwar anticolonialists envisioned self-determination as the ‘essential pre-requisite’ of all human rights. Central to this argument was the equation of self-determination with individual freedom and the conflation of citizenship rights with human rights. This understanding of self-determination would be short-lived however, reaching a peak in the 1950s, as nationalist imperatives ultimately prevailed. Through the case study of French Algeria, FABIAN KLOSE (LMU Munich) demonstrated how human rights language functioned as an instrument of colonial and anticolonial agitation. In the battle for public opinion the FLN and French government used human rights language extensively to press anticolonial and colonial claims. In discussion, BARBARA KEYS (University of Melbourne) noted that during the period of decolonisation understandings of human rights were highly localised, pointing to how in the United States in the 1960s human rights were tied closely to civil rights.

The third session dealt with human rights discourse in nineteenth-century colonial and imperial spaces. PENNY RUSSELL (University of Sydney) explored notions of humanity and justice in nineteenth-century Australia through a case study of violence in Australian settler society. Questions of jurisdiction, race and morality all had bearing on the distribution of justice and the attribution of rights. Russell noted that the language of natural rights was used to exclude indigenous persons from the scope of imperial law or jurisdiction through its imposition of a hierarchy of humanity, while the language of barbarism was used similarly to morally legitimate the inhumane treatment of settlers. ANN CURTHOYS (University of Sydney) highlighted recent historical scholarship on the role of evangelical humanitarianism and missionary endeavour in Australian settler society, as well as the place of law in colonial situations. In nineteenth-century Australian settler society the principle of equality before the law and the imperial principle privileging settler sovereignty seemed to be in direct competition. Curthoys questioned whether the languages of rights and protection were in fact alternatives. In discussion, the sentimentalist language of humanitarianism and its inadequacy in securing a stable notion of humanity were considered. NIKOLAS KOMPRIDIS (University of Western Sydney) inquired as to the historical conditions of possibility that allowed for the detachment of humanism from paternalism in settler society.

The fourth session explored the extent to which human rights are a legacy of empire. ROB SKINNER (University of Bristol) argued that decolonisation resulted in the development of a more articulated human rights discourse that was notable for its distillation into ‘narrowly-defined questions of legal rights.’ As demonstrated through the example of anti-apartheid campaigns and activism in Britain in the 1960s, the grassroots mobilisation that occurred was largely constitutive of the concerned liberal middle class. Support for armed freedom fighters articulated in terms of human rights suggests that the discourse was being used opportunistically. Ultimately, for Skinner, human rights were an ‘empty vessel,’ an ‘obvious choice of discursive framework’ for western activists responding to an emerging postcolonial
world. CHARLES PARKINSON (Victoria Bar) also touched on the opportunism present in the implementation of bills of rights as a legacy of the British Government to its former dependents. The 1962 decision that British protectorates adopt bills of rights was one made with acute awareness of the political value of such a move. The British saw small value in a bill of rights and had done little to establish a local legal culture that would support its implementation. Bills of rights were political solutions to the problem of peaceful transition of power. In discussion, DIRK MOSES (EUI/University of Sydney) highlighted the Anglo-centrism of the session, asking for a broadening of the discussion. In response, FABIAN KLOSE (LMU Munich) presented cases from the French experience in Algeria and JAY WINTER (Yale University) raised the Irish experience regarding the adoption of bills of rights. All the examples attested to the cavalier and opportunistic attitude to such rights documents held by colonial powers.

The fifth session asked whether human rights justify ethnic partition and violence. JAY WINTER (Yale University) presented a paper focusing on the rights discourse of René Cassin. Noting that all utopias perform the contradictions of their age, Winter used the example of Cassin’s response to the Algerian War of Independence and Arab-Israeli conflict to argue that Cassin was beholden to the liberal imperialist assumptions of his generation. Cassin articulated the Jewish cause in the language of ‘human rights’ (entitlements), while understanding the Palestinian cause in terms of ‘humanitarian rights’ (laws of war). Cassin’s imperial lens illustrated the myopia of human rights struggles of the period. DIRK MOSES (European University Institute/University of Sydney) argued similarly in that there was an imperial blindness and generational overhang, in this case of minority rights concerns, despite increased human rights rhetoric during the 1930s and 1940s. The oft-made assumption that human rights had a ‘stable meaning’ or ‘uniform purpose’ is ahistorical. Human rights discourse, far from being a ‘mere puff’, was an inspiration and justification for the foundational violence of the new postwar order and was littered with residual imperial designs. In discussion, SAUL DUBOW (University of Sussex) inquired as to whether there were instances where limited social protections were granted to avoid granting individual entitlements as political rights. In response, Winter stated that the problem with population transfers was that it imposed a hierarchy of humanity onto humanitarian law. Moses agreed, noting that this contributed to persons being classed as either objects of pity or a rights-bearing citizens in the 1940s. SHEILA FITZPATRICK (University of Sydney) also drew attention to the practice of mass population transfers in the Soviet Union during the 1930s about which there is a notable absence of discussion.

The sixth session questioned whether human rights discourses helped the subalterns of imperial history. KIT CANDLIN (University of Sydney) analysed the incidence and evolving definition of the word ‘refugee’ in the early nineteenth-century Atlantic world. As Anglo-Atlantic crises increased the number of migratory groups, the idea of a ‘freeborn’ member of empire became problematic. To deal with this, a system of social exclusion designed to solidify colonial identities and reinforce distinctions was developed. A direct expression being the language used to distinguish membership within the empire, such as ‘refugee.’ TOMOKO AKAMI (Australian National University) focused on socio-economic rights and the inter-imperial health regime of the League of Nations in the Asia and Pacific region. Akami argued that the institutions established in the interwar period to deal with humanitarian crises that fell beyond the borders of national sovereignty were inter-imperial institutions designed to ensure the security of the metropolitan state. She contended that, despite genuine humanitarian concern by certain key figures in the League, their interest was not the welfare of the individual. The inter-imperial dimension of the League resulted in its
public health regime becoming an important public relations forum for imperial and national claims of legitimacy. KIRAN GREWAL (University of Sydney) posited that the ongoing framing of issues relating to gender equality and culture within the classic imperial discourse of the ‘civilising mission’ has frequently served to undermine the benefits of international human rights interventions by reinforcing an apparent dichotomy between the endorsement of ‘Western feminist values’ and respect for local (patriarchal) cultural norms. In the recent case of post-conflict Sierra Leone, this process has allowed the international community to remain blind to its own sexist and racist assumptions, establishing similar patterns to those of colonial feminism while once again excluding the possibility of specifically located women expressing their demands and desires in their own terms. Sierra Leonean women are forced to present themselves through dominant discourses of celebrating native culture or adopting a ‘western’ notion of liberation. This led Grewal to question whether the subaltern continues to be unable to speak or be heard in the contemporary ‘postcolonial’ world of human rights. In discussion, ROLAND BURKE (La Trobe University) challenged the duality of an imperial rights-bearing West and an implicitly ‘backward’ colonial space. DANIELLE CELERMAJER (University of Sydney), in commenting on the processes of exclusion operative in human rights language, questioned whether rights discourses are so deeply embedded in pre-existing civilizational organisational categories that it is impossible for them to be uncorrupted or reformed.

The seventh session examined the extent to which human rights emerged as a response to national crimes. Using the case study of South Africa, SAUL DUBOW (University of Sussex) argued that any consideration of human rights should be examined in view of not only the demise of apartheid but also its rise. Rights talk in South Africa has a distinctly indigenous character that stems beyond simply a response to apartheid. Instead, the emergence of human rights concerns has deeper, more complex roots that incorporate traditions of racism, legality, colonialism and anti-imperialism. Dubow identified three predominant forms of rights thinking in South Africa: Boer republican, Anglophone liberal, and African nationalist. All of these contributed to the political transition in South Africa to varying, and not always positive, effect. As Dubow emphasised, rights provisions were included in the South African constitution largely to ensure white supremacy. The real imperialist force that should be considered in postwar rights talk, he concluded, is the United States. BARBARA KEYS (University of Melbourne) did just this, presenting a paper that considered the Vietnam roots of U.S. human rights legislation enacted in the early 1970s. Buried underneath accounts of a general desire to curb executive power, the Vietnam roots of U.S. human rights legislation, Keys argued, had been forgotten. This perspective had been lost in a political culture that emphasised national responsibility for government involvement in human rights abuses but preferred to erase any memory of direct involvement. Using the example of Section 32 of the 1973 Foreign Assistance Act, Keys showed that there was, in this case, a direct relationship between national crimes and human rights. However, she also noted the anti-imperial aspect to this insofar as severing funding to South Vietnam allowed for the U.S. to relieve itself of any further direct responsibility for their fate. ESTELA VALVERDE (Macquarie University) suggested that Section 32 was propagandistic as the United States was still funding right-wing regimes in Latin America. FABIAN KLOSE (LMU Munich), citing similar conduct by the British and French at the end of empire, put forward that the United States treated the end of the Vietnam War as a window of opportunity to cleanse them of a ‘dirty war’.

The eighth session explored if and how human rights help master the imperial past. MICHAEL HUMPHREY (University of Sydney) presented a paper on transitional justice
and its reach into past imperial violence and trauma, illustrating through two cases – the Mau Mau of Kenya and Rawagede of East Java – how post-transitional justice attempted a balance between achieving justice and peace for victims of colonial oppression. He argued that, in these cases, decolonisation was an instance of ‘transitional amnesty’ whereby victims were submerged in a particular version of transition, one that was notable for the colonial silence on one hand and the presentation of suffering victims as heroes by postcolonial states on the other. This meant that victims of colonial oppression remained invisible and colonial crimes officially unacknowledged. The international hearings of the Mau Mau in Britain and the Rawagede in Holland, Humphrey stated, were an instance of historical revisionism, one in which a universalising discourse, namely human rights, led to victims re-entering history as individuals and as identities. Although more importantly, argued Humphrey, was the issue of trauma in activating demands for effective accountability within the postcolonial states themselves. In her paper, DANIELLE CELERMAJER (University of Sydney) engaged with a debate identified among historians on the relationship between self-determination and human rights movements, focusing on their conceptual compatibility. Using the example of contemporary international and domestic indigenous rights movements, Celermajer argued that the emphasis of contemporary human rights discourse on the individual presented a constraint for indigenous groups attempting to engage the international human rights system collectively, effectively placing them in a position of structural disadvantage and political marginalisation and belying the fact that human rights abuses themselves are usually organised around particular types of identities. Her paper identified the tension between individual human rights and collective political rights and the need to re-evaluate the way in which sovereign political communities can be legitimately formed beyond current ‘rights solutions.’ In discussion, BONNY IBHAWOH (McMaster University) expressed concern about human rights only making sense in political communities as the age of the transnational corporation dawns. Celermajer responded that there are multiple levels of sovereignty and political expression of which the state is only one and that corporations play a part only in an organisational capacity.

In the concluding round table discussion, MARCO DURANTI (University of Sydney) addressed areas for future research, highlighting the challenge that liberal imperial and liberal human rights discourses posed to welfarist democratic nation-states, particularly as the conference demonstrated how human rights had so often been used as the enabling discourse for empire. Exploring the normative dimensions of the conference theme, Duranti asked whether it was possible to disentangle contemporary human rights projects from the legacy of empire and whether scholars should be attempting to do so in their work when ‘liberal human rights imperialism’ continued to undermine the welfarist democratic nation-state. NIKOLAS KOMPREDIS (University of Western Sydney) identified three key conceptions of human rights brought to light during the conference: firstly, human rights as a universal moral standard; secondly, human rights as an ideology that justified various forms of imperialism and colonialism; and thirdly, the work and real practices of human rights. In emphasising the centrality of utopia to the idea of human rights, Kompridis asked if it were necessary for human rights to be a moral utopia or if it could simply be a political one. DANIELLE CELERMAJER (University of Sydney) argued that it was useful to think of human rights in light of Walter Benjamin’s discussion of our ‘weak messianic power’ as it allows for the possibility to critique the actual and understand the limitations of a discourse that separates humans from the natural context in which they exist. SAMUEL MOYN (Columbia University) observed that the debate had centred on formal empire and formal decolonisation, a focus he asserted was far too narrow. He remarked that to effectively theorise empire there is a need to think not only about colonial logics and legacies but also why they persist.
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