

Human Beings are Born Neither Free nor Equal

Guy Ankerl

Interuniversity Institute of Geneva

Email: inu@inuge.ch

In this study, we are concerned with the social-political implications of fundamental observations that we can make concerning all individual human beings and their societies. In light of these observations, the contribution of the Enlightenment to the world's "epistemological progress" seems dubious. The original intent of the Western Enlightenment was to liberate mankind from unfounded prejudices and bias. But, in reality, the liberal social contract is based on the *anthropologically* naive idea of "self-made," "self-created" men—in the broadest sense of the term. This is an unrealistic utopia that the West tries to present as universally valid, and therefore imposes it also on other spheres of civilization by the strait jacket of colonialization.

In short, the so-called individualistic liberal ideology does not promote the unimpeded empirical reconnaissance of Nature but replaces the Creator with human artificiality.

We begin our reasoning *in medias res*. The founders of individualistic liberalism—John Locke, Adam Smith, Jean-Jacques Rousseau—try to reconstitute human society based on contracting between free and independent parties. For them, in general, the reciprocal ("horizontal") relation—exchange—should be the typical "median" ground relation that fundamentally constitutes society. (This ideal-typical mental experimentation is also beyond John Rawls' *Theory of Justice*.¹ The Enlightened will free society from "tribal" links and create a universal model of society comprising independent, responsible, free human beings. In principle, the enlightened society should be based on the empirical observation of Nature (of mankind) and not on some farfetched daydreaming.

In reality, because of the characteristic *anthropobiological conditions* of the human species, contractual relations—deals between equal, free, and responsible partners based on consensus—are not and cannot otherwise be the *first perceived* (human) relation. Without touching the question of how the human race—as such—came into existence, in general, the newborn man's first experienced relation is subordinate to and dependent on his breeder. This exposed, helpless situation creates the prototypical human relation (perhaps a "tribal" one in the broader sense of the term, since the upbringing can be done institutionally, or perhaps separately from the blood-relationship). What is essential is that this primary relation is not a reciprocal contracting market-like relation. In the human

¹ John Rawls, *A Theory of Justice* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971).

Human Beings are Born Neither Free nor Equal

race, the newborn's brain is only 30% of that of an adult.²

No human individual comes into the world free and self-supporting (by the way, without his self-will). All become full-fledged adults after an unavoidable commitment to the (pre)existing society. In reality, not a single human society is created from nothing.

All these statements seem commonplace, truisms, but nevertheless neglected in the liberal reconstruction of the society. The market-based, modern model of society, the idea of a society composed strictly of contracts among independent (self-created) individuals, glosses over the basic factual biological condition of mankind. It is a product of pure imagination.

Society with all its attributes should exist before the human being becomes adult and able to conclude contracts freely between equal parties. A whole society comprising equal adults who encounter one another by chance, without tribal attachment, looking for initial cooperation, is a myth, a cock and bull story as is the legend of the twins, Romulus and Remus, suckled by a she-wolf. This and similar fairy tales exist to corroborate, to "prove," that the first relation between human beings could be equal and not inter-generational.

Indeed, general experience shows that most human relations do not originate from a chance human encounter in a marketplace between individuals without existing deep "antecedent relations." For this very reason, to declare that the model of the human society should be fully based on contracts among free and equal individuals is unrealistic (in the best case, utopian). The "discovery" of contracts between equal individuals as an ideal for society, put forth by, among others, Herbert Spencer in his *Sociology*³ and J.J. Rousseau in his *Contract Social*⁴ in the XVIII century, cannot bring so-called progress, since the declaration, the positing of this idea itself doesn't transform the main natural (anthropological) parameters of mankind. Only perhaps a biological discovery that would allow the human being to be immediately independent—in *statu nascenti*—as are some other breeds or species of animals—would bring a societal change. All efforts to base the constitution of human society mainly on "horizontal" market-contracts, deals between equal anonymous individuals, are ahistorical. "*We are born late into history that is well under way.*" For biological reasons—necessarily—all societies exist only in continuity.

Instead of scrutinizing the imagination of some reputed authors again, we examine here directly the variety of human relations that constitute observable human societies. This concise study is based on our work *Global Communication*

² Kate Wong, "Why Humans Give Birth to Helpless Babies", (28 August 2012), online: *Sci Am Blog Netw* <https://blogs.scientificamerican.com/observations/why-humans-give-birth-to-helpless-babies/>.

³ Herbert Spencer, *The Study of Sociology* (London: Henry S. King & Co.).

⁴ J J Rousseau, *Contrat Social* (Paris: Librairie, 2015) at 13; cf. André Lalande, *Vocabulaire technique et critique de la philosophie* (Presses Universitaires de France, 1972) at 185.

*without Universal Civilization*⁵ and our article *The Relativity of Human Rights in the New Era of Society Based on Contracts Between Equals*.⁶

We look now at what relations a human being must bear before he or she can have horizontal trade between free and equal individuals.

The *lineage*, the relation between mother and child, is the foremost one, which itself is already a continuation of the previous relation between a mother and father. New scientific research shows that the apprenticeship of *mother tongue*—regarding its phonetic articulation and pronunciation—begins even in the mother's womb. This first human relation integrates the infant *eo ipso caste* progressively in a *determined language community*. Even if this mother-child relation could be undone by foster parents, the mother-child relation remains the typical, "mean" relation involving inherited qualities. Biological research will advance and deepen these considerations, but the *in vitro* birth will remain an exceptional human artifice for circumventing Nature. Language is a social phenomenon; therefore, by way of native language, belonging to a speech community will be an inalienable (cultural) part of the identity of each individual.

The first declared effort of the Enlightened Days was to abolish the "caste," the nobility with its entitled inherited prerogatives. However, this "noble egalitarian" idea becomes a simple manoeuvre between social classes if the right of material inheritance remains intact. The new order simply concentrates, *implicitly and essentially*, the privileges on moneyed classes, called the capitalist class. This opens an *econocratic* era.

The most liberal philosophers became the apologists of the econocratic societal systems of capitalism under the regime of a formal procedural equality of individuals. One of the prominent contemporary apologists of this order, John Rawls, wrote: "The unequal inheritance of wealth is no more inherently unjust than the unequal inheritance of intelligence."⁷ Of course, Rawls, as an enlightened author, cannot address this argument to God but to the society, and since the right of inheritance of wealth is manmade and that of intelligence not, this thesis is untenable. Rawls himself adds casually that the inheritance of wealth "is presumably more easily subject to social control."

Indeed, beyond the giving of nurture, the relation of lineage, the battle for collective subsistence, creates economic relations: production, cooperation and exchange. This could be composed of horizontal market-relations. It became the prototypical model for the Enlightened constitution of the last centuries in Western civilization. If the inheritable capital—means of production and even natural resources—accumulates in some private hands and the others rely only on their capacity for work, we have a capitalistic system.

⁵ Aziz Enhaili & Guy Ankerl, "Global Communication without Universal Civilization" (2000) 33 INUPRESS 775 at 501.

⁶ Guy Ankerl, "The Relativity of Human Rights in the New Era of Society Based on Contracts Between Equals" (2011) 1:1 23 at 14–36.

⁷ John Rawls, *A Theory of Justice* (Cambridge: Belcamp Press, 1978) at 278.

Human Beings are Born Neither Free nor Equal

As mentioned, the biological fundamentals of the human species oblige us to recognize that human society cannot be reconstituted uniquely as a network of equal anonymous partners encountered in the marketplace for an exchange (perhaps resulting from the professional division of labour in the society). The relation resulting from lineage is pre-existent.

Beyond the natural necessary relationship between the "rising generation" and the adult one there is another—more comprehensive, not transversal but "longitudinal"—generational relation. For the continuity and change in history we can speak also about an inter-generational relation, though this is not to be confused with the actual relation between adult and adolescent. Indeed, the human race doesn't proceed in interrupted succession—as with some seasonal animals—but as a continuity, even if from time to time catastrophes create disruptions.

This is a succession of (adult) generations that should be distinguished from relations resulting from the coexisting adult and adolescent, since the mentality of youth *as such* from that of an adult is different. Thus, this can be called the relation between parent and child, while that between successive generations (of adult cohorts) can be called a *historical* one.

At least in the Neolithic age, around 6000 years ago, the historical dialogue is assured mostly by (ideographic or phonetic) *scribal tradition*.

Communities that are comprehensive enough in time and space to constitute a relatively permanent self-sufficient entity, can be called *civilizations*. Each perpetuates a cumulative "collective knowledge" and has a common consciousness based on accepted evidence and memory of general observation. The imperfection of knowledge is completed by beliefs.

Value orders are neither innate nor universal but civilizationally immanent. They vary according to time and space. It is just the different rankings of values that characterize the various civilizations.⁸ Some successions in value orders could be interpreted as "progress" or "decadence," as normless libertarian decomposition is frequently the last phase of an era of civilization.

Because of all the given determinants of all human societies by (impotent) birth and nurture, "rational choice theory cannot provide a universal theory of human behaviour."⁹ A realistic constitution cannot be constructed on the premise that human society is composed solely from calculated cooperative-associative acts of a heteronomous set of individuals, independent of their various origins. The liberal constitution is an arbitrary dream based on "curtailed reality."

Present Western thought tries to invalidate all non-individualistically based non-market-oriented societal constitutions by "archaizing" them. Indeed, non-Western contemporary civilizational spheres are ranged in one epistemological

⁸ See Guy Ankerl, "Tolerance: Variation of the Concept According to Different Civilizations" in *Democr Toler* (Paris: UNESCO, 1995) 59 at 59–78.

⁹ Duncan J Watts, *Everything Is Obvious* (London: Atlantic, 2011) at 252.

agglomeration, ready for colonialization by New Imperialism, as does the London University with the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS).

The postulated value orders of societies are civilizational immanent. The continuity of a civilization is assumed, anchored by its scribal tradition (phonetic or ideographic) inherited and accepted by the "newcomers"—as noted, again unilaterally—from the past. The human being—in addition to the newborn-parent relation experience—is also nested in the scribal tradition of the civilization into which he is born.

We can conclude that only a very limited number of the whole set of human relations can be ruled by a constitutional principle of (market-like) egalitarian exchanges that result from so-called rational human behaviours. The contemporary globalist societal doctrine, the individualistic economism, is a "dystopia." The human being is not free-floating. The "omni mobile" individual's whole personality is enveloped in a halo of his particular lineage, his mother tongue and scribal tradition largely defining his individual identity by external determinants, outside his self-will (own free will). The world cannot be reconstituted from a set of anonymous strangers' self-projects.

A fundamental misconception of individualistic, egalitarian, liberalist social reform is that it tries to obliterate the (anthropological, cultural) differences, the givens of grown-ups of the human race, instead of simply fighting against all kinds of supremacism. The simple ascertainment of anthropological, cultural differences in the organization of the society can't be condemned as racist or sexist. Only the arbitrary hierarchical categorization of human beings could be the object of reasonable debate.¹⁰ And in this sense, in our Western civilization, even the (inherited) economic situation of human beings is the object of gross—nonprocedural but *de facto* daily—latent and even open discrimination.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ankerl, Guy. "The Relativity of Human Rights in the New Era of Society Based on Contracts Between Equals" (2011) 1:1 23.

Ankerl, Guy. "Tolerance: Variation of the Concept According to Different Civilizations" in *Democracy and Tolerance* (Paris: UNESCO, 1995) 59.

Cavalli-Sforza, Luigi Luca & Francesco Cavalli-Sforza. *Qui sommes-nous?: Une histoire de la diversité humaine* (Flammarion, 1997).

¹⁰ Luigi Luca Cavalli-Sforza & Francesco Cavalli-Sforza, *Qui sommes-nous?: Une histoire de la diversité humaine* (Flammarion, 1997); David Reich, *Who We are and how We Got Here: Ancient DNA and the New Science of the Human Past* (Oxford University Press, 2018).

Human Beings are Born Neither Free nor Equal

Enhaili, Aziz & Guy Ankerl. "Global Communication without Universal Civilization" (2000) 33 *Études internationales* 775.

Lalande, André. *Vocabulaire technique et critique de la philosophie* (Presses Universitaires de France, 1972).

Rawls, John. *A Theory of Justice* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971).

Reich, David. *Who We are and how We Got Here: Ancient DNA and the New Science of the Human Past* (Oxford University Press, 2018).

Rousseau, J.J. *Contrat Social* (Paris: Librio, 2015).

Spencer, Herbert. *The Study of Sociology* (London: Henry S. King & Co.).

Watts, Duncan J. *Everything Is Obvious* (London: Atlantic, 2011).

Wong, Kate. "Why Humans Give Birth to Helpless Babies", (28 August 2012), online: *Scientific American Blog Network*
<https://blogs.scientificamerican.com/observations/why-humans-give-birth-to-helpless-babies/>.

Guy Ankerl is a professor of Sociology. He was appointed as a professor of Sociology at the University of Montreal in 1996. He published numerous scientific articles and books, including *Beyond Monopoly Capitalism and Monopoly Socialism* (1978), *Experimental Sociology of Architecture* (1981), *Rapid urbanization in the Third World* (1984), and *Coexisting Contemporary Civilizations: Arabo-Muslim, Bharati, Chinese, and Western* (2000). Apart from that, he is an expert consultant for the United Nations, the ILO, the Ministry of Finance of Canada, and the Swiss National Science Foundation scientific research for urbanization issues around the world.