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Among all the labours of life, if there is one pursuit more replete than any other with benevolence, more likely to add comforts to existing people, and even to augment their numbers by augmenting their means of subsistence, it is certainly that of spreading abroad the bounties of creation, by transplanting from one part of the globe to another such natural productions are likely to prove beneficial to the interests of humanity.


In 1799 a group of wealthy women in Madrid began a decade-long experiment aimed at discovering the best substitute for breast milk. The ladies, members of the Junta de Damas affiliated with Madrid’s Royal Economic Society, had taken over the management of the city’s foundling hospital, which provided a motivation for their experiments and a ready supply of infants on whom to test their experimental formulas. Unable to find enough wet nurses for the hundreds of babies now in its charge, the Junta investigated various foods including goat’s milk, goat’s milk mixed with fennel, and donkey’s milk drunk directly from the animal’s teat. Members kept
notes on the outcome of their tests and discussed the results with doctors from the Royal Academy of Medicine. Disappointingly, virtually all the babies died. The Junta was therefore eager to trial a new substance that came highly recommended as an infant feed. *Maranta arundinacea*, or arrowroot, originated in Cuba, where it was reportedly used to great effect. The Junta tested the powder on twenty-two babies. The trial was halted after twenty deaths. The surviving infants were handed over to a wet nurse and the Junta’s medical team concluded that despite the fanfare this Caribbean root was not a suitable baby food.¹

The Junta’s arrowroot experiment was one example of the hundreds of investigations undertaken across eighteenth-century Europe to assess the nutritive qualities of extra-European plants. Many substances—sweet potatoes, quinoa, peanuts, wild rice—were evaluated as possible supplements or staples.² Although schemes to popularise these foods stressed their universal appeal, the ambition was usually to increase consumption by—as one promoter put it—‘a poor man with a large family’, or foundlings.³

The transformative impact of new world foods on old world diets is of course well known. Alfred Crosby’s pioneering works, together with more recent studies, have deftly charted the ways in which global eating practices were revolutionised by the Columbian exchange. The eighteenth-century quest for new foods to feed Europe forms part of this larger history, while at the same time reflecting central aspects of enlightened science, as the Junta’s careful experiments suggest. A growing corpus of research indeed points to the importance of food in framing eighteenth-century debates about knowledge and health.⁴ The promotion of novel staples in Europe ran parallel to eighteenth-century efforts to identify new commercial crops, edible or otherwise, that might profitably be exploited in European colonies. A rich scholarship
has documented the sustained efforts by European states to discover such commodities, and where possible to relocate production to their own colonial orbits. The close links between natural history, colonialism and commerce, in particular, have been amply demonstrated by a substantial body of research.\(^5\)

These better-known efforts at commercial botany, and at discovering new foods for the peoples of Europe, were accompanied by a third enterprise that formed part of this larger assemblage of eighteenth-century food transfers. This was the search for new staples to feed labouring populations not in Europe but its colonies. This article explores two foods that were persistently advocated as ideal staples for ‘workers and black people’ from Cuba to Calcutta: breadfruit and potatoes.\(^6\)

These endeavours rarely succeeded in their ostensible aim of transforming subaltern eating practices, but they reveal much about the role of food in the eighteenth-century imagination. Ample supplies of nutritious foods were viewed as crucial to building the healthy and energetic populations that formed the basis for agricultural, commercial and industrial wealth. The close associations between strong populations, nourishing foods, and enlightened governance meant that interventions in colonial diets were rarely concerned solely with practical matters of supply. Ultimately, for botanists, colonial officials and settlers, the appeal of schemes to disseminate breadfruits in Guatemala or potatoes in Bengal lay in their ability to encapsulate a complex of enlightened desiderata about benevolence, improvement, and public happiness. These links between the provision of food and the pursuit of happiness fuelled and legitimated enlightened promotion of new foods in the eyes of their advocates, and explain why colonial elites were so enthusiastic about such plant transfers, despite their limited success in modifying popular diets.
These stories reflect the global nature of the Enlightenment. While scholars once viewed the Enlightenment as a fundamentally European phenomenon that either naturalised or withered in other parts of the world, more recent research has stressed the central role that extra-European dialogue played in the construction of European knowledge. As Sebastian Conrad suggests, scholars should perhaps focus less on the origin of ideas and practices, and more on their interconnections. The global circulation of breadfruit plants or recipes for potato bread illustrates precisely these connected histories. It was the breadfruit’s movements, across empires and islands, that made it a powerful symbol of enlightenment. Potatoes resonated differently in Lima, Paris and Calcutta, but in all three locations discussion of their merits formed part of a body of ideas whose central themes were the relationships between nutritious food, good governance and happiness. Examining these histories helps concretise our understanding of the simultaneously mobile and localised nature of enlightened projects and imaginaries.

Let us begin by taking a closer look at the Junta de Damas’ infant formula.

How Many Labourers! How Many Honest Grenadiers!

As the Junta’s sourcing of the root from Havana indicates, arrowroot grew in Meso-America and the Caribbean. Its significance in pre-colonial culture is absolutely unclear, but from the seventeenth century Europeans reported that Caribbean islanders employed it to treat wounds, especially those caused by poisoned arrows. French and English settlers, attracted by the root’s medicinal qualities, endorsed its utility and widened the range of conditions for which it was considered effective. Once converted into flour, moreover, it made a smooth jelly recommended for those with delicate digestions. By the mid-eighteenth century it was cultivated in the West Indies.
for local use and as a commodity exported (on a very small scale) to Europe. At the
time of the Junta’s experiments arrowroot was represented in a number of European
botanical gardens, and was recognised as a suitable food for infants and the infirm.
The Junta’s interest in the root, therefore, was not prompted by its recent appearance
on the European scene.

Rather, it reflected the quest for foodstuffs which would facilitate the social,
political and economic transformations desired by enlightened thinkers across Europe.
A central concern, embraced by the Junta, was the creation of a substantial population
of healthy and active workers. As Spanish ministers affirmed, echoing a widely
shared conviction, ‘a large population that is usefully employed is the greatest
treasure a state can possess, the foundation of its true power’. Were sickly
foundlings transformed into healthy adults, rhapsodised one writer, ‘how many
individuals—which we now lack—would we have for public works! How many
labourers! How many honest grenadiers!’ The conversion of Madrid’s orphans into
productive members of society was therefore a patriotic act; similar efforts were
underway in other European cities, where the shocking mortality rates at foundling
hospitals attracted increasing attention for reasons both philanthropic and economic.
Writers across Europe insisted that a flourishing economy depended on a well-
nourished and vigorous population. While philosophers disputed whether large
populations were invariably preferable to smaller ones, all agreed that to be
productive the existing population needed to be well-fed. For this reason, a nation’s
strength was closely correlated with its possessing ‘the greatest possible quantity of
foodstuffs’, as the economic theorist Jean-François Melon noted. An adequate supply
of affordable and nourishing food was thus essential for the ‘security, wealth and
glory of a state’. 
Since a nation’s wealth depended on the vigour of its population, publically-minded individuals diligently examined ways not simply to prevent famine, but to provide the healthy and agreeable food necessary to create this energetic workforce. Identifying more nourishing sources of food therefore constituted a topic ‘worthy of the meditations of philosophers and the protection of government’, in the view of Antoine-Augustin Parmentier, one of the century’s great potato promoters. The search for nourishing new foodstuffs, and the promotion of efficient ways to prepare them, were not simply ad-hoc responses to shortages, but rather reflected new ways of thinking about governance, and new debates about the sources of wealth and economic prosperity.

What, however, constituted a nourishing food? Was arrowroot such a substance, for instance? Although some British enthusiasts insisted that it could form the basis of an improved diet for ‘natives’ in India and ‘our new African settlements’, the root’s status as a food for babies and invalids mitigated against its promotion as a staple. Prior to the nineteenth-century invention of the calorie, which provided a numerical scale for ranking putative energy value, assessment of a food’s nourishing qualities did not rely on a single indicator. Claims that a food was nutritive were usually linked to a perception that it was sustaining, in the sense that it enabled a lengthy period of work. Working people often evaluated a food’s ability to nourish in this way. In 1790s England, for instance, labourers in the southern counties considered barley and potato soup ‘washy stuff, that affords no nourishment’, which would not allow them to undertake a day’s work. Peasants in the Vaud made the same complaints about potato bread. Labourers in various regions seem to have viewed meat as particularly nourishing.
For many scientists, nourishing foods were those that contained a greater quantity of starch. The physician James Clark made this clear in a 1797 report on the starchy qualities of various West Indian roots. Clark, who practiced for many years in Dominica, conducted experiments on manioc, eddoes, arrowroot, and a number of other common foods, with a view to determining how much starch each yielded, and thereby how nutritious each was. Sweet manioc, for instance, proved to be more nutritious than the bitter variety because it contained more starchy matter. Guinea yam and sweet potato contained equal quantities of starch, and so were equally nourishing. Other plants such as plantains proved more difficult to reduce to a starch through chemical experimentation, but Clark was certain that their reputation as a ‘hearty food for hard working people’ meant that they must contain a great deal of starch. Indeed, he declared that all these commonly consumed foods ‘contain starch, and are looked upon to be very nutritious’. Starchy foods were highly nourishing, and therefore suitable for labourers. It was fortunate for the enslaved population of the West Indies that this was so, since, as Clark happily noted, starchy substances formed their principal food. He therefore felt confident in concluding that their diet was wholesome and nourishing. Working people required hearty, nourishing food and a growing scientific consensus agreed that starch constituted a particularly nourishing substance. Indeed, as Emma Spary has observed, ‘it was over the question of nourishing the poor that administrators and savants first began to collaborate in generating new definitions of dietary requirements and experimenting with new nutritional resources’.

This equation of nutritiveness with starness explains why the many efforts to identify new foods for colonized populations focused almost exclusively on starchy substances. In the same years that arrowroot was recommended as a food for
colonised Africans, colonial official Robert Kyd, founder of the Calcutta Botanical Garden, was encouraging the introduction of sago palms from the Malay Peninsula to India—sago being another supremely starchy substances to which arrowroot was often compared. Writing a decade after the devastating Bengal famine exacerbated, if not indeed caused, by British policies, Joseph Banks, President of the Royal Society, imagined the multiple benefits accruing from Kyd’s proposals. The introduction of sago, Banks believed, would not only provide an immensely wholesome food for ‘natives’, but would also lead these natives to ‘revere the name of their British Conquerors’, whom they would thank for delivering them from ‘famine, the most severe scourge with which Providence had afflicted them’. Banks thereby endorsed the dissemination of sago at the same time as he disavowed any British responsibility for the circumstances that prompted its introduction. These eighteenth-century dreams of beneficent starchy foods for natives were thus inherently connected to European ideals of good governance, which justified such interventions in the eating practices of ordinary people, and obscured, at least to the dreamers, the structures of power and coercion that made them appear necessary.

The Celebrated Breadfruit

Advocates of sago and arrowroot often alluded to the century’s most sensational act of nutritional botany: the transfer of breadfruits from the south Pacific to the Caribbean. The story of the breadfruit’s journey from Tahiti to the West Indies is as well known now as it was at the time, as is the spectacular fate of the Bounty, which transported the original cache of seedlings. Fletcher Christian’s 1789 mutiny against Captain Bligh was provoked in part by the demands imposed on the crew by the delicate cargo, which monopolised much of the ship’s space and water supply. On
seizing the vessel the mutineers promptly tossed the saplings overboard. This setback did not deter the British government from funding a second expedition, again under Bligh, which in 1792 succeeded in bringing the trees to the Caribbean.23

Breadfruit-promoters stressed two features: that the fruit was nutritious, and that it offered a highly suitable food for enslaved people. John Ellis, a colonial agent for Dominica, stated pithily in a 1775 pamphlet why the plant merited attention. Breadfruit, he explained, ‘affords a great deal of nourishment, and is very satisfying, therefore proper for hard-working people’. For this reason, it ‘might be easily cultivated in our West India islands, and made to supply an important article of food to all ranks of their inhabitants, especially to the Negroes’.24 The breadfruit, insisted another planter, ‘would be of infinite importance to the West India Islands’ because it would afford ‘a wholesome & pleasant food to our Negroes’.25

The conviction that the West Indies needed breadfruit seems to have originated in the imagination of Joseph Banks. During his voyage to the South Pacific with James Cook, Banks identified the plant as an almost limitless source of nutrition. Because they subsisted effortlessly on the bountiful breadfruit, the young Banks recorded, Tahitians ‘may almost be said to be exempt from the curse of our forefather; scarcely can it be said that they earn their bread with the sweat of their brow’.26 As David Mackay observed, for Banks the breadfruit represented not so much a foodstuff as ‘a symbol of a simple and idyllic life free from worries about work or property’.27 Banks therefore lobbied vigorously for their transfer to the Caribbean. For Banks’ Caribbean interlocutors, too, the prospect of a food source that required no labour whatsoever was tantalising. The West Indian plantation system largely depended on the enslaved to grow their own food in kitchen gardens and provision grounds. This arrangement necessarily diverted labour from commercial to subsistence agriculture.
The tree offered the possibility of converting enslaved bodies yet more efficiently into sugar. The time required to cultivate food, for planters a tiresome distraction from the business of profit, could perhaps be redirected wholly into sugar cane. The breadfruit thus lay at the potent convergence of the capitalist logic of the plantation system and an enlightened fantasy of a life without labour.²⁸

As a number of scholars have remarked, there is a deep irony in the expectation that breadfruits, representatives of a paradisiacal world without toil, should serve as food for the enslaved. That by all accounts enslaved people displayed little enthusiasm for them further illustrates the marginal place of the subaltern eater within these schemes of nutritional generosity; colonial writers complained that through ‘some unaccountable indifference’ these ‘valuable acquisitions obtained by the munificence of our King’ were shunned by their intended beneficiaries.²⁹ At the same time, new-world plantations were a natural location for such experiments, given the associations of productive labour and nourishing foods with the kindly governance that eighteenth-century planters insisted, loudly, was characteristic of the plantation system.³⁰

Imperial interest in the breadfruit derived from these associations far more than from practical concerns about food supply in the Caribbean. During the same years that it underwrote the breadfruit voyages the British state explicitly rejected claims that the West Indies was suffering a food shortage such as might necessitate the introduction of a new staple. When the West India lobby urged Parliament to lift an embargo on trade with the United States, alleging that without food imports the enslaved population faced starvation, Pitt’s government stated repeatedly that food provisions were adequate.³¹ The British state did not fund the transportation of thousands of breadfruits from Tahiti to solve a subsistence crisis whose very existence
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it denied. Rather, the enterprise was framed as a demonstration of altruism and commitment to the public good. As Bligh insisted, ‘if a man plants ten [breadfruit trees] in his life-time, which he may do in about an hour’, he would instantly fulfil ‘his duty to his own and future generations’. Breadfruits signalled beneficence, regardless of whether anyone ate them.

The British were not alone in viewing breadfruit as an almost talismanic agent of enlightenment. The celebrated German anatomist Johann Friedrich Blumenbach reported excitedly on the arrival in Göttingen of a single specimen of this ‘inestimable benefit’ to mankind, and colonial officials and naturalists elsewhere laboured to disseminate the tree in their own empires. Bligh’s efforts were in fact preceded by a French mission to naturalise breadfruits, which succeeded in transporting the plant from the south Pacific to Martinique without incident. Agronomists were later to advocate its cultivation in France’s north African colonies. Like Banks, French naturalists viewed the plant as a highly symbolic food that encapsulated nature’s bounty. French celebration of the breadfruit resonated with British writings to help establish the fruit as a transformative foodstuff whose mere possession would not simply banish hunger, but also increase human happiness. The man who succeeded in bringing the plant to France’s colonies, stated the head gardener of the Jardin du Roi, will ‘have done more for the happiness of mankind than all the savants of the world’. By the 1790s breadfruits were growing in British and French botanical gardens in the East and West Indies, where they demonstrated a commitment to benevolent governance, without serving as a significant source of food. Indeed, within a few years of the tree’s arrival in the Caribbean, planters had lost interest in its dietary potential. ‘The fact is’, stated the superintendent of the St. Vincent botanical garden in 1806, ‘planters hate giving it a place on their estates, as they regard it as an
intruder on their cane land, and they dislike any other object but canes’. ‘For to say he had such a thing’, he added, a planter might ‘make a negro plant it’, but after that he would accord it no more attention. In this context tree was less a solution to a provisioning dilemma than a sign of Europe’s commitment to its colonies and an emblem of enlightenment.

Spanish officials and botanists watched these developments with interest. Peninsular newspapers reported the efforts by rival colonial powers to disseminate the tree, and in 1779, after reading English and consular reports, the head of Madrid’s botanical garden concluded that the introduction of breadfruit to Spanish America would be ‘extremely useful . . . because it is highly nourishing for workers and black people’. As with the proposal to introduce arrowroot to ‘our new African settlements’ or breadfruit to Martinique, this assertion was not motivated by a particular moment of dearth. Neither was it a response to a recent encounter with breadfruit. Spanish explorers and missionaries in the Pacific had long been familiar with the plant, which they had not hitherto regarded as a particularly promising food source. Indeed, a group of Franciscans stationed in Tahiti in the 1770s clashed repeatedly with locals when the missionaries began felling breadfruit trees for use as timber. The new-found enthusiasm rather reflected the breadfruit’s recent elevation to wonder-food within the republic of letters.

The fruit’s status as an agent of enlightenment may be glimpsed in a satirical essay published in a Spanish literary journal in 1788. After reporting British plans to transport the fruit to the Caribbean, the journal observed that its readers would doubtless welcome the discovery of ‘a healthy and plentiful foodstuff, which the earth spontaneously offers to mankind, and which multiplies so rapidly that effort is required not to encourage but rather to contain it’. The breadfruit, in short, seemed the
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very fruit of paradise. Doubtless, the journal continued, readers would admire ‘the activities of an enlightened nation’ in disseminating this bountiful food. But, the journal warned, readers not be seduced by the breadfruit’s apparent attractions. All too often enterprises guided by ‘charitable and humane instincts’ had led to disaster. Warming to its theme, the journal insisted that popularising the breadfruit would deal a fatal blow to monopoly trade, unjust privilege and inequality, because its immense nutritive qualities would enable colonies to be self-sufficient. What a threat to tyranny the innocent breadfruit posed! It might spell the end of colonialism itself. Perhaps, the journal concluded, it would be wise to start a war to prevent its reaching the Americas. The author of this sardonic essay captured neatly the near-miraculous qualities ascribed to the exotic fruit.

As in Britain and France, in Spain the state encouraged its dissemination, ordering botanists in the Philippines to experiment with growing breadfruit, and arranging for samples to be sent to Mexico. These imperial directives were accompanied by more local efforts, which demonstrate both the global relevance of the language of enlightened governance, and the ways in which this language was inflected through local contexts. One such effort was championed by the Royal Economic Society of Guatemala. This was one of the many patriotic organisations existing in Europe and the Americas devoted to disseminating useful knowledge. Improved agricultural practices featured largely in the concerns of these organisations, since (in the words of a Chilean merchant) no nation ‘that encourages agriculture has not enjoyed a large population, or improved industry, or failed to establish an advantageous commerce’. The Guatemalan Society accordingly stressed that its remit was ‘the perfecting of agriculture and the mechanical arts’. Most of its attention was focused on commercial agriculture; the ‘decay’ of cacao cultivation was
a topic of persistent concern, as were efforts to develop the linen industry.\textsuperscript{44} The Society moreover experimented with new fodder crops such as Guinea grass, for which it sought out seeds and published guides to cultivation.\textsuperscript{45}

The Society was also concerned with the kingdom’s food supply. Its newspaper, the \textit{Gazeta de Guatemala}, echoed the views of Spanish economic theorists that it was impossible for arts and industry to flourish when food was expensive or scarce. It monitored the availability and cost of basic foodstuffs such as maize, and was indignant when critics suggested it was not doing enough to address particular moments of shortage. In its publications the Society insisted that it had a long history of promoting new varieties of food plants.\textsuperscript{46} Its practical activities in this direction were in fact limited, but this did not impede the Society from celebrating its efforts to disseminate an iconic foodstuff: the breadfruit.

In 1801, Alejandro Ramírez, the \textit{Gazeta’s} editor, announced that he was in possession of a supply of exotic seeds and plants—‘many of them unusual, all useful, and most unknown in this kingdom’—which he and a Guatemalan merchant had obtained on a visit to Jamaica.\textsuperscript{47} Among the seedlings were several varieties of breadfruit. This was not the first time that visitors to Jamaica from the Spanish Circum-Caribbean have returned home with horticultural treasures. In 1795 officials in Cuba reported that they had acquired specimens of various modish plants, including breadfruit, from Jamaica. After reviewing the miserable fate of the \textit{Bounty}, they observed with satisfaction that Cuba had freely acquired these Jamaic plants, ‘which constitute part of that island’s wealth’, and for which Britain had paid such a high price.\textsuperscript{48} Botany and science were never disconnected from competition over imperial power. At the same time, local networks of exchange made possible collaborations that worked across such jealousies of trade. Cuban botanists and the
Guatemalan Society obtained their breadfruits from a neighbouring British colony. Officials in Madrid, in contrast, were obliged to design a complex trans-oceanic programme to import the plants from the Philippines which ultimately failed to deliver a single live specimen. If breadfruits represented enlightenment, then the new world was no less enlightened than the old.

The Guatemalan Society had established a small acclimatisation garden in Truxillo, on the Caribbean coast, and it was there that the plants were raised. The agents of the transfer, Alejandro Ramírez and Francisco Sosa, congratulated themselves that through their efforts the kingdom’s families would in the future subsist on breadfruit, a hyperbolic statement that did not reflect any serious ambition to promote breadfruit consumption, but which captured well the era’s breadfruit-discourse. The experiment however went poorly. By 1802 the reportedly superior Tahitian variety had died, and other plants were attacked by disease, insects and cattle. Labels became detached from the specimens, which meant that the gardener was no longer certain of the identity of some of the plants in his care. He subsequently left Truxillo under a cloud; by the time a new gardener took over many of the plants had perished. The Society however considered the experiment a success because the ‘celebrated’ breadfruit remained alive, its reputation untainted by its failure produce a single fruit.

For the Society the breadfruit was less a plausible candidate to replace maize, the kingdom’s staple, than an emblematic plant representing Guatemala’s participation in a global conversation about botany, acclimatisation and enlightenment. As scholars have repeatedly observed, colonial botany embraced far more than the practical quest for useful or exotic plants. It also constituted a symbolic display of legitimate governance. In this spirit the presence of even a single
breadfruit tree was heralded in Guatemala, the West Indies, New Granada, Brazil, Tenerife and other corners of the Atlantic world, not because it provided a significant source of food but because it represented a commitment—to enlightenment, political economy, and the public good.53 This is why, in 1825, the newly-formed Republic of Bolivia incorporated a breadfruit tree into its official shield. The architects of this emblem explained that the ‘prodigious’ breadfruit symbolised Bolivia’s natural wealth, just as the liberty tree they included on the coinage clearly proclaimed the new state’s enlightened, republican ambitions.54 For such statesmen, as for Joseph Banks and the Guatemalan Society, the breadfruit’s appeal lay less in its practical utility as a source of food, then in its powerful ability to encapsulate, underneath its wrinkled skin, enlightenment, and, in the words of the Jardin du Roi’s head gardener, ‘the happiness of mankind’.

The Valuable Potato

Discussions of breadfruits often compared them to the plant that in Europe was the object of the most intense promotion during the eighteenth century: the potato. John Ellis’s pro-breadfruit pamphlet likened the fruit to ‘the potatoe-bread made in the West of England’. In his assessment of the quantity of starch yielded by West Indian tubers the physician James Clark carefully compared each to potatoes, which he treated as a bench-mark for nutritiveness.55 Breadfruit, its advocates hoped, might come to play a role in Africa or the Caribbean comparable to that of the potato in Europe. But might not the potato itself fulfil this role? Why make recourse to distant, unfamiliar plants when a suitable food was already close to hand?

Much of the potato’s journey from the Andean highlands around the globe predated its intense promotion in Europe in the late eighteenth century, when it was
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widely touted as an ideal food. By the early seventeenth century potatoes were cultivated and eaten in many parts of Europe; British, Iberian and French navigators moreover left a trail of potatoes as they voyaged across the globe. By the eighteenth century potatoes were completely naturalised in many parts of the extra-European world; both the Iroquois in upstate New York and ladies in New England consumed potatoes, while visitors to Botany Bay were astonished as the settlement’s flourishing potato plots. To a significant degree, the potato established itself as an important global staple independently of the vigorous eighteenth-century pro-potato propaganda. This propaganda nonetheless resonated with the concerns of enlightened savants in Spanish America and British India eager to demonstrate their commitment to the pursuit of useful knowledge and the public good. Their own potato schemes helped articulate a colonial vision of paternalist improvement, even if they had little effect on local diets.

The potato was the beneficiary of a sustained propaganda campaign in eighteenth-century Spain. Local economic societies investigated the potato’s qualities, experimented with new varieties, offered premiums for the largest harvest, and edited treatises on approved horticultural techniques. Newspapers printed recipes for nourishing potato bread. Charles III issued orders encouraging potato cultivation, and sponsored the publication of an entire book extolling the tuber, which was into its fourth edition by 1804. Such propaganda was accompanied by a patriotic insistence that the rest of Europe was indebted to Spain for having introduced the potato; newspapers recorded with pride that it was ‘our conquistadors’ who had brought this ‘precious fruit’ to Europe.

Organisation such as the Guatemalan Society were perfectly familiar with the potato’s lofty reputation in Spain. The Society subscribed to Spain’s principal
agricultural journal, which reported regularly on the potato’s merits and its promotion by states and economic societies across Europe.62 The Society’s own publications translated extracts from the essays of the celebrated Count Rumford, famous for his low-cost potato soup. Likewise the Gazeta de Guatemala reprinted Spanish recipes for economical potato bread, although in Guatemala potatoes were in short supply and hardly provided a useful substitute for wheat flour.63 At no stage however did the Society make any effort to increase potato consumption, a major aim of analogous European organisations. As with its celebration of the breadfruit, the Society’s enthusiasm for the potato reflected its commitment to an Atlantic conversation about enlightenment. It did not form part of a practical project of dietary reform, but rather demonstrated the Society’s fluency in the language of improvement, public happiness and good governance.

The separation of the potato’s importance as an emblem of enlightenment from its local relevance as a foodstuff is particularly clear in the case of Peru, where Spaniards had first encountered the potato in the sixteenth century. The Peruvian analogue of the Guatemalan Society was the Academic Society of the Friends of Lima, whose members enthusiastically embraced the rhetoric of utility, reason and enlightenment. Their journal, the Mercurio peruano, returned repeatedly to the need to promote agriculture, commerce and industry, and displayed a keen awareness of the importance of natural history, in particular, to wealth and improvement. As the botanising bishop of Trujillo observed in a letter reprinted in the Mercurio, knowledge of natural history and geography was vitally important to governance.64 The journal likewise detailed the useful and unusual plants cultivated in Lima’s botanical garden and drew pointed comparisons between Britain’s ill-fated efforts to transport ‘the prodigious breadfruit’ to Jamaica, and Spain’s numerous state-funded
botanical expeditions around the world. Like its counterparts in the Peninsula, the Peruvian Society lauded Spain’s role in introducing the potato to Europe, which in its view helped disproved hostile assertions that Spain’s colonisation of the Americas had contributed nothing the advancement of humanity. Viewed from this perspective, the potato was evidence of Peru’s, and Spain’s, contribution to knowledge and its participation in the community of enlightened states.65

At the same time, enlightened Peruvians could not have been less enthusiastic about potatoes when it came to eating them. In the Andes the potato had long been regarded as a distinctly indigenous foodstuff. As one of the earliest European descriptions stated, the potato was ‘a certain food eaten by Indians’.66 Potatoes were moreover important within Inca religion; the Jesuit naturalist and theologian José de Acosta noted in his 1590 chronicle that Amerindians venerated certain oddly-shaped potatoes, ‘which they call llallahuas and kiss and worship’.67 Potatoes were thus strongly linked to the indigenous world, and therefore, in the eyes of colonial elites, to poverty and incivility. The Mercurio’s discussion of the tuber largely reproduced this set of associations. ‘Paltry’ and ‘miserable’ were the words most closely linked to potatoes in its pages.68

Worse, some Peruvian writers suspected that potatoes were actually unhealthy. In the thesis that earned him a medical degree from the University of Montpellier, the Limeño José Manuel Davalos attributed the ailments typically afflicting the city’s residents to their overuse of local foodstuffs, most notably heavily seasoned pork, manioc and potatoes. Citing Linnaeus, Davalos noted that the potato ‘is a true species of Solanum, and hence it is easy to judge it to be suspect. If used frequently it produces a harmful effect even in small quantities’.69 The Mercurio likewise published warnings about the lethal effects of excessive potato consumption by
travellers, especially when this was accompanied by spicy foods and alcohol. At best travellers could hope for indigestion, but a fatal dysentery was more likely. Far from promoting potato consumption, Peru’s community of patriotic savants discouraged its use, because of its links to poverty and indigeneity.

In fact, potatoes were a significant commercial crop in eighteenth-century Peru. As the Mercurio itself documented, they were an important item of commerce within the viceroyalty and between neighbouring colonies. Grown by indigenous and non-indigenous farmers alike, potatoes were traded up and down the Andes and along the Pacific coast, providing a handsome profit for those able to mount a large-scale trade. They were not a miserable substance associated solely with deprivation. Within the pages of the Mercurio, then, ‘potato’ was at once a commodity, a despised food, and an example of Hispanic enlightenment.

The promotion of the potato in British India provides a final example of the potato’s ability to index good governance, independent of its uptake as a dietary staple. As in Spanish America colonists in India established local societies intended to promote good agricultural practice and general improvement. The Agricultural and Horticultural Society of India, for instance, was formed in 1820 to effect the ‘general amelioration of the agricultural condition of India’. The Society made a sustained effort to encourage potato cultivation, alongside its commitment to developing new commercial crops. Its founding prospectus stated clearly that one ‘object to be pursued by an Agricultural Society is, the introduction of new and useful Plants’. Already, its first president insisted, the promotion of the potato by a few colonists demonstrated the merits of this ambition. ‘How much more then’, he continued, ‘might be accomplished by the joint efforts of a number of persons arduously engaged in the same pursuit!’. To this end it established an acclimatisation garden in which
members grew potatoes alongside tobacco, apples, Seville oranges, nectarines, cherimoyas and avocados. The Society also imported seed potatoes from Europe and distributed them to members, who experimented with the effect of different manures and soils on the productivity of ‘this valuable vegetable’.74

The Society’s ambitions were not satisfied by such gentlemanly pottering. It wanted Indians to grow European vegetables as well. Using a long-established technique the Society sponsored prizes for the cultivation of potatoes, peas, cauliflowers and other plants by ‘native farmers’. While such incentives were aimed in part at remedying the ‘deplorable lack of good produce’ in the markets that provisioned their own kitchens, their goal was to induce Indians not simply to grow but also to eat potatoes and cauliflowers. The Society therefore conducted questionnaires on the tuber’s reception among India’s different religious communities, and was pleased when particular villages embraced the potato.75 It regarded these enterprises as an uphill struggle against the ‘ignorance or mistaken ideas of the natives relative to those things which concern their own interests’, but overall it was confident that it was working to increase happiness and improve the well-being of India’s rural population. For the Indian Society, efforts to encourage potato consumption provided vivid evidence of the beneficent intentions of colonists, and also of the obstinate refusal of ‘native farmers’ to embrace enterprises so clearly in their own interest.76

As David Arnold has shown, the Society could count some modest successes in their agricultural programme, but the dissemination of the potato was not one of them. Well before it embarked on its promotional scheme ‘this salutary and useful root’ had already attained the status of a commercial crop in Calcutta, the western Deccan and elsewhere, spread in part by the tastes of the British troops garrisoned
there. The Society’s activities did little to alter this situation.77 Far more lasting was its local articulation and development of the discourse of improvement, and the construction of India as a derelict region in need of agricultural renewal. Its promotion of the potato, and conviction that through such actions Indian peasants would experience a ‘happiness till now unknown in India’, in turn, reflect both the global reach of the fascination with the potato, and also the strong conviction that the dissemination of such staples was a privileged means of promoting public happiness.78

What Comfort for them! What Happiness for the Nation!

Promoters of new foods often observed that their schemes would result in an increase in public happiness. If poor people were to eat more potatoes, commented a French advocate, their healthier bodies could better contribute to the glory and prosperity of the state: ‘what comfort for them! What happiness for the Nation!’79 Since root vegetables were a superior foodstuff, their greater consumption within Spain would bring every possible benefit, insisted the country’s leading agricultural journal. ‘What a simple means of promoting national happiness!’, it concluded.80 Discussing George III’s support for the breadfruit venture, the superintendent of the St. Vincent botanical garden waxed lyrical: no undertaking, he proclaimed, was ‘more pregnant with benevolence’ than that which ‘while it increased the comforts and means of subsistence, multiplied, at the same time, the happiness and numbers of mankind’.81 Happiness both individual and public was thus enhanced by the introduction of these foods.

That it was everyone’s duty to promote happiness—the ‘great goal of the century’—was universally accepted.82 Indeed, the promotion of public happiness was
not only an obligation incumbent on all individuals but also constituted the highest aim of government. ‘It is undeniable, or at least I have reason to believe that in this enlightened century it is a universally recognised truth, that the first object of any government is to make its people happy’, stated the Marques de Chastellux in a treatise on happiness. In short, to disseminate better foods was to spread happiness, the fundamental aim and purpose of existence, in the view of many philosophers of all political stripes.

The power of this assemblage linking nutritious food, good governance and happiness is reflected in the persistent eighteenth-century efforts to quantify it. Quantification, that ‘quintessential form of modern thought’, which spread rapidly across many areas of eighteenth-century life from cookbooks to forestry, offered an authoritative new language for analysing the world. Presenting the components of happiness mathematically underscored the importance of their interconnections, as well as adding precision. The Irish philosopher Francis Hutcheson for instance produced a complicated arithmetical formula for measuring the relationship between virtue, evil and happiness, expressed as a series of equations. Jeremy Bentham’s ‘felicific calculus’ likewise sought to provide a mathematical basis for evaluating pleasure and woe. The quantifying spirit enabled the Marques de Chastellux to construct an ‘index of happiness’, which demonstrated that the inhabitants of regions with an abundant supply of wholesome food were the happiest. Plentiful food led, mathematically and philosophically, to happiness.

Just as the new discipline of political economy oscillated between the individual and the nation as its point of reference, so happiness was theorised as an individual condition that occurred within a nation-state. The Scottish agronomist John Sinclair’s ‘quantum of happiness’ for instance measured the happiness of a state by
adding up the happiness of its inhabitants.86 In their small way, even the Junta’s foundlings formed part of the population; their individual happiness therefore contributed to their country’s overall happiness, because happiness was both a personal and a national good. This did not mean that philosophers disdained the well-being of foreigners, or that public-spirited individuals did not dream of increasing the happiness of all mankind. The natural unit of measure for public happiness, however, was rarely the entire globe. Rather, whether an action increased happiness was generally determined by considering its impact on the population of an individual country. The New England Congregationalist minister Timothy Dwight indeed treated the terms ‘public happiness’ and ‘national happiness’ as synonymous in his own attempts to calculate levels of felicity.87 The public of félicité publique was the population of the nation-state, not the whole world.

What place did colonies occupy in this felicific framework? Were they part of the public whose well-being statesmen and philosophers championed? In the cold logic of colonialism the answer was probably no. Modern colonies, explained the Encyclopédie, ‘are established solely to benefit the metropole’.88 From this perspective, metropolitan happiness contributed to—indeed, constituted—the nation’s quantum of happiness, but colonial happiness did not. Colonies could perhaps be seen as happiness ‘ghost acres’—extra-territorial regions that supplied essential commodities to the metropolis, whose own needs were not taken into account. Critics of mercantilism such as James Mill made precisely this point when they argued against the colonial system. Because it failed to account for the well-being of colonists, colonialism in reality diminished the net ‘quantity of happiness’, in his estimation. Advocates of colonial reform in turn reminded ministers that because colonies were in fact ‘part of the metropolis’, the state was responsible for ensuring
happiness in both zones. The geography of happiness, and the happiness entitlement of colonists, thus formed part of the larger debate about the benefits of colonialism.89

The communities of enlightened colonial writers considered here did not doubt that they, and their homelands, were entitled to happiness. Writers from across the colonial world composed treatises, drafted proposals and discussed among themselves the ways in which they might promote félicité publique. The Guatemalan Society insisted that its principal aim, underpinning all its activities, was ‘the happiness of the nation’, by which it meant the kingdom of Guatemala.90 Such organisations were less certain about the happiness entitlement of the ‘workers and black people’ who attracted the attention of breadfruit- and potato-promoters. Did their well-being contribute to the aggregate happiness of Guatemala or India?

Colonial writers equivocated, sometimes insisting, in the words of the Indian Society, that their efforts were directed at augmenting the ‘general happiness’ of native peoples, while at the same time displaying scant interest in matters far more likely to improve well-being than the distribution of seed potatoes. Indeed, the experimental potato-plots of the Calcutta botanic garden were constructed on lands confiscated from locals.91 Ultimately, it was the Society’s well-being that mattered to India’s overall index of happiness, not that of ‘natives’. For these colonial writers, the enthusiastic celebration of nutritious foods was a way of affirming their own place within the geography of happiness, regardless of the practical impact of their gestures of nutritional largesse.

In his writings on population Thomas Malthus insisted that food was closely linked to ‘human happiness’. Colonial spaces, Alison Bashford and Joyce Chaplin have shown, were central to his analysis, because neither Malthus nor his critics believed it was possible to assess the relationship between food, population growth
Breadfruits, potatoes, political economy and happiness were indeed entangled in the enlightened imagination in ways that both reflected and transcended food’s actual ability to nourish. It was perhaps for this reason that posterity’s most famous proponent of the pursuit of happiness, Thomas Jefferson, was so enthusiastic about his own role in disseminating new foodstuffs. Looking back on his contributions to the nation he helped to found, he concluded with satisfaction that his efforts had not been negligible. In his list of achievements he recorded his promotion of new foods, and concluded: ‘the greatest service which can be rendered any country is to add an useful plant to its culture; especially a bread grain’. Jefferson’s comments reflect the wider faith in the transformative effects of new foods on the body politic. These effects were best measured not through actual changes in eating practices, but rather the nation’s quantum of happiness, which was destined to rise even if, through ‘some unaccountable indifference’, these new foods did not enjoy the reception to which their immense nutritional qualities entitled them. The British government’s 2010 embrace of gross national happiness should remind us of the enduring power of these eighteenth-century shell games.
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