

# *The European Legacy*



## TOWARD NEW PARADIGMS

“Boundless Compassion”: The Contemporary Relevance of Schopenhauer’s Ethics

*Michael Allen Fox*



From Counterterrorism to Resilience

*Jon Coaffee*



Foundations of Tolerance in Turkish Culture

*Osman Sezgin and Ramazan Biçer*



*Deeper Than Reason* Makes a Lot of Sense

*Jonathan Inbar*

Descartes's background, the Meditator's condition and some basic epistemological issues and terminology. She avoids referring to the narrator as Descartes. Instead, she uses the term Meditator because she claims it is questionable whether Descartes is describing events as they actually occurred, and because the point of the *Meditations on First Philosophy* is for the reader to undergo the philosophical journey. As a result of this convention, she uses either the male or female pronouns in alternating chapters to refer to the Meditator, suggesting that anyone can occupy the place of the Meditator. While her reasons for using these devices are both philosophically and literarily sound, had she tried using the first person she would have pulled the reader into the philosophical journey even more.

Wilson analyzes *Meditations One* and *Five* in separate chapters and devotes two chapters to each of the *Meditations Two*, *Three*, *Four*, and *Six*. At the end of each chapter she discusses some of the objections raised by Gassendi and others to the *Meditations*, which Descartes added to the later editions of the book. In the final chapter, Wilson offers historical information on Descartes and examines the Cartesian legacy in its immediate aftermath, its impact on modern philosophy and its lasting effect on contemporary issues in analytic philosophy.

As someone who has read and taught Descartes for years, I found *Descartes's Meditation* to be a clear and distinct analysis. Anyone interested in Descartes would benefit from Wilson's book. However, the reader should not expect it to break any new ground or to provide new insights on Cartesian scholarship, but, as stated, this was not Wilson's purpose.

RICHARD FINDLER  
Slippery Rock University, USA

**Making Globalization Good: The Moral Challenges of Global Capitalism.** Edited by John H. Dunning (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), xiii + 385 pp. £18.99 paper.

*Making Globalization Good* brings together a number of significant essays by well-known writers. Despite the variety of perspectives, and the fact that several of the chapters express

divergent (and perhaps incompatible) prognoses, the text is well integrated and well edited. The foreword by the Prince of Wales reminds us of the historical role of the monarchy in seeking to tame and control the vicissitudes of unfettered capitalism—but it also reminds us that it has failed to do so, and that the issue of world development and democratization is as much political and social as it is economic. The moral man cannot escape from the socio-political-economic realm into which he was born.

Part 1, with essays by John H. Dunning, Deepak Lal, Alan Hamlin, Joseph Stiglitz, and Jack N. Behrman, discusses the necessary role of ethics and morality in international institutions and in the highly competitive and cutthroat world of global capitalism. In chapter 4, Joseph Stiglitz, for example, argues for a new approach to development, one that breaks the clichés of the neo-liberal “Washington consensus” with its excessive emphasis on efficiency and the marketization of all facets of society. He argues that development must be intertwined with political and social transformation.

Part 2 presents the differing Christian, Islamic, and Jewish perspectives on global capitalism and globalization, as well as those of eastern religions such as Buddhism, in essays by Hans Küng, Brian Griffiths, Khurshid Ahmad, Jonathan Sacks, and David R. Loy. These represent excellent, richly rewarding, general overviews, but they can still be criticized for their tendency toward idealization: the views expressed tend to be those of the religions in their ideal forms and thus not necessarily as religious activists may present them in their actual existential, social and political contexts.

Part 3, which features essays by Michael Novak, Richard Falk, Robert Davies, Gordon Brown, Shirley Williams, and John H. Dunning, makes some tentative stabs at prognosis, discussing the increasing need to incorporate the views and political pressures of global civil society and world public opinion in corporate and international institutional decision-making.

Michael Novak's essay in chapter 11 examines the crisis in “moral ecology,” which he eloquently defines as the “ideas, narratives, institutions, associations, symbol systems, prevailing opinions and practices, and local

dispensers of shame and praise—that teach us the habits necessary for human flourishing and support us in their practice” (259). In seeking to re-invigorate St. Augustine’s vision of a new *Caritapolis* (city of communion between man and man, man and god), Novak argues that the processes of globalization and human interconnectedness now require more than a balance of power based on fear, and that toleration itself is not sufficient. What is needed is respect and friendship, along the lines outlined by the Quaker William Penn, in finding a way to cooperate in an increasingly interconnected world.

Richard Falk then points out in his essay in chapter 12 that the distinction between globalization from above and from below is not intended to examine globalization from a hierarchical and dualistic moralistic perspective that regards *globalization-from-below* as necessarily “good” and *globalization-from-above* as “evil.” Falk succinctly argues:

there is no illusion that the social forces emanating from global civil society are inherently benevolent, while those from the corporate/statist collaboration are necessarily malevolent. . . . One of the contentions of the chapter is that there are dangerous chauvinistic and extremist societal energies being released by one series of ultra-nationalist responses to *globalization-from-above* that are threatening the side of the evolution of an anarchic society of states in the cumulative direction of humane governance. . . . [and] that there are strong positive effects and potentialities arising from the various aspects of *globalization-from-above*. At the same time, the historic role of *globalization-from-below* is to challenge, resist, and transform the negative features of *globalization-from-above*, both by providing alternative ideological and political space to that currently occupied by market-oriented and *statist* outlooks and by offering opposition to the excesses and distortions that can be properly attributed to globalization in its current phase (285).

Falk thus sees the possibility, despite significant, if not violent, disputes among civil society movements, for global civil society movements to become positive agents for alternative political change, as compared to largely outmoded socialist political parties and organized labor (elements of the former industrial economy), which he believes should ally themselves to a larger oppositional civil society

movement, in what he calls, “*globalization-from-below* and allies” (286).

Some of the problems raised by *globalization-from-above* are then addressed by Robert Davies in chapter 13 on the emerging corporate responsibility movement. His argument is that there is no such thing as “values free” business; thus, it is in the enlightened self-interest of corporations to encourage social and political development. In this regard, education, for example, is in the interest of business and makes for better-qualified workers; likewise, development feeds mouths and opens new markets and consumer demand.

It is also clear that calls for a “Marshall plan” for world development represent yet another shibboleth. A Marshall Plan has been called for in nearly every major crisis in the post-Cold War era, from reconstructing the Soviet Union after its collapse to aiding Iraq after US intervention (then for Asia after the Tsunami and for New Orleans after Hurricane Katrina). Yet Shirley Williams’s argument in chapter 15 does not represent yet another plea for more aid from the rich to the poor, but rather a call to establish a multilateral cooperative framework similar to that initially established by the Marshall Plan through the OEEC/OECD. Williams’s chapter recognizes that the key dilemma is that capital is free and mobile, while trade is not entirely free and reciprocal, and that labor will show up at the doorsteps of the developed world whether it wants it or not—unless capital can be redirected to regions that really need it.

In the final chapter, John H. Dunning critically summarizes the key points raised by each of the chapters; he engages in a quest for ways to upgrade moral standards in the behavior of corporations, civil society, states and governments, religious organizations, and individuals. In the section entitled “The Prerequisites for Action,” Dunning emphasizes the prerequisites that must be met before positive action is taken (real dissatisfaction with the status quo of moral ecology, a vision to achieve socially responsible and morally acceptable standards, resources to achieve those standards, and a will to take desired action) as outlined by Jack Behrman in chapter 5. Adding to the latter, Dunning stresses the need for global cooperation to make the appropriate enforcement mechanisms available. He then points out the key positive triggers,

as developed by Richard Davies in chapter 13, that might cause businesses (involving pressures to regulate dubious accounting practices, loss of reputation for firms engaged in such practices, social pressures against corrupt practices, the impact of shocks and crises) to actually attempt to upgrade moral standards, and thus to realize their *enlightened* self-interest.

The question, however, remains to what extent corporations and state leaderships can see beyond what they believe to be their immediate interests, and look at more *long-term* concerns, which can be regarded as *enlightened* self-interest. To what extent can effective national or international government really attempt to eliminate corruption? To what extent can an essentially anarchic and hierarchical territorial state system—in which a few highly developed states tower over the vast majority, and in which the *structural* gaps among classes both between and within the more developed and “developing” states appear to be widening—truly organize resources to assist development, thus directing capital and moving labor to regions where it is truly needed? While global civic organizations can press for change from below, is it at all possible for *enlightened* international and corporate leadership to implement a system of global governance and international *dirigisme* that seeks to better influence the direction of long-term state and corporate decision-making toward systems of sustainable development?

Moreover, these latter questions, which focus on international political economy, tend to overlook the additional issues raised by the geopolitics and geostrategy of the major territorial states that have not yet given up their power to influence their general populations in support of state directives. From a historical perspective, civil society movements have rarely been able to unify across borders; efforts of both international civil society movements and international labor unions (which were, in turn, countered by nationalist or pan-nationalist civil movements) were unable to prevent the geopolitical rivalries that led to World War I, for example. Whether the world can enter into a qualitatively different era, in which both corporations and states recognize their enlightened self-interest, accordingly remains to be seen.

The above questions may remain open, but the book, *Making Globalization Good*, points in the right direction.

HALL GARDNER

*American University of Paris, France*

**Xenophon's Socratic Discourse: An Interpretation of the *Oeconomicus*.** By Leo Strauss (South Bend, IN: St. Augustine's Press, 2004), xviii + 211 pp. \$19.95 paper.

The current revival of interest in the ideas of Leo Strauss (1899–1973) has undoubtedly played a role in the reissuing of his commentary on Xenophon's *Oeconomicus*. As Christopher Bruell observes in his foreword, Strauss considered his scholarship on Xenophon (which also includes commentaries on the *Hiero* and the *Memorabilia*) as his best work. Why did Strauss lament the fact that his age “is surely blind to the greatness of Xenophon” (84)?

It is intriguing that Strauss wrote an extensive commentary on a work that is more concerned with the economics of farming than with politics, the latter being his typical focus. Yet Strauss shows that there is more to the *Oeconomicus* than meets the eye. This work contains two dialogues, both of which concern the meaning of the “gentleman,” or the best manager of one's estate. Socrates, with his characteristic irony, seeks to know what it means to be a farmer, and, accordingly, a gentleman. For a gentleman must be wealthy as well as a virtuous leader. Since he has no wealth or knowledge of wealth creation, Socrates dialogues, first, with Kritobulos, a young farmer with aspirations to become rich. Like all of Socrates' interlocutors, Kritobulos believes that he already knows enough (about wealth acquisition) and proceeds to instruct Socrates. By the end of the first dialogue, Socrates has shown that his young friend, who has a low reward–punishment understanding of ethics, needs further instruction. Socrates recounts for Kritobulos' benefit an earlier dialogue with an older and more established farmer, Ischomachus. Unlike Kritobulos, Ischomachus has a wide experience and knowledge of the marketplace. While Ischomachus sometimes embraces a low calculative ethics, he ultimately understands (with the cajoling