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This Element begins by describing T.M. Scanlon's contractualism according to which an action is right when it is authorized by the moral principles no one could reasonably reject. This view has argued to have implausible consequences with regards to how different-sized groups, non-human animals, and limited cognitive human beings should be treated. It has also been accused of being theoretically redundant and unable to vindicate the so-called deontic distinctions. I therefore consider the contractualist framework and Scanlon's version of contractualism. I explain how the general framework enables us to formulate many other versions of contractualist some of which can already be found in the literature. Understanding contractualism in this new way enables us both to understand the structural similarities and differences between different versions of contractualism and also to see the different objections to contractualism as internal debates about which version of contractualism is correct.

The euro crisis, Japan's sluggish economy, and partisan disagreements in the United States about the role of government all have at least one thing in common: worries about high levels of public debt. Nearly everyone agrees that public debt in many advanced economies is too high to be sustainable and must be addressed. There is little agreement, however, about when and how that addressing should be done—or even, in many cases, just how serious the debt problem is. At the former director of the International Monetary Fund's Fiscal Affairs Department, Carlo Cottarelli has helped countries across the globe confront their public finance woes. He also had direct experience in advising his own country, Italy, about its chronic fiscal ailments. In this straightforward, plain-language book, Cottarelli explains how and why excessive public debt can harm economic growth and can lead to crises such as those experienced recently in Italy and several other European countries. But Cottarelli also has some good news: reducing public debt often can be done without trauma and through moderate changes in spending habits that contribute to economic growth. His book focuses on positive remedies that countries can adopt to deal with their public debt, analyzing both the benefits and potential downsides to each approach, as well as suggesting which remedies might be most useful in particular situations. Too often, public debate about public debt is burdened by lies and myths. This book not only explains the basic facts about public debt but also aims to bring truth and reasoned nonpartisan analysis to the debate.

THE SUNDAY TIMES BESTSELLER A beautiful book to connect us after such a challenging time. 'Dark clouds were looming in the distance. We watched them gather, and we wondered when will it come? How long will it last? A monumenal storm brings huge and sudden change. We follow a man and his dog through the uncertainty that it brings to their lives.

Through their eyes, we see the difficulties of being apart, the rollercoaster of emotions that we can all relate to, and the realisation that by pulling together we can move through difficult times with new perspective, hope and an appreciation of what matters most in life. Luke has dedicated the book to his late grandfather, who was a key figure in his life. The main characters are based on his grandfather and his own dog, Robin, who offers a reassuring guide through the challenges of the storm. It's a story with very personal emotion, but one that speaks to us all. 'Though clouds may gather again, and we may see other storms, we have realized most of all that we are stronger facing them together.'

An insight into moral skepticism of the 20th century. The author argues that our every-day moral codes are an 'error theory' based on the presumption of moral facts which, he persuasively argues, don't exist. His refutation of such facts is based on their metaphysical 'queerness' and the observation of cultural relativity. 

Derek Parfit presents the third volume of On What Matters, his landmark work of moral philosophy. Parfit develops further his influential treatment of reasons, normativity, the meaning of moral discourse, and the status of morality. He engages with his critics, and shows the way to resolution of their differences. This volume is partly about what it is for things to matter, in the way that we all have reasons to care about these things. Much of the book discusses three of the main kinds of meta-ethical theory: Normative Naturalism, Quasi-Realist Expressivism, and Non-Metaphysical Non-Naturalism, which Derek Parfit now calls Non-Realist Cognitivism. This third theory claims that, if we use the word 'reality' in a wide sense, including non-natural truths, there are non-metaphysical truths—true, objective, and in a sense, natural—raise no difficult ontological questions. Parfit discusses these theories partly by commenting on the views of some of the contributors to Peter Singer's collection Does Anything Really Matter? Parfit on Objectivity. Though Peter Railton is a Naturalist, he has widened his view by accepting some further claims, and he has suggested that this wider version of Naturalism can be combined with Non-Realist Cognitivism. Parfit argues that Railton is right, since these theories no longer deeply disagree. Though Alan Gibbard is a Quasi-Realist Expressivist, he has suggested that the best version of his view could be combined with Non-Realist Cognitivism. Parfit argues that Gibbard is right, since Gibbard and he now accept the other's main meta-ethical claim. It is rare for three such different philosophical theories to be able to be widened in ways that resolve their deepest disagreements. This happy convergence supports the view that these meta-ethical theories are true. Parfit also discusses the views of several other philosophers, and some other meta-ethical and normative questions.

Inequality is widely regarded as morally objectionable. T.M. Scanlon investigates why it matters to us. He considers the nature and importance of equality of opportunity, whether the pursuit of greater equality involves objectionable interference with individual liberty, and whether the rich can be said to deserve their greater rewards.

This book collects major original essays developed from lectures given at the award of the Lauener Prize 2016 to T. M. Scanlon for his outstanding oeuvre in Analytical philosophy. In “Contractualism and Justification,” Scanlon identifies some difficulties in his theory and explores possible ways to deal with them. In “Improving Scanlon’s Contractualism,” D. Parfit recommends revisions and extensions of Scanlon’s theory, while R. Forst suggests in “Justification Fundamentalism” that Scanlon may want to replace reason with justification as his foundational concept. T. Nagel raises fundamental questions concerning “Moral Reality and Moral Progress,” and S. Mandle offers in “On How to Explain Rational Motivation” a critical discussion of Scanlon’s cognitivist theory of motivation. Z. Stempielowska does the same for Scanlon’s conception of responsibility in “Substantive Responsibility and the Causal Thesis,” and S. Olsaretti suggests...
in "Equality of Opportunity and Justified Inequalities" an alternative to Scanlon's arguments against economic inequalities. All contributors receive extensive replies by Scanlon. For anyone interested in Scanlon's seminal work in moral and political philosophy, the present volume is indispensible.

Michael Sandel's Just Ice: What's the Right Thing to Do? invites readers of all ages and political persuasions on a journey of moral reflection, and shows how reasoned debate can illuminate our lives. Is it always wrong to lie? Should there be limits on painkillers? Is the free market fair? What is the right thing to do? Questions like these are at the heart of our lives. In this acclaimed book Michael Sandel - BBC Reith Lecturer and the Harvard professor whose "Justice" course has become world famous - gives us a lively and accessible introduction to the intersection of politics and philosophy. He helps us think our way through such hotly contested issues as equal rights, democracy, euthanasia, abortion and same-sex marriage, as well as the ethical dilemmas we face every day. One of the most popular teachers in the world, "Observer"'s morally refreshing Michael Sandel transforms moral philosophy by putting it at the heart of civic debate! New Statesman 'One of the world's most interesting political philosophers' Guardian 'Spellbinding' The Nation Michael Sandel is the Anne T. and Robert M. Bass Professor of Government at the University of Harvard. Sandel's legendary 'Justice' course is one of the most popular and influential at Harvard. Sandel is the author of many books and has previously written for the Atlantic Monthly, the New Republic and the New York Times. He was the 2009 BBC Reith Lecturer.

T. M. Scanlon offers a qualified defense of normative cognitivism: the view that there are irreducibly normative truths about reasons for action. He responds to three familiar objections—that such truths would have troubling metaphysical implications; that we would have no way of knowing what they are; and that the role of reasons in motivating and explaining action could not be explained if accepting a conclusion about reasons for action were a kind of belief—and goes on to argue that the method of reflective equilibrium, properly understood, provides an adequate account of how we come to know both normative truths and mathematical truths, and that the idea of a rational agent explains the link between an agent's normative beliefs and his or her actions.

Elmina A. Roberts and David T. Wasserman 1 Purpose of this Collection What are our obligations with respect to persons who have not yet, and may not ever, come into existence? Few of us believe that we can wrong those whom we leave out of existence merely possibly persons. We may think—well that the directive to be "fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth" 1 does not hold up to close scrutiny. How can it be wrong to decline to bring more people into existence? At the same time, we think: we are clearly ob- gaged to treat future persons—persons who don't yet but will exist—in accordance with certain stringent standards. Bringing a person into an existence that is truly awful—can we do it? and so can bringing a person into an existence that is worth having when we had the alternative of bringing that same person into an existence that is substantially better. We may think as well that our obligations with respect to future persons are triggered well before the point at which those persons commence their existence. We think it would be wrong, for example, to choose today to turn the Earth of the future into a miserable place even if the victims of that choice do not yet exist.

With a new foreword by Jonathan Lear 'Remarkably lively and enjoyable! It is a very rich book, containing excellent descriptions of a variety of moral theories, and innumerable and often witty observations on topics encountered on the way.' - Times Literary Supplement Bernard Williams was one of the greatest philosophers of his generation. Ethics and the Limits of Philosophy is not only widely acknowledged to be his most important book, but also hailed a contemporary classic of moral philosophy. Drawing on the ideas of the Greek philosophers, Williams reorients ethics away from a preoccupation with universal moral theories towards "truth, truthfulness and the meaning of an individual life". He explores and reflects upon the most difficult problems in contemporary philosophy and identifies new ideas about central issues such as relativism, objectivity and the possibility of ethical knowledge. This edition also includes a commentary on the text by A. W. Moore. At the time of his death in 2003, Bernard Williams was hailed by the Times as "the outstanding moral philosopher of his age." He taught at the Universities of Cambridge, Berkeley and Oxford and is the author of many influential books, including: "Moral Philosophy"; "Ethics and the Limits of Philosophy"; "A Vindication of the Rights of Woman"; "The Right of Conscience"; "The Right of Conscience"; and "The Right of Conscience".

"Democracy is hard work. It can flourish only when citizens actively participate in the business of collective self-government. Yet political participation gives rise to deep political divides over core political values. In the midst of these divisions, citizens are required to recognize one another as political equals, as fellow participants who are entitled to an equal share of political power. Research shows that political engagement exposes citizens to forces that erode their capacities to regard their political equals as their political equals. In the course of democratic participation, we come to see our opponents as inept and ill-motivated, ultimately unfit for democracy. This tendency is especially pronounced among those who are the most politically active. Democratic citizenship thus can undermine itself. There is a conflict at the heart of democratic citizenship. We must actively pursue justice while at the same time embracing injustice as our equals. Sustaining Democracy navigates this conflict. It begins by exploring partisanship and polarization, the two mechanisms by which citizens come to regard their opponents as unsuited for democracy. It then proposes strategies by which citizens can mitigate these forces without thereby dampening their political commitments. At it turns out, the same forces that lead us to scorn our opponents can also undermine and fracture our political alliance. If we are concerned to further justice, we need to uphold civil relations with our opponents, even when we despise their political views. If we want to preserve our political friendships, we must sustain democracy with our foes."

In this book by the award-winning author of "Justice: Healthcare, Normans Daniels develops a comprehensive theory of justice for health that answers three key questions: what is the special moral importance of health? When are health inequalities unjust? How can we meet health needs fairly when we cannot meet them all? Daniels' theory has implications for national and global health policy: can we meet health needs fairly in ageing societies? Or protect health in the workplace while respecting individual liberty? Or meet professional obligations and obligations of justice without conflict? Each is a question about reducing health disparities, or to set priorities in realising a human right to health,

Highly controversial when it was first published in 1981, A Landlord's A Fifer Virtue has since established itself as a landmark work in contemporary moral philosophy. In this book, McCrone-tyre sought to address a crisis in moral language that he traced back to a European Enlightenment that had made the formulation of moral principles increasingly difficult. In the search for a way out of this impasse, McCrone-tyre returns to an earlier strand of ethical thinking, that of Aristotle, who emphasised the importance of Virtue to the ethical life. More than thirty years after its original publication, A Fifer Virtue remains a work that is impossible to ignore for anyone interested in our understanding of ethics and morality today.

By exploring the ethical differences between humans and animals, A biomakind establishes a middle ground between egalitarianism and outright dismissal of animal rights. A thought-provoking foray into our complex and
contradictory relationship with animals. A advocates that we owe each animal due respect. Offers readers a sensible alternative to extremism by speaking of respect and compassion for animals, not rights. Balances philosophical analysis with intriguing facts engaging tales.

In this remarkable and groundbreaking book, Kenan Malik explores the history of moral thought as it has developed over three millennia, from Homer's Greece to Mao's China, from ancient India to modern America. It tells the stories of the great philosophers and of their ideas, while also challenging many of our most cherished moral beliefs. Engaging and provocative, The Quest for a Moral Compass confronts some of humanity's deepest questions. Where do values come from? Is God necessary for moral guidance? Are there absolute moral truths? It also brings morality down to earth, showing how, throughout history, social needs and political desires have shaped moral thinking. It is a history of the world told through the history of moral thought, and a history of moral thought that casts new light on global history. At a time of great social turbulence and moral uncertainty, there will be few histories more important than this.

This volume provides readers with the state-of-the-art in research on gratitude. It does so in the form of sixteen never-before-published articles on the emotion by leading voices in philosophy and the sciences of the mind.

First Published in 2017. Routledge is an imprint of Taylor & Francis, an Informa company.

Wonderful. You finish the book more alive than ever of the enduring mystery and miracle of that thing that makes us most human’ STEPHEN FRY ‘Most popular books on language dumb down; Shariatmadari’s smartens things up, and is all the more entertaining for it’ THE SUNDAY TIMES, A Book of the Year ‘A meaty, rewarding and necessary read’ GUARDIAN Fascinating and thought-provoking . . . crammed with weird and wonderful facts . . . for anyone who delights in (linguistic) intricacies rewarding to read MAIL ON SUNDAY *** - A word’s origin doesn’t tell you what it means today - There are languages that change when your mother-in-law is present - The language you speak could make you more prone to accidents - There’s a special part of the brain that produces swear words - Taking us on a mind-boggling journey through the science of language, linguist David Shariatmadari uncovers the truth about what we do with words, exploding nine widely-held myths about language while introducing us to some of the fundamental insights of modern linguistics.

Written by one of the founders of modern political philosophy, Thomas Hobbes, during the English civil war, Leviathan is an influential work of nonfiction. Regarded as one of the earliest examples of the social contract theory, Leviathan has both historical and practical importance. Social contract theory prioritizes the state over the individual, claiming that individuals have consented to the surrender of some of their freedoms by participating in society. These surrendered freedoms help ensure that the government can be run easily. In exchange for their sacrifice, the individual is protected and given a place in a steady social order. Articulating this theory, Hobbes argues for a strong, undivided government. To support his argument, Hobbes includes topics of religion, human nature and taxation. Separated into four sections, Hobbes claims his theory to be the resolution of the civil war that raged on as he wrote, creating chaos and taking causalities. The first section, Of Man discusses the role human nature and instinct plays in the formation of government. The second section, Of Commonwealth explains the definition, implications, types, and rules of succession in a commonwealth government. Of a Christian Commonwealth imagines the religious’s role government and societal moral standards. Finally, Hobbes closes his argument with Of the Kingdom of Darkness. Through the use of philosophical theory and historical study, Thomas Hobbes attempts to convince citizens to consider the cost and reward of being governed. Without an understanding of the sociopolitical theories that keep government bodies in power, subjects can easily become complicit or allow society to slip into anarchy. Created during a brutal civil war, Hobbes hoped to educate and persuade his peers. Though Leviathan was a work of controversy in its time, Hobbes’ theories and prose has survived centuries, shaping the ideas of modern philosophy. This edition of Leviathan by Thomas Hobbes is now presented with a stunning new cover design and is printed in an easy-to-read font. With these accommodations, Leviathan is accessible and applicable to contemporary readers.

A compressed, visceral novel about exile, dislocation, and the emotional minefields between mothers and daughters.

Like nature itself, modern economic life is driven by relentless competition and unbridled selfishness. Or is it? Drawing on converging evidence from neuroscience, social science, biology, law, and philosophy, Moral Markets makes the case that modern markets are not just for the most efficient but for the most moral, most of the time, in the sense of virtuous competition and growth. People and values are certainly part of economics, but Moral Markets shows how the rules of market exchange have evolved to promote moral behavior and how exchange itself may make us more virtuous. Examining the biological basis of economic morality, tracing the connections between morality and markets, and exploring the profound implications of both, Moral Markets provides a surprising and fundamentally new view of economics—one that also reconnects the field to Adam Smith’s position that morality has a biological basis. Moral Markets, the result of an extensive collaboration between leading social and natural scientists, includes contributions by neuroeconomist Paul Zak; economists Robert H. Frank, Herbert Gintis, Vernon Smith (winner of the 2002 Nobel Prize in economics), and Bart Wilson; law professors Oliver Goodenough, Erin O’Hara, and Lynn Stout; philosophers William Casebeer and Robert Solomon; primatologists Sarah Brosnan and Frans de Waal; biologists Carl Bangstrom, Ben Kerr, and Peter Richerson; anthropologists Robert Boyd and Michael Lachmann; political scientists Elinor Ostrom and David Schweb; management professor Rakesh Khurana; computational science and informatics doctoral candidate Erik Kimbrough; and business writer Charles Handy.

The Good Place is a fantasy-comedy TV show about the afterlife. Eleanor dies and finds herself in the Good Place, which she understands must be mistake, since she has been anything but good. In the surprise twist ending to Season One, it is revealed that this is really the Bad Place, but the demon who planned it was frustrated, because the characters didn’t torture each other mentally as planned, but managed to learn how to live together. In Season Two, The Good Place and Philosophy, twenty-one philosophers analyze different aspects of the ethical and metaphysical issues raised in the show, including: Is indefinitely long punishment can only be justified as a method of ultimately improving vicious characters, not as retribution? Can individuals retain their identity after hundreds of rebirths? Comparing Hinduism with The Good Place, we can conclude that Hinduism gets things five percent correct. If looking at all the events in the show, it follows that humans don’t have free will, and so people are being punished and rewarded unjustly. Is it a problem that the show depicts torture as hilarious? Is this problem can be resolved by considering the limited perspective of humans, compared with the eternal perspective of the demons? The Good Place implies that even demons can develop morality. The only way to explain how the characters remain the same people after death is to suppose that their actual bodies are transported to the afterlife? Since Chidi knows all the moral theories but can never decide what to do, it must follow that there is something missing in all these theories? The show depicts an afterlife which is bureaucratic, therefore unchangeable, therefore deeply unjust. Eleanor acts on instinct, without thinking, whereas Chidi tries to think everything through and never gets around to acting; together these two characters can truly act morally. The Good Place shows us that authenticity means living for others. The Good Place is based on Sartre’s play No Exit, with its famous line “Hell is other people.” In fact both No Exit and The Good Place inform us that human relationships can redeem us. In The Good Place, everything the humans do is impermanent since it can be rebooted, so humans cannot...
accomplish anything good. ? Kant's moral precepts are supposed to be universal, but The Good Place shows us it can be right to lie to demons. ? The show raises the question whether we can ever be good except by being part of a virtuous community.

"Heart-swelling in its wholesomeness" - Gina Martin "A reminder of the life-changing power of empathy" - Emma Gannon Why are you kind? Could you be kinder? The kindness we owe one another goes far beyond everyday gestures like taking out the neighborhood dog to show them some love. Kindness can also mean much more. In this timely, insightful guide, Henry James Garrett lays out the case for developing a strong, courageous, moral kindness, one that will help you fight cruelty and make the world a more empathetic place. Building on his academic studies in metaethics and using his signature sweet animal cartoons, Henry explores the sources and the limitations of human empathy and the many ways, big and small, that we can work toward being our best and kindest selves. A world in which everyone was the fully-empathetic version of themselves would be a very kind world indeed. And that's the world this book will move us toward.

How do we judge whether an action is morally right or wrong? If an action is wrong, what reason does that give us not to do it? Why should we give such reasons priority over our other concerns and values? In this book, T. M. Scanlon offers new answers to these questions, as they apply to the central part of morality that concerns what we owe to each other. According to his contractualist view, thinking about right and wrong is thinking about what we do in terms that could be justifiably imposed on others. But Scanlon could not reasonably reject. He shows how the special authority of conclusions about right and wrong arises from the value of being related to others in this way, and he shows how familiar moral ideas such as fairness and responsibility can be understood through their role in this process of mutual justification and criticism. Scanlon bases his contractualism on a broader account of reasons, value, and individual well-being that challenges standard views about these crucial notions. He argues that desires do not provide us with reasons, that states of affairs are not the primary bearers of value, and that well-being is not as important for rational decision-making as it is commonly held to be. Scanlon is a pluralist about both moral and non-moral values. He argues that, taking this plurality of values into account, contractualism allows for most of the variability in moral requirements that relativists have claimed, while still accounting for the full force of our judgments of right and wrong.

The fact that we will die, and that our death can come at any time, pervades the entirety of our living. There are many ways to think about and deal with death. A mong those ways, however, a good number of them are attempts to escape its grip. In this book, Todd May seeks to confront death in its power. He considers the possibility that our mortal deaths are the end of us, and that this might mean for our living. What lessons can we draw from our mortality? And how might we live as creatures who die, and who know we are going to die? In answering these questions, May brings together two divergent perspectives on death. The first holds that death is not an evil, or at least that it was far worse than dying. The second holds that death is death is an evil, and that there is no escaping that fact. May shows that, if we are to live with death, we need to think about what we need to hold together. Their convergence yields both a beauty and a tragedy to our living that are inextricably entwined. Drawing on the thoughts of many philosophers and writers - ancient and modern - as well as his own experience, May puts forward a particular view of how we might think about and, more importantly, live our lives in view of the inescapability of our dying. In the end, he argues, it is precisely the contingency of our lives that must be grasped and which must be folded into the hours or years that remain to each of us, so that we can live each moment as though it were at once a link to an uncertain future and yet perhaps the only link we have left.

Human rights are one of the most controversial and widely discussed ideas in contemporary politics, ethics, and law—and one of the most significant contributors to the debate has been James Griffin, formerly White's Professor of Moral Philosophy at the University of Oxford. In his book, On Human Rights, and in other work, Griffin has defended the view that contemporary judicial understandings of human rights rest on an insecure theoretical basis. This has the result that the language of human rights has been over-extended, and consequently has less force where it really matters. On Griffin's view, human rights are best understood as protections of ouragency and personhood, and he argues his case with reference to many real-life human rights cases. This volume collects several of the most significant responses to Griffin by internationally leading moral and political philosophers. It also includes a response by Griffin himself.

Scanlon reframes current philosophical debates as he explores the moral permissibility of an action. Blame, he argues, is a response to the meaning of an action rather than its permissibility. This analysis leads to a novel account of the conditions of moral responsibility and to important conclusions about the ethics of blame.

Five leading moral philosophers assess various aspects of T. M. Scanlon’s moral theory as laid out in his seminal work, What We Owe to Each Other. An assessment of T. M. Scanlon’s seminal work What We Owe to Each Other. Written by five leading moral philosophers. Contributes to debates initiated by Scanlon on value theory, normative ethics, and metaethics. Includes a response by T. M. Scanlon in which he clarifies and develops his views.

The place of religion in society has changed profoundly in the last few centuries, particularly in the West. In what will be a defining book for our time, Taylor takes up the question of what these changes mean, and what, precisely, happens when a society becomes one in which faith is only one human possibility among others.

The Moral Nexus develops and defends a new interpretation of morality—namely, as a set of requirements that connect agents normatively to other persons in a nexus of moral relations. According to this relational interpretation, moral demands are directed to other individuals, who have claims that the agent comply with these demands. Interpersonal morality, so conceived, is the domain of what we owe to each other, insofar as we are each persons with equal moral standing. The book offers an interpretative argument for the relational approach. Specifically, it highlights neglected advantages of this way of understanding the moral domain; explains important theoretical and practical presuppositions of relational moral duties; and considers the normative implications of understanding morality in relational terms. The book features a novel defense of the relational approach to morality, which emphasizes the special significance that moral requirements have, both for agents who are deliberating about what to do and for those who stand to be affected by their actions. The book argues that relational moral requirements can be understood to link us to all individuals whose interests render them vulnerable to our agency, regardless of whether they stand in any prior relationship to us. It also offers fresh accounts of some of the moral phenomena that have seemed to resist treatment in relational terms, showing that the relational interpretation is a viable framework for understanding our specific moral obligations to other people.

From one of the leading policy experts of our time, an urgent rethinking of how we can better support each other to thrive. Whether we realize it or not, all of us participate in the social contract every day through mutual obligations among our family, community, place of work, and fellow citizens. Caring for others, paying taxes, and benefiting from public services define the social contract that supports and binds us together as a society. Today, however, our social contract has been broken by changing gender roles, technology, new models of work, aging, and the perils of climate.
change. Minouche Shafik takes us through stages of life we all experience—raising children, getting educated, falling ill, working, growing old—and shows how a reordering of our societies is possible. Drawing on evidence and examples from around the world, she shows how every country can provide citizens with the basics to have a decent life and be able to contribute to society. But we owe each other more than this. A more generous and inclusive society would also share more risks collectively and ask everyone to contribute for as long as they can so that everyone can fulfill their potential. What We Owe Each Other identifies the key elements of a better social contract that recognizes our interdependencies, supports and invests more in each other, and expects more of individuals in return. Powerful, hopeful, and thought-provoking, What We Owe Each Other provides practical solutions to current challenges and demonstrates how we can build a better society—together.

A look at political ethics covers cruelty, hypocrisy, snobbery, betrayal and misanthropy, and is accompanied by a description of modern public opinion about these vices.

In Dworkin’s master work, the central thesis is that all areas of value depend on one another. This is one, big thing that the hedgehog knows, in contrast to the fox, who knows many little things. Dworkin’s understanding of the relationship—between ethics, morality, and political morality—is significantly revised and also greatly elaborated. He argues that “dignity” is the essential core of living well and that a satisfactory account of dignity would, in turn, point to two principles. The first states that it is objectively important that each person’s life go well; and the second that each person has a special responsibility for identifying what counts as success in his or her own life. Dworkin believes that values cohere and that in order to defend that coherence he has to take up a broad variety of philosophical issues that are not normally treated in one book. He discusses the metaphysics of value, the character of truth, the nature of interpretation, the conditions of agreement and disagreement, the phenomenon of moral responsibility and the problem of free will as well as more substantive issues of ethical, moral and legal theory.

“A cross the world, cities and regions have wasted trillions of dollars on blindly copying the Silicon Valley model of growth creation. We have lived with this system for decades, and the result is clear: a small number of regions and cities at the top of the high-tech industry but many more fighting a losing battle to retain economic dynamism. But, as this books details, there are other models for innovation-based growth that don’t rely on a flourishing high-tech industry. It argues that the purveyors of the dominant ideas on innovation have a feeble understanding of the big picture on global production and innovation. They confute innovation with invention and suffer from techno-fetishism. In their devotion to start-ups, they refuse to admit that the real obstacle to growth for most cities is the overwhelming power of the real hubs, which siphon up vast amounts of talent and money. Communities waste time, money, and energy pursuing this road to nowhere. Instead Breznitz proposes that communities focus on where they fit within the four stages in the global production process. Success lies in understanding the changed structure of the global system of production and then using those insights to enable communities to recognize their own advantages, which in turn allows to them to foster surprising forms of specialized innovation. All localities have certain advantages relative to at least one stage of the global production process, and the trick is in recognizing it.”

In this book, acclaimed economist Herbert Gintis ranges widely across many fields— including economics, psychology, anthropology, sociology, moral philosophy, and biology—to provide a rigorous transdisciplinary explanation of some fundamental characteristics of human societies and social behavior. Because such behavior can be understood only through transdisciplinary research, Gintis argues, Individuality and Entanglement advances the effort to unify the behavioral sciences by developing a shared analytical framework— one that bridges research on gene-culture coevolution, the rational-actor model, game theory, and complexity theory. At the same time, the book persuasively demonstrates the rich possibilities of such transdisciplinary work. Everything distinctive about human social life, Gintis argues, flows from the fact that we construct and then play social games. Indeed, society itself is a game with rules, and politics is the arena in which we affirm and change these rules. Individuality is central to our species because the rules do not change through inexorable macrosocial forces. Rather, individuals band together to change the rules. Our minds are also socially entangled, producing behavior that is socially rational, although it violates the standard rules of individually rational choice. Finally, a moral sense is essential for playing games with socially constructed rules. People generally play by the rules, are ashamed when they break the rules, and are offended when others break the rules, even in societies that lack laws, government, and jails. Throughout the book, Gintis shows that it is only by bringing together the behavioral sciences that such basic aspects of human behavior can be understood.
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