"primarily, a duty to avoid taking advantage of people in developing countries" (1). In such situations, people in developed nations treat people in developing nations with inadequate regard for the equal moral importance of their interests, taking advantage of their bargaining weaknesses due to desperate neediness. One of Miller's core examples is a case involving Chinese leather workers. Miller rightly claims that the fact that the workers are made better off than they would be without the work, voluntarily accept employment, and report satisfaction with their lives does not mitigate the moral wrong of the exploitative arrangement between manufacturers and laborers.

Miller's focus on exploitation has great intuitive appeal. But Miller's discussion leaves some unanswered questions. It seems plausible that once the basic needs of the leather workers are met they are not being exploited in a morally objectionable way just by being made to do something they would not do if they were not in a (relatively) weak bargaining position. This view is at least suggested by Miller's characterization of the leather workers' situation as "stultifying" (64), and his claim that improving wages and working conditions would avoid the wrongdoing of exploitation. If Miller has a basic-needs threshold beyond which exploitation as he defines it is not morally objectionable, then clearly much hinges on how robust a conception of "basic needs" Miller has in mind.

Miller's *Globalizing Justice* is an important contribution to thought about transnational justice. The book's combination of fresh, compelling theoretical argument and deep engagement in the realities of global political and economic life are a paradigm for philosophical work on this subject, and indeed for applied ethics in general.

–Benjamin Rossi
University of Notre Dame

THE POWER OF POLITICAL ECONOMY

Sophus A. Reinert: *Translating Empire: Emulation and the Origins of Political Economy.* (Harvard University Press, 2011. Pp. 438.)

doi:10.1017/S0034670512000691

To rise to power through emulation, one must grasp the principles at the origins of the admired power: knowledge is necessary for successful imitation. When the formidable economic success of England came to be codified in political economy, European nations yearned to acquire such powerful knowledge. Emulation thus took the form of translations, the necessary step toward the appropriation of the original. Following the path of this

emulation across Europe, *Translating Empire* traces a novel history of the origins and institutionalization of political economy. Rejecting the "historiography of political economy invented retroactively in Britain in the second half of the nineteenth century" (3), the book takes issue with its portrait of the birth of political economy as the scholarly accomplishment of a few distinguished theorists laying out the doctrines of *doux commerce* and free trade. Instead, by showing the influence of a forgotten and seemingly minor book by a merchant from Bristol and its subsequent translations across Europe, Reinert argues that the new science of trade arose in England as a practical instrument of conquest codifying the way to "give laws" to other nations and that it was then disseminated through the repeated efforts of European nations to emulate England's wealth.

Reinert's book thus seeks to debunk two myths: first, the supposed role of laissez-faire economics in England's success, and, second, the idea that commerce was a peaceful activity replacing conquest. Instead, emphasizing the context of British imperialism and European rivalries, he argues that substantial government interventions in stimulating industrial activities were foundational to political economy and that the intentions of this new science of trade were clearly nationalistic, bellicose, and imperialist. Reinert also takes issue with two methodological tendencies in the scholarship: following the canon of established "classical economists" and studying national traditions independently from one another. The originality of Reinert's book lies in his alternative strategy: to focus on the comparative study of a minor yet deeply influential figure. The reader is introduced to John Cary's neglected *Essay on the State of England* (1695) as the central piece laying out the principles of an English science of trade. Reinert then argues that studying the multiple cumulative translations and adaptations of this book in the eighteenth century across France, Italy, and Germany would help us understand the displacements of the emerging science of political economy. *Translatio studii* and *translatio imperii* are indissociable. Following the flow of translations of the foundational books of political economy is thus tracing the displacements of power, sought by Europeans who tried to emulate the formidable economic—and therefore political—success of England by studying political economy as the art to gain such power. Through his study of the flow of economic translations, Reinert proposes an original path to understand the codification of political economy in an international context.

The first chapter lays the conceptual and methodological foundations of the book by studying "emulation" and justifying the focus on translation. Trade emerged as a powerful instrument of domination, allowing the commercially aggressive nations to "give laws" to other nations. Reinert shows how international trade thus became an aspect of statecraft: success in trade and wealth appeared as keys to domestic freedom and political hegemony. The second part of the chapter analyzes a data set of early modern economic translations between different European languages (from 1500 to 1848) in light of markers of economic development. While the author acknowledges the

incompleteness of his data, he argues that the neglected study of economic texts in translation transforms our perception of the history of political economy by shedding light on forgotten books such as Cary's, which were the ones that had a lasting influence on economic strategies in Europe.

Much of the book's argument relies on the importance of the *Essay on the State of England* in codifying the successful commercial practices explaining the economic success of England. Taking its source in Cary's experience as a merchant, the *Essay* offers "the principles of all [English] trade," an endeavor necessary for the "publick good," which is the protection of the "Protestant interest in Europe" (79). Never leaving the practical world of merchants, the *Essay* nonetheless has a main theoretical point: the government should encourage domestic manufacturing, while colonies must provide raw materials necessary for such industrial development. While Reinert notes that Cary had a few notable supporters such as John Locke, he aims to show the intrinsic interest of Cary's own position independently of the support from more famous figures. Cary supported high wages as he thought technological progress rather than pressure on wages was the key to competiveness. He argued that through the use of targeted tariffs, the maintenance of a powerful navy, and encouragement to manufacture and technological inventions, the government could realize its imperialist policy and become both economically and politically powerful. Cary's book endorsed a mixture of economic and military principles illustrating Reinert's thesis that the science of commerce was a bellicose science.

Cary's insights into the relation between government intervention and the production of wealth proved influential beyond England. In the remainder of the book, we follow the history of their dissemination across Europe. Reinert shows how Cary's book kept growing in size as translators adapted and transformed the original to meet the specific features of their national circumstances, excising unwanted elements (such as anti-Catholicism in the French version and more generally Cary's interest in the Irish question) or adding concerns unknown to the English (such as the fear of decline in Italy). Reinert analyzes each of these translations in France, Italy, and Germany, showing how they shed light on the economic development of these countries as they tried to counter economic decline. Ultimately, the book shows how the instruments used by an imperialist England served an emancipatory role when Argentina and the United States came to use them in turn to encourage their own domestic industry. Knowing the sources of economic power became a tool to fight back against imperialist nations.

Reinert's book is remarkable for its density, erudition, and ambition. Following the fate of Cary's book in translations, Reinert traces the landscape of political economy as an emerging science across Europe in the long eighteenth century, revisiting the scholarship on many thinkers such as Melon, Hume, Gournay, and the Cameralists. The book combines original research and methodology with historical breadth and depth. One might object that some chapters oscillate uneasily in the tension between the analysis of these

forgotten translations and a larger overview of political economy in national traditions. Moreover, some of the theses contested here (the predominance of *doux commerce* and free trade at the birth of political economy) have already been challenged in recent scholarship. Yet it remains true that *Translating Empire* is an impressive and original piece of scholarship opening new paths in the study of the history of political economy.

–Geneviève Rousselière
University of Chicago

SCIENCE GUIDED BY HERESY

Arthur Pontynen and Rod Miller: *Western Culture at the American Crossroads: Conflicts over the Nature of Science and Reason*. (Wilmington, DE: ISI Books, 2011. Pp. xiv, 411.)

doi:10.1017/S0034670512000708

The full title of Arthur Pontynen and Rod Miller's book *Western Culture at the American Crossroads: Conflicts over the Nature of Science and Reason* indicates how far from their own field of art history they range in this ambitious study. For them the fundamental problem with what they call "modernist-postmodernist" (5) culture is its "denial of Being as such" (7). Acknowledging the value of the critiques of conservative thinkers such as "Henry and Brooks Adams, George Santayana, Paul Elmer Moore [sic], Royal Cortissoz, Irving Babbitt, Russell Kirk, Richard Weaver, and others," Pontynen and Miller nevertheless insist that their arguments "were typically denied the success they deserved because of the untouched dominance of science as *scientism*" (41). It is not enough, Pontynen and Miller argue, to merely reject attempts to expand the authority of natural sciences such as physics and chemistry beyond their particular fields into questions of morality and ultimate reality while accepting their findings in physics and chemistry. The authors go further, asserting the contemporary validity of a physics that would provide, for example, "a scientific understanding of gravity as the impulse towards completion as an act of cosmic love" (11).

Pontynen and Miller state that the "foundational principle" of the science they endorse is not restricted to Christianity alone: "Greek, Jew and Christian accept the foundational principle that ultimately the universe is informed by purpose and obtaining glimpses of that purpose is the role of science and reason" (24). It appears, however, that only Christian theology can provide the proper framework for the kind of "moral" physics they call for: "The Trinitarian reconciliation of eternal Truth with temporal material existence is grounded in a qualitative, indeed moral, conception of physics. It is Incarnational and Trinitarian" (138). In particular, they endorse "the