

School must now take up the great heritage of Maynard Keynes and Piero Sraffa, carried on to a considerable extent, by Luigi Pasinetti and Pierangelo Garegnani, to work out a classical-Keynesian system of political economy in opposition to Walrasian-Marshallian neoclassical economics. The volume by Mauro Baranzini and Amalia Mirante provides a precious tool to coordinate this crucially important undertaking.

Heinrich Bortis
University of Fribourg, Switzerland
heinrich.bortis@unifr.ch

GILLES CAMPAGNOLO, JEAN-SÉBASTIEN GHARBI (eds.), *Philosophie Économique, un État des lieux*, Paris, Éditions Matériologiques, Collection E-conomique, 2017. Pp. 650. € 38.00. ISBN: 978-2-37361-057-4.

The Éditions Matériologiques of Paris have published an ambitious book edited by Gilles Campagnolo and Jean-Sébastien Gharbi on *Economic Philosophy*. It is written in French, which fortunately still is an international language for learned persons. The two editors have collected, accurately assembled and intelligently presented the subject and the contributions to the third international conference on economic philosophy held in Aix-en-Provence, June 2016. Although being a collected book, this work achieves an excellent coherence and thoroughfulness thanks to both the excellence of the single papers and the balanced coordination of the collected matters. For this reason, it is worth having this book for research in both economic philosophy and the advanced studies of each of the subjects presented in the various chapters.

The first issue discussed in the opening essay written by the editors is the meaning of the label *economic philosophy*. Economic theory does not involve methodological problems only, but it also implies some ethical, epistemological and ontological issues that can be competently studied only by the means of some philosophical competences. *Economic philosophy* is in this way defined as the reflexive approach in the field of interaction between philosophy and economics (p. 4). The editors would like to avoid any application of philosophy to economics or *vice versa*. It is different from the the English “economics and philosophy” where “and” is not a logical symbol of intersection \cap nor a unity \cup . This subject is neither the philosophy of science applied to economics. In the Anglo-Saxon world the term *economic methodology* is used as a broad category including philosophical research while *epistemology* is referred to the theory of knowledge. Both have difficulties to express *economic philosophy*. The editors also reject the idea of a *philosophical economics* which simply refers to the use of specific conceptual tools. Consequently, *economic philosophy* is seen as an open field of research studying the ethical, epistemological and ontological assumptions of economic theories by analysing the core of their reasoning. These

assumptions make theories particularly fit to study certain aspects of the economy and incomparable to other theories.

Often, economists relying on the positivist view of their field divide theories between positive and normative, simplifying a whole world of dimensions that make theorizing quite complex. The hope of positivists is that maths could avoid any value judgement, but they forget that also mathematics is embedded in philosophical dimensions. *Economic philosophy* aims at bringing forth and analysing the values and pre-judgements of theories instead of denying them. Economics studies a dimension of man in society and has to acknowledge its consubstantial relationship to values (p.21). The isolation of facts from the background of reality is a complex process implying some social dimension and depending on some values. All theoretical choices have some intrinsic ethic, epistemological and ontological implication. Consequently, by bringing forth these dimensions, *economic philosophy* is inherently critical and it can highlight some good or bad use of reason.

Economic philosophy is not the history of economic thought, but it can be a constitutive part of it if historians highlight the philosophical implications of theories. Moreover, it is difficult to perform *economic philosophy* without referring to the history of thought. That notwithstanding, this discipline tends to focus on contemporary issues. The editors underline the existence of a French tradition in this discipline, which is helped by the structure of the language. The adoption of English as the single language of science is a danger from this perspective as it tends to shape concepts in a specific tradition of thought. A plurality of languages helps keeping a certain pluralism in terms of philosophical approaches.

The recent French studies on economic philosophy owe much to Leroux, Marciano and Livet (see references) who proposed three main areas of contact between economics and philosophy: political economy and social philosophy, normative economics and moral philosophy, economics and philosophy of science. However, this tripartition can be enriched by more specific fields.

The volume is divided in three main parts. The first deals with the interaction of political economy with moral and political philosophy and includes five essays. Catherine Audard discusses the utilitarian conception of the person and of the economic agent by reviewing the work of John Rawls. Among the various concepts discussed, Audard includes the idea of “democracy of owners” which is said being inspired by the work of James Meade. The latter aimed at achieving a dispersed property of capital by the means of fiscal measures. This idea is related to *justice as fairness* proposed by Rawls. Above all, Audard discusses the various morals that may rule an economic constitution, showing the advantages of the consequentialist. Antoinette Baujard presents a complete critical review of welfare economics. This is a well structured and complete presentation of the subject and of all moral implications of the interpersonal utility comparison and of the various ways of conceiving and aggregating preferences. Claude Gamel criticizes liberal egalitarianism and the interaction between political and economic liberalism. Neoliberalism is compared to liberal egalitarianism and the

debates around the question “equality of what?” are reviewed and rationalized. Jean Magnan de Bornier presents a noteworthy essay on the economic philosophy of property. He affirms that in this field of inquiry it is difficult to outline the limits between philosophy of law and economic philosophy for how much property theory jointly relies on them (p. 181). The author begins with Thomas Aquinas, continues with theories of natural rights (Grotius and Pufendorf) and Jean-Jacques Rousseau. Then he particularly develops Locke’s idea of *property in his own person*, which is said to be the last act of the dual theory of property as well as its end. Proudhon is included in the critical descendants of Locke. Then the utilitarian theories are discussed, from Hume to Coase. Some alternative approach is presented, as Destutt de Tracy and Veblen. Finally, Magnan de Bornier concludes with the issues introduced by intellectual property. Danielle Zwarthoed analyses intergenerational justice in a very systematic and complete essay. This first part of the volume is particularly worth to post-graduate students as well as to those aiming to have a systematic review of disciplines and their debates as it presents the subjects in a very complete and well organized way.

The second part of the volume deals with economic epistemology and methodology. These essays are not conceived as critical reviews but as specific developments of each issue. Ricardo Crespo discusses the Aristotelian *oikonomike*, of which he is one of the maximum experts and disseminators. The essay begins with a definition of economics in Aristotle and continues with a structuration of the relationship between economics and ethics in the *practical philosophy* characterising this kind study of the economy. The author discusses the epistemological consequences of the Aristotelian approach and concludes on the ethical and political nature of economics. Pierre Livet (one of the fathers of this discipline) discusses the ontology of economics. Bernard Walliser reviews the issues of the scientific method and modes of reasoning. Yves Meinard discusses biodiversity as a theme of economic philosophy. Denis Phan and Franck Varenne propose a thorough reasoning on the agent-based simulations.

The third part of the book put together papers of philosophy of action and decision theory. Mikaël Cozic discusses the role of psychology in the neoclassical theory of consumer. This is again an outstanding critical review of the variable conceptualizations of preferences. Maurice Lagueux proposes an inquiry on the rationality of economic agents. Cyril Hédoin studies the implications of game theory applied to the theory of institutions. Emmanuel Picavet investigates the status of norms in economic philosophy. This author develops the interesting theme of the relationship between value judgements and fact judgements relatively to norms of behaviour. Finally, Christian Walter proposes an inquiry on the philosophy of finance with a specific focus on the implications of markets’ informational efficiency.

In conclusion, although this work has been rapidly assembled after the Aix conference, it displays a high quality of contributions showing both the high level reached by this field of study and the usefulness of this kind of inquiry, which contributes to a more aware use of theories (lacking in many prominent

economists). Therefore, this is a volume worth having also for those not strictly interested in philosophy.

Stefano Solari
University of Padua
stefano.solari@unipd.it

References

- Leroux A., A. Marciano (1998). *La Philosophie Économique*, Paris, PUF.
Leroux A., P. Livet (eds.) (2005). *Lecons de Philosophie Économique*, Paris, Economica.

MARKUS K. BRUNNERMEIER, HAROLD JAMES, JEAN-PIERRE LANDAU, *The Euro and the Battle of Ideas*, Princeton and Oxford, Princeton University Press, 2017. Pp.448. \$ 35.00. ISBN: 978-0-6911-7292-7.

One of the most relevant battlefield of economic ideas in the last two decades concerns the single currency in Europe. Powerful and very diverse ideas have influenced the way it was conceived, implemented, managed, criticized. Surprisingly, this has nevertheless not given rise to any comprehensive reflection on the specific theoretical views that inspired the supporters and critics of the euro, as well as the current structure of European economic governance. The aim of the volume written by Brunnermeier, James and Landau is to try and fill this still existing gap; and it provides interesting insights into this issue.

The leading (but eventually misleading, in my opinion, as I shall illustrate) theme of their narrative is the dramatic divide between the French and the German views of economics and the role of public authorities in the operation of the market. The book clearly illustrates the debates dating back to the early construction of the euro (but they could have gone much further back, maybe until the very birth of the European integration project) showing each relevant episode of the history of European monetary integration as the clash (and compromise) between these two (small) titans.

A clash which changed in time, according to power shifts, as it is convincingly recalled in the book. The authors observe that several major “power shifts” took place at the end of the Eighties, during the Nineties, and in the last few years.

One of the main debates that the authors single out concerning the structure of the European Union is between a “federal” model, allegedly supported by Germany, and a “centralized” model supported by France. This reminds of the old quarrel between France and Germany as concerns and “economist” or a “monetarist” approach to monetary integration in the Seventies. We recall that an “economist” vision implied an ex-ante macroeconomic convergence, before proceeding towards monetary unification (suggesting a decentralized “federal” model of economic governance), and this was attributed to Germany. France, on the contrary, took a “monetarist” stance, implying that money comes first (suggesting a preference for a centralized model), and convergence would follow.