

In 1982, we are told in an interesting aside, Clark Kerr, former chancellor of the University of California, made the statement, "Among the eighty-five institutions in the Western world established by 1520 that still exist in recognizable form are the Catholic Church, the British Parliament and seventy universities. The seventy universities were still in the same location, pursuing their eternal themes of teaching, scholarship and service."

By the twenty-first century, "the university" had become "the multiversity," with no guarantee that even a Ph.D. had ever encountered a course in philosophy or theology or even history, usually regarded as the source of wisdom. Another datum: a recent study of higher education in the United States identifies fifty or so elite universities, and 200 "high" or "very high" research centers, whose numbers constitute 4.4 percent of America's research centers. Axtell never passes a moral judgment, but leaves the reader with plenty of data to make his own.—Jude P. Dougherty, *The Catholic University of America*

CARSON, Thomas L. *Lincoln's Ethics*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015. 427 pp. Paper, \$32.99—This is a fine-meshed book on Lincoln, very thoroughly researched, sparkling with hundreds of Lincoln's own sentences. It is mainly organized around familiar charges brought against Lincoln. In other passages, the author himself probes Lincoln quite severely. The book often bears the mark of good historical writing, wed to the strengths of a learned political philosopher.

Carson divides his book into two parts, the first on the ethics of Lincoln the political leader and commander-in-chief. Here he devotes five long chapters to Lincoln's preoccupation with the most profound ethical dilemmas of his time, such as slavery, race, and the question of whether the Union had a just cause for fighting the Civil War. Carson also adds a quite original discussion of "Moral Bad Luck" and "Moral Good Luck." It was bad luck, for instance, that Lincoln lived during a time of deeply ingrained bad feelings against blacks.

Part two, of equal length, also consists of five chapters, which cover Lincoln's virtues, salient features of his character and personality, and his star-crossed family life. Then follows the very long fourth chapter, "Was Lincoln a Racist?" Then the book's conclusion.

Carson closes the book with a summary passage on Lincoln from W. E. B. Du Bois: "I personally revere him the more because out of his contradictions and inconsistencies he fought his way to the pinnacles of earth and the fight was within as well as without. . . . The scars and foibles and contradictions of the Great do not diminish but enhance the meaning of their upward struggle." Du Bois closed by calling Abraham Lincoln "a Prince of men." But before this conclusion, Carson distinguishes many

different kinds of racism and shows how many of them Lincoln manifested, and some few he did not.

Lincoln's dilemma was how to achieve two seemingly contrary ends at once: to end slavery and to keep the Union together. For most of his career, Lincoln refused to announce himself an abolitionist. He calculated that to do so would throw several key states into the Confederate camp. Further, Lincoln calculated that if slavery could be kept out of the West and the Middle West, the electoral power of the free states would over time put the institution of slavery on the road to extinction. On the first calculation, Lincoln was almost certainly correct; on the second, certainly so.

Following Lincoln's line of thought, we today can pose a counterfactual: suppose that the Southern states had triumphed, and the Union had dissolved into two separate states (or even four). In that case, would the Allies have been able to defeat the Kaiser in World War I, the Fascist nations in World War II in 1945, and international Communism in 1989? As events played out, Lincoln's reasoning did result in saving the Union, ending slavery in the United States, and helping some hundred nations in the twentieth century gain their freedom and independence.

The two most gripping sections of the book, however, consider these questions: did Lincoln have to go beyond utilitarianism to find slavery wrong; and what is racism, and in what sense and to what degree can Lincoln today be called a racist? Carson is very good on all his distinctions here.

On the other hand, Lincoln probably never read either Bentham or Mill, so Carson's use of the term "utilitarianism" seems forced. An appeal to practical wisdom (prudence, the consideration of means and their consequences) is older, more traditional, and more embedded in the common law than is the term utilitarianism. It was common sense even in the time of Aristotle. Moreover, it is Lincoln who said, "As I would not be a slave, so I would not be a master." He holds to the principle no matter whose utilitarian advantage is served. It is principle, not utilitarian calculation, that is decisive.

My biggest disappointment with Carson's book is that he does not discuss the very strong arguments of Harry Jaffa in *Crisis of the House Divided*, Hadley Arkes, and others concerning Lincoln's rediscovery of this nation's commitment to natural rights. Arkes points out that always and everywhere Lincoln thought it evil to take from the mouth of another the food that he had earned with his own hands; that is, to deprive another of the fruits of his own labor. Again, Lincoln saw that no man can by right put others in slavery; nor even put himself in slavery. In short, I wish Carson had discussed at some length Jaffa, Arkes, and the rather large school around them, and the crucial points they made.

Professor Carson is to be very much commended for his years of work in a close, close study of Lincoln, for his diligent pursuit of objections and charges against Lincoln, and for his clarity of exposition. Lincoln buffs will find a lot to chew on, and they will rejoice once more in the pleasures

of going back to Lincoln again and again.—Michael Novak, *Ave Maria University*

COLOMBETTI, Giovanna. *The Feeling Body*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 2014. xviii + 270 pp. Cloth, \$42.00—It is tempting to locate our thoughts and feelings strictly inside our brains (as opposed to, say, the whole body or outside the body altogether). Many succumb to temptation and even identify people with their brains. But a growing number of cognitive scientists and philosophers dissent. Their research programs take as their starting point alternative hypotheses that locate cognition, perception, and feeling within the human body as a whole.

Colombetti takes these programs one step further. The central thesis her book develops, explores, and defends is that affect is *pervasive*—throughout the human body, and throughout living things in general. This is the sort of thesis one might expect a writer to propose only to—through a series of qualifications—eventually deny. Colombetti is not in that business. She means what she says here, and her thesis is as bold as it sounds. It implies, for example, that even single-celled organisms enjoy affect appropriate to their lowly station; as she puts it, “Life is thus always ‘minded’ or ‘mindful,’ and the richer a living form, the richer its mind.”

The reader may be startled to learn that all living things have minds; indeed, this is just the sort of thesis that garners incredulous stares. Interestingly, Colombetti does not address this kind of worry head-on. But she does give the ingredients to cook up a reply. It would go as follows. The mind is constitutively affective. Affectivity is a lack of indifference and a sensibility or interest for one’s existence. And even the simplest living things “have a capacity to be sensitive to what matters to them” because they have a (possibly nonconscious) “perspective or point of view from which the world acquires meaning.” These capacities and perspectives are, in turn, a matter of an organism’s propensity toward self-organization and the ability to generate and maintain structured order. Organisms engage with their environments and their own parts in complex, purposeful, and patterned ways. These dynamical patterns of self-organization sometimes suffice for emotion, but in all cases suffice for sense-making and affect. And so, all living things have minds.

Emotions, then, are not the only kind of affect, on Colombetti’s view. But they are an important one. Accordingly, she spends a fair chunk of the book working through, developing, and, where appropriate, criticizing extant accounts of emotions from cognitive science. Colombetti argues that there need be no palette of “basic emotions” out of which others are built, that emotions are best construed as dynamical patterns, and that the body enters into emotion experience, though not always as its intentional object.

Copyright of Review of Metaphysics is the property of Philosophy Education Society, Inc. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.