

# Editor's Note

Joel H. Rosenthal

This diverse collection of essays is unified by two enterprises: evaluating the institutional arrangements that govern our interactions with one another and assessing the choices we make as individual citizens, consumers, employees, policymakers, and members of civic and religious groups. In all these roles, we are engaged in confronting the Socratic question of how one should live. We can at least begin to respond to Socrates' question by articulating the values and standards that we hope will guide us in distinguishing just and unjust social arrangements and better or worse courses of conduct.

Although they are unified by this shared concern, each essay focuses on specific problems, such as facing up to the challenges of globalization, measuring human rights, controlling weapons, reckoning with past injustices, and developing national and global institutional reforms that will better entrench democracy at home and abroad. Each essay is self-consciously analytical and reflective. Each seeks to find principles to guide our assessments, judgments, and actions. And each questions whether these principles can be developed into workable public policies.

Over the past ten years there has been a scramble both to explain what the post-Cold War world will look like and to justify institutional arrangements and principles for state conduct that will improve it. We are all now familiar with the end of history, the democratic peace, the clash of civilizations, hegemony, unipolarity, globalization, and calls for strengthened international institutions.

Some theorists point to patterns of convergence revealing a growing supranationalism. They emphasize increasing consensus around a body of codified international moral norms that are reflected in various treaties and human rights instruments.

Others point to patterns of divergence, fragmentation, and unbridgeable difference. They emphasize the voices of those who prefer local control to the internationalization of politics and justice. The rhetoric of "thickening the web of international law and international moral norms" seems weak and ineffective in such a world, perhaps even obfuscatory and counterproductive.

It seems uncontroversial to note that concurrent trends toward integration and fragmentation are very much with us. This is empirical, verifiable fact. There is, however, controversy about what these trends should mean for us in terms of specific

public policies. How should states and other actors conduct themselves in such a world? What kinds of social arrangements should we aim to construct? We must in any case remember that difficult issues of public policy are not contested only because we lack the technical ability to see them clearly. The issues we care about are contested because they are, in essence, matters of conflicting interests and competing moral choices. This collection of essays and reviews offers arguments and analyses that help us to make these difficult choices.