

OA.698

Newey, Glen, 'How do you like your liberalism: fat or thin?', review of John Gray, *Two Faces of Liberalism*, *London Review of Books*, 7 June 2001, 3–6

Contains a useful illustration of the need to define terms when talking about pluralism:

[...] pluralism needs careful specification here. Among contemporary liberal philosophers, it's the name for quite different claims: that society contains many different religions, belief-systems, subcultures etc.; that whether or not there are a lot of these things, there ought to be; that reasonable people disagree, or that disagreement is reasonable, about morality, and God, and that sort of thing; that different lifestyles, e.g. of a Bronze Age Greek warrior and the CEO of General Motors, are hard to combine; that some valuable things, such as love, can be difficult to combine with others, like cash; that sometimes it's hard to make up one's mind, e.g. between love and cash.

The term's elasticity makes it hard not to agree to be a pluralist. Its strength and weakness lie in its beginning with banality, and gesturing towards grandeur. It can sometimes sound as if we start off on the sofa in front of the telly, mildly torn (or as the phrase has it, 'conflicted') about whether or not it's worth missing the commercials to get up for another beer; and ... whoosh, we're at Aulis with Agamemnon, in agonies, the cold steel glinting, over whether or not to murder Iphigenia.