

SAINTS AND MADMEN

THE LIMITS OF INTEGRITY

Konzeption:

Amber Carpenter York

Susan Neiman Potsdam

Rachael Wiseman Durham



Internationale Tagung

Mittwoch, 4. – Freitag, 6. Juni

EINSTEIN
FORUM

Einstein Forum

Am Neuen Markt 7

14467 Potsdam Tel. 0331-27178-0

www.einsteinforum.de

einsteinforum@einsteinforum.de

Speakers and Themes

Jeremy Bendik-Keymer

Rejecting Integrity, Choosing Humanity

Integrity maintains the connotation of being untouched. Two of its prominent images – that of upholding norms or of being idealistic – reinforce that connotation through the concepts of rules and of forms. Incorruptibility is then found in being rigid or absolutely being. I believe there is an undemocratic politics and a stultifying view of moral education in this nest. I would prefer something humane: a trustworthy goodness comfortable in anarchy, disobedience, non-conformity and becoming, stuff of the comedy of life. What happens to what we want out of integrity when we begin with the assumption that the good part of life – and also the moral – involves being in touch with life and with people? Secondly, what happens to the good stuff of life – and the moral – when we avoid being normative or being ideal, that is, when we turn away the very concepts of norms and of ideals? Thirdly, what happens when good people aren't seen as undeviating or absolute but are seen as in the process of becoming? What is incorruptibility when we reject integrity and prefer humanity?

Educated at Yale and at the University of Chicago, **Jeremy Bendik-Keymer** is Elmer G. Beamer-Hubert H. Schneider Professor in Ethics and Associate Professor of Philosophy at Case Western Reserve University in Cleveland, Ohio. He is the author of *The Ecological Life: Discovering Citizenship and a Sense of Humanity* (2006) and co-editor (with Allen Thompson) of *Ethical Adaptation to Climate Change: Human Virtues of the Future* (2012).

Karl Heinz Bohrer, London

Kohlhaas's Revenge. Not a Moral Dispute, but Imaginative Intensity

It is usually assumed that "Michael Kohlhaas" represents a moral paradox: can a radical fighter against injustice himself lapse into injustice? The relevance of this moral theme, which Friedrich Schiller treated in his drama "The Robbers", will be examined through, on the one hand, Kleist's representation of the deadly injustice inflicted upon Kohlhaas by the upper class and the state, and on the other, Kleist's representation of Kohlhaas' campaign of vengeance against a corrupt society. As Kohlhaas' revenge becomes an apocalyptic-chiliastic symbol, it seems to confirm the moral paradox of the world reformer gone astray. But this perspective is corrected through Kleist's style and mode of presentation, because the analysis of narcissism in the name of duty and virtue (Kant) is surpassed by the emphatic elevation of the soul as an organon of existence that cannot be revealed.

Karl Heinz Bohrer is Professor emer. for Literature. He studied History, Philosophy, German literature, and Sociology. In 1962 he completed his studies with a doctoral thesis on the *Geschichtsphilosophie* of the German Romantics at the University of Heidelberg, followed in 1978 by a Habilitation at the University of Bielefeld with a study on the early works of Ernst Jünger. Until 1974, Bohrer was literary editor of the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, thereafter he worked for the same paper as a foreign correspondent in London. The Deutsche Akademie für Sprache und Dichtung awarded him its Johann Heinrich Merck Prize for his London essays. In 1982 he was appointed Professor for Modern German Literary History at the University of Bielefeld and in 1983 he succeeded Hans Schwab-Felisch as editor of *Merkur*. The recipient of the 2007 Heinrich-Mann Prize now lives in Paris and London. Among his many publications are *Granatsplitter* (2012); *Selbstdenker und Systemdenker* (2011); *Das Tragische* (2009); *Großer Stil* (2007); *Temporalität und Form* (2004) and *Imaginationen des Bösen* (2004).

Amber Carpenter, York

Keeping One's Bearings in a World Gone Mad

When integrity demands saintliness, it makes sinners of us all. Either we have all already sold out, or else we are in the indomitable grip of an *idée fixe* – infatuated with our own virtue, or drunk on lofty ideals. Yet a lesser notion of integrity, one which would balance it prudently against other goods, simply misses the point. In fact, there are many ways of simply missing the point of this most elusive quality. This is due not to our universal ineptitude, but to the peculiar nature of integrity itself. It is this same distinctive nature, I shall argue, that makes the person of integrity so often appear to the world as mad, bad, or sad. But where exactly does the madness lie?

Amber Carpenter is a lecturer in the Department of Philosophy at the University of York. She received her B.A. in Philosophy from Yale University in 1996 and her Ph.D. from King's College London in 2001. 2003 to 2005 she was Assistant Professor at the Franklin & Marshall College, 2005 to 2007 teaching fellow at the University of St. Andrews; in 2007 she was Albert Einstein Fellow at the Einstein Forum. She works in Ancient Greek philosophy and in Indian philosophy. Her general interest is in ethics, ancient and modern, and specifically in the place of reason in a well-lived life – what might reason be that it could be ethically relevant, or even required? Her publications include a number of articles on Greek and Indian philosophy and, most recently, a monograph entitled *Indian Buddhist Philosophy* (2013).

Konstanty Gebert, Warschau

The Enemy's Integrity

Is integrity a technical feature of professing any belief system, or is it intrinsically connected with the true, good and beautiful? If the latter, since we stand for these values, the enemy is by definition deprived of integrity. Is his recognition of this fact a precondition of reconciliation? And what happens if it is we who turn out to have been the enemy? How do we deal with the discovery that what we had thought to be integrity was only hubris? And if integrity is a technical feature only, is there any difference between it and consistency?

Konstanty Gebert is an international reporter and columnist at "Gazeta Wyborcza", Poland's biggest daily. He was a democratic opposition activist in the 1970s, when he was also an organizer of the Jewish Flying University, and an underground journalist in the 1980s under martial law. He is the founder of the Polish Jewish intellectual monthly „Midrasz“, and a board member of the Taube Centre for the Renewal of Jewish Life in Poland and of the Einstein Forum. He has taught in Poland, Israel and the US and has authored ten books, e.g. on the Polish democratic transformation and on French policy toward Poland, the Yugoslav wars and the wars of Israel, Torah commentary and post-war Polish Jewry. His essays have appeared in two dozen collective works in Poland and abroad, and his articles in newspapers around the world.

Volker Gerhardt, Berlin

Integrität und Wahrhaftigkeit

The most important condition for integrity is one that we ourselves need to create: truthfulness. This virtue, which Kant regarded as decisive, is inseparable from the concept of truth itself. But what do we do, if it should be true, as many claim, that there is no truth at all any longer? Volker Gerhardt will seek to provide an answer to this crucial question.

This presentation will be given in German.

Volker Gerhardt is Professor emeritus of Practical Philosophy at the Humboldt-University in Berlin. After studying Philosophy, Psychology and Law in Frankfurt and Münster, he obtained his doctorate at Münster, and received his *Habilitation* there in 1984. In 1985, Gerhardt was appointed Professor of Philosophy at Münster. From 1988 to 1992 he led the Institute of Philosophy at the *Deutsche Sporthochschule* in Cologne. In 1992, he took over his current position at the Humboldt University in Berlin. His research focuses on ethics, political philosophy, aesthetics, metaphysics and theology, while his historical studies are centered on Plato, Kant and Nietzsche but have also dealt with Hegel, Marx, Jaspers, Voegelin, Hannah Arendt, Carl Schmitt and others. Volker Gerhardt has been Vice President of the Berlin-Brandenburg Academy of Sciences and Humanities, Chairman of the Union of German Academies of Sciences and Humanities, senate member of the German National Foundation, member of the SPD Basic Values Commission, Chairman of the Humboldt-University Council and until 2012, he has been a member of the German Ethics Council. Volker Gerhardt has received numerous prizes, including an honorary doctorate of the University of Debrecen, Hungary. His book publications include, among many: *Partizipation. Das Prinzip der Politik* (2007) and *Öffentlichkeit: Die politische Form des Bewusstseins* (2012).

Nora Hangel, Konstanz

Reflections on Ethos, Personality, and Habitus in Narrative Interviews. A Study of the Self-Perception of Researchers across Disciplines

Freedom of research is fundamental to epistemic gain. Often, however, the ethos of epistemic rationality is paired with further individual and social motives. By looking into both epistemic and social knowledge cultures in the natural and social sciences as well as in the humanities and cultural sciences, I will explore the entanglements created by these divergent motives in epistemic, social and normative cultures in the scientific community. Three levels will be distinguished: (i) reflections on the individual virtues or principles of a researcher, (ii) her involvement in the dynamics of the social culture in her discipline and (iii) the perspective as a member of the scientific community serving the ethos of epistemic rationality. These levels will aid us in identifying the limits of integrity within the scientific community.

In what respect do epistemic cultures oppose social cultures? Is the perception of certain forms of misbehaviour negotiable, a mere matter of interpretation or dependent on the social culture of a discipline? What forms of dilemmas of integrity do researchers face at different stages of their careers?

Narrative interviews with researchers in the UK, USA and Germany from the research project "Scientific Integrity in a Context of Integration and Competition" (2009-2014) provide the material for this talk. Figures such as the "Luminary", the "Altruist", the "Career-Zombie", and the "Whistleblower" are proposed as prototypes and take their places in the spectrum between the scientific saint and the madman.

Nora Hangel studied Philosophy, English literature and Gender studies at the Universities of Salzburg and Montclair, New Jersey. In 2011 she completed her PhD in Philosophy at the University of Vienna. Since 2010, she is researcher at the Centre of Excellence "Cultural Foundations of Integration" at the University of Konstanz. Her most recent publication is „Integrity endangered by hypocrisy“ in the volume *Autonomy and the Self* (2013, ed. by Michael Kühler).

Larissa MacFarquhar, New York

Life in the Shallow Pond

The philosopher Peter Singer compares the way most of us live to seeing a child drowning in a shallow pond and declining to save him so as not to muddy our clothes. Even if we don't see a child in danger, if we spend \$200 on shoes that could have bought life-saving medicine, we're still responsible for a death. Most people either don't believe this or can't imagine what their lives would look like if they did — how can you live measuring every action by its effect on dying children? Larissa MacFarquhar will tell the story of a young utilitarian couple who do believe it, and live their lives accordingly.

Larissa MacFarquhar has been a staff writer at *The New Yorker* since 1998. Her subjects have included John Ashbery and Edward Albee, among many others. Before joining *The New Yorker*, she was a senior editor at *Lingua Franca* and an advisory editor at *The Paris Review*. Larissa MacFarquhar lives in Brooklyn, New York.

Matthew Maguire, Chicago

Can You Tell a Saint from a Monster? The Integrity Controversy in a New Century

In the contemporary West, the prospect of integrity evokes a unique mixture of admiration and queasiness, the latter sometimes shading into censure. Doubtless it is thought desirable not to surrender one's convictions to the fat blandishments of comfort and ease, either by way of ingratiatingly exploitative commerce, or by flattering one's way into diverse circles of influence and power. Yet our historical moment is also prone to find in integrity a source of danger and wrenching discord, even of violence. If the person of integrity is the person who climbs atop the barricades or endures the rack to fight monstrous injustice without compromise, she is also the one whose uncompromising commitments may belong to and perhaps produce the world of monstrous barricades and racks. This is a world that a postmodern order devoted to tolerance, global markets and integrative sociability understandably prefers to encounter virtually— on the various screens that display our collective fantasies of moral heroism, for example— rather than in reality.

At such a moment, what is the purpose and role— if any— of integrity? Is it possible that the saint and the monster are indistinguishable from one another? If they are distinguishable from one another, do they inevitably produce one another? These questions are of considerable importance for engaging with and confronting the dilemmas of our own time.

Matthew W. Maguire is an associate professor at DePaul University in Chicago (USA), and a scholar of European intellectual history. He received his doctorate from Harvard University and is the author of *The Conversion of Imagination* (Harvard), and is finishing a new book project entitled *The Revolutions of Charles Péguy*. He has also recently published an essay entitled "Pascal and Rousseau" in *The Challenge of Rousseau* (Cambridge).

Gesine Schwan, Berlin

Integrität in der Politik

The strict sense of the word integrity – the state of being whole and unimpaired; or ethically: the quality of acting in accordance with one's own moral principles – seems to suggest that it would be simple to lead a life of integrity, if only there was no external world, no other people, no „outside“ impairing us. This leads to an egocentric view, an aesthetic preoccupation with one's own self, which has to be shielded from the vicissitudes of life and the dangers of the world at large. Yet it is only in situations that require compromise and concession, that the goal of integrity – the conformity of one's actions with one's moral principles – becomes interesting, above all in politics. Here, the highest precept is no longer the purity of moral values, but instead their practical realization. Put differently: moral principles that neglect the difficulties of political practice are useless when seeking to determine a type of integrity that has to prove itself in the world. Using the example of the three maxims of the communal sense in Immanuel Kant's *Critique of Judgement*, „1. Thinking for oneself, 2. Thinking for all others, 3. Thinking in accordance with oneself“, as one of the foundations of trustworthy behaviour in politics, Gesine Schwan will examine the difficulties that can occur in their practical application.

This presentation will be given in German.

Gesine Schwan, studied Roman Languages, History, Philosophy and Political Science in Berlin and Freiburg/Breisgau. Extensive research stays in Warsaw and Krakow followed in preparation for her dissertation about the Polish philosopher Leszek Kolakowski. In 1971, Gesine Schwan was appointed Assistant Professor in the Department of Political Science at the Free University Berlin and in 1975 received her *Habilitation* there. In 1977, Gesine Schwan was named Professor of Political Science, in particular of Political Theory and Philosophy, at the Free University Berlin. Research stays in Washington D.C., Cambridge and New York followed. Her main fields of research are Political Philosophy and Theories of Democracy, recently also problems of Political Psychology and Political Culture. From October 1999 to October 2008 Gesine Schwan was president of the Europe University Viadrina in Frankfurt (Oder). She was one of the joint founders and since June 2010 also president of the Humboldt-Viadrina School of Governance. In 2004 and in 2008, she was nominated by SPD and Bündnis 90/Die Grünen as candidate for the office of the Federal President, but lost the election to the candidate of CDU/CSU and FDP. Her main publications include among many *Die Gesellschaftskritik von Karl Marx. Philosophische und politökonomische Voraussetzungen* (1974); *Sozialismus in der Demokratie? Theorie einer konsequent sozialdemokratischen Politik* (1982); *Politik und Schuld. Die zerstörerische Macht des Schweigens* (1997); *Vertrauen und Politik. Politische Theorie im Zeitalter der Globalisierung* (2006) and (together with Susanne Daschke) *Allein ist nicht genug. Für eine neue Kultur der Gemeinsamkeit* (2007).

David Shulman, Jerusalem

Non-Saintly Integrity in the South Hebron Hills

Is integrity a Western notion, rooted in Western philosophical concepts of wholeness and moral consistency? I can't think of a Sanskrit equivalent. Yet the Indian metaphysical and meta-psychological traditions do offer several possible points of comparison, partly in the context of a pervasive theory of human freedom to act and to know, and partly in relation to the idea of "self-coincidence", *tadatmya*, the autonomous coherence of disparate pieces of self and the linguistic acts proper to such a (relatively rare) state of being-- that is, sentences like "I am," "I want," "I think," and "I know." *Tadatmya* contrasts with heteronomy, *paratmya*. I hope to explore these notions in a concrete context of action rich with ethical implications, that is, our work in the south Hebron Hills, with its Gandhian textures. Specific conditions seem to enable self-coincidence, and there are decisions which, at such moments, either fulfill this inner state or compromise it. The Israeli invention of selective refusal to serve in the army also offers an unusual illustration of Gandhian/Israeli integrity.

David Shulman is Professor of Indology and Comparative Religious Studies at The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. He received his Ph.D from the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London. His many publications on Tamil and Sanskrit literature and mythology include: *The Wisdom of Poets: Studies in Tamil, Telugu, and Sanskrit* (2001); as co-author and co-editor: *Self and Self-Transformation in the History of Religions* (2002), *Siva in the Forest of Pines: An Essay on Sorcery and Self-Knowledge* (2004), *God on the Hill. Telugu Songs by Annamayya* (2005), *The Demon's Daughter: A Love Story from South India* (2006) and *Spring, Heat, Rains: A South Indian Diary* (2008). Shulman is also a long-time dedicated peace activist, and has published a book-length account, entitled *Dark Hope: Working for Peace in Israel and Palestine* (2007), of his years working, and often clashing with police and settlers, to deliver food and medical supplies to Palestinian villages.

Carl Tham, Stockholm

Integrity Dilemmas. Diplomatic and Political Perspectives

I will talk from my own experience as diplomat and politician. Very different worlds – and the difference may also illuminate the elusiveness of the word “integrity”.

In normal peaceful times and in democratic societies you face no specific integrity problems related to the diplomatic service. There are very rarely issues, which may raise conflicts of conscience versus directions from above, not more than in other parts of civil service. The question of transparency and openness may be an integrity problem. Related to that is also the question how much a diplomat can or should participate in the public debate in her or his home country.

The integrity problem may be much more important and difficult if you serve in a country with a repressive regime or in time of violent conflicts or even war. I will give a few examples from the Swedish diplomatic history, also recent cases. The main question: Should you as ambassador in a critical moment act according to your values and good judgement even if you have reason to suspect that your government dislike or even oppose your actions?

A less dramatic but important integrity question relates to reporting. Should you adjust reporting to what your government would like to hear?

In politics the integrity question is – in contrast – a more or less eternal companion, if you interpret integrity as a strong commitment to you personal values. Should you stick to your own strong beliefs and at the end reject the party line? Adjustment or opposition? Is that integrity or just a kind of egocentricity?

In societies where market values and market operations are penetrating every corner politicians are more and more exposed to the power of wealth and money. Here are severe integrity problems not only for individual politicians but also for the whole public life.

Carl Tham studied Literature and History at the University of Stockholm. From 1976 to 1982, he was a member of the Swedish parliament. During his parliamentary career, he was also Secretary of State in the Ministry of Works (1976 - 1978), Energy Minister (1978 - 1979), Special Council for Development Aid to the Foreign Minister (1979 - 1981) and Secretary of State for Development Aid (1981 - 1982). From 1982 to 1994 he was the General Director of SIDA, the Swedish Office for International Development Cooperation and from 1994 to 1998 he was the Minister for Education and Science. From 2002 to 2006, Carl Tham served as the Swedish Ambassador to Germany. He has also served on special committees of the UN and the World Bank as well as having been Co-Chairman of the Independent International Committee on Kosovo. He has written a number of books on such diverse topics as the new/old left in Swedish politics, on the reform of the University system and on sustainable economic development. Carl Tham is a regular contributor to Swedens leading journals and newspapers.

Dieter Thomä, St. Gallen

The Danger of Being Ridden by a Type. Reflections on Integrity and Depravity

The rhetoric of integration appeals to an all-encompassing spirit of reconciliation and unity. Yet the theory of integrity has to account for the fact that integrity cannot be thought without demarcations and distinctions: Literally speaking a person of integrity is a person untouched, a person defending her sound state of mind. Integrity is polemical in nature, it is opposed to commonplaces, common wisdom, and common sense. From without, integrity may even be regarded as an evasion, as a state of depravity. This paper discusses the ambivalent stance of integrity mainly by reference to Denis Diderot and Hegel.

Dieter Thomä studied Philosophy and Literature at the Universities of Freiburg and Berlin, attended the Henri Nannen School of Journalism in Hamburg, and received his postdoctoral qualification from Rostock University. After teaching Philosophy in Paderborn, Rostock, Essen, Berlin, and New York, and working as Senior Scholar at the Getty Research Institute in Los Angeles, he was appointed Professor of Philosophy at the University of St.Gallen in 2000. His publications include: *Die Zeit des Selbst und die Zeit danach: Zur Kritik der Textgeschichte Martin Heideggers 1910-1976* (1990), *Eltern: Kleine Philosophie einer riskanten Lebensform* (1992), *Erzähle dich selbst: Lebensgeschichte als philosophisches Problem* (1998), *Unter Amerikanern: Eine Lebensart wird besichtigt* (2000); *Vom Glück in der Moderne* (2003); *Totalität und Mitleid: Richard Wagner, Sergej Eisenstein und unsere ethisch-ästhetische Moderne* (2006); and *Väter. Eine moderne Heldengeschichte* (2008).

Program

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 4, 2014

10:00

Amber Carpenter, York

Keeping One's Bearings in a World Gone Mad

11:00

Dieter Thomä, St. Gallen

The Danger of Being Ridden by a Type. Reflections on Integrity and Depravity

12:30

Volker Gerhardt, Berlin

Integrität und Wahrhaftigkeit

Lunch Break

15:00

Larissa MacFarquhar, New York

Life in the Shallow Pond

16:00

Carl Tham, Stockholm

Integrity Dilemmas. Diplomatic and Political Perspectives

17:30

Gesine Schwan, Berlin

Integrität in der Politik

Wine Reception

19:00

Karl Heinz Bohrer, London

Kohlhaas's Revenge. Not a Moral Dispute, but Imaginative Intensity

THURSDAY, JUNE 5, 2014

10:00

Jeremy Bendik-Keymer

Rejecting Integrity, Choosing Humanity

11:00

David Shulman, Jerusalem

Non-Saintly Integrity in the South Hebron Hills

12:30

Konstanty Gebert, Warschau

The Enemy's Integrity

Lunch Break

15:00

Nora Hangel, Konstanz

*Reflections on Ethos, Personality, and Habitus in Narrative Interviews
A Study of the Self-Perception of Researchers across Disciplines*

16:30

Matthew Maguire, Chicago

Can You Tell a Saint from a Monster? The Integrity Controversy in a New Century

FRIDAY, JUNE 6, 2014

Panels

10-11:45

Arendt and Integrity. Person, Action, World

Chair: Alexander Beaumont, York St. John

Panel participants: Sophie Loidolt, Vienna; Siobhan Kattago, Tallin

Hannah Arendt's life sketched out the contours of intellectual integrity in the 20th Century. This session goes beyond the popular debate on Arendt's biography, however, to examine the concept of integrity in her thought itself, assessing the degree to which it helps us understand her complex account of the necessarily political relationship between person, action and world.

12-13:45

Conceptual Corruption in Practice

Chair: Chon Tejedor, Oxford

Panel participants: Rachael Wiseman, Durham; Katharina Bauer, Bochum

How do linguistic and conceptual practices erode the integrity of a discourse, making it corrupt as well as distorted? We will focus on the effects that such practices have on different kinds of discourse, from the theoretical to the applied and political.

15-16:45

Literature and Integrity

Chair: Jan Niklas Howe, Berlin

Panel participants: Kai Wiegandt, Berlin; Jens Elze, Göttingen

The panel investigates the problematic role of integrity in poetic conceptions of subjectivity. From Greek tragedy to postmodern novel, literature privileges constellations in which integrity remains unrequited. This may point to either an aesthetics of integrity or an implicit ethics of literature; the panel addresses both options with examples from literary history.

17-18:45

Saints in Science?

Chair: Nora Hangel, Konstanz

Panel participants: Greta Wagner, Frankfurt; Martin Bruder, Konstanz

This session on the scientific community will reflect the relation between integrity and misbehaviour, on the one hand, and sanity and madness, on the other. We will consider exemplars or prototypes of actors in academia such as the luminary, the whistleblower, the career zombie, the altruist and the saint. Can integrity, considered as a quality of the person, act as a means of developing a stable and resilient self-image and of achieving self-respect?

Katharina Bauer is Researcher the Department of Philosophy at the Ruhr-University Bochum

Alexander Beaumont is Lecturer of English Literature at York St. John University

Martin Bruder is Researcher in the Department of Psychology at the University of Konstanz

Jens Elze is Researcher at the Graduate School of Humanities in Göttingen

Nora Hangel is Researcher at the Centre of Excellence "Cultural Foundations of Integration" at the University of Konstanz

Jan Niklas Howe is Researcher at the Peter Szondi-Institut at the Free University Berlin

Siobhan Kattago is Associate Professor of Political Philosophy at the University of Tallin

Sophie Loidolt is Researcher in the Department of Philosophy at the University of Vienna

Chon Tejedor is Lecturer in Philosophy at the University of Oxford

Greta Wagner is Researcher in the Social Science Department at the Goethe University in Frankfurt

Kai Wiegandt is Researcher in the Department for English Language and Literature at the Free University Berlin

Rachael Wiseman is Teaching Fellow in the Department of Philosophy at Durham University

Saints and Madmen

The Limits of Integrity

We want our friends, colleagues, and certainly our heroes to be people of integrity; we don't seek out hypocrites, liars or cowards for company or leadership. But a moment's reflection on the demands of integrity may lead us to question this apparent truism. People of integrity may be confrontational, awkward, humorless, offensive, and even occasionally mad. Are there limits to integrity? Do we know how to combine the demands of morality with other virtues that make up good lives?