

WAHEED HUSSAIN

667 Huntsman Hall
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia PA, 19104
whussain@wharton.upenn.edu

1255 New Hampshire Ave. NW #730
Washington, DC 20036
Work: (215) 573-0601
Home: (202) 486-0951

Education

Ph.D. in Philosophy, March 2006
Harvard University
Dissertation title: *The Value of Freedom*

A.M in Philosophy, June 1999
Harvard University

A.B. in Philosophy, *summa cum laude*, June 1995
Princeton University

Employment

July 2006 - Present
Assistant Professor
Department of Legal Studies and Business Ethics
The Wharton School
University of Pennsylvania

July 2004 - July 2006
Lecturer
Department of Legal Studies and Business Ethics
The Wharton School
University of Pennsylvania

Areas of Specialization

Social and Political Philosophy
Moral Philosophy
Normative Issues in Economic Life

Areas of Concentration

Business Ethics

History of Ethics
Philosophy of Law
Philosophy of the Social Sciences
Hegel and Marx

Publications

“The Limits of a Pluralist Commonwealth” *The Good Society* (forthcoming).

“The Ethical Dimension of the Class Structure” *Social Theory and Practice* vol. 33, no. 2
(April 2007)

“Democratic Capitalism and Respect for the Value of Freedom” *International Journal of
Business Governance and Ethics* vol. 2, no 3/4 (2006)

Book note for Charles Lindblom, The Market System, *Business Ethics Quarterly* vol. 16,
no. 3 (July 2006).

“A Philosophical Critique of Fazlur Rahman’s Islam and Modernity” *Harvard Middle
Eastern and Islamic Review* 6 (2000-1).

“Interpreting the Tradition: The Modernist Argument and the Sources of Islam” *Ameri-
can Journal of Islamic Social Sciences* 18/1 (Winter 2001)

Academic Honors

Edmund J. Safra Graduate Fellow in Ethics
Center for Ethics and the Professions
Kennedy School of Government, 2003-4

Graduate Fellow
Program in Justice, Welfare and Economics
Weatherhead Center for International Affairs
Harvard University, 2002-3

Graduate Society Dissertation Fellowship
Harvard University, 2002-3 (declined)

Phi Beta Kappa

Alexander Guthrie McCosh Prize
Princeton University, 1995

Class of 1869 Prize in Ethics
Princeton University, 1995

Conferences and Presentations

- April 2007 "A Challenge to Pettit's Republican Theory of Freedom"
Annual Meeting, American Philosophical Association, Pacific Division
San Francisco, CA
- March 2007 "Global Inequality"
"Worlds Collide," Wharton Social Impact / School of Public Policy
University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA
- Dec 2006 "Democratic Corporatism and Political Autonomy"
Seminar on Political Economy and Contemporary Social Issues
Columbia University, New York, NY
- Nov 2006 "The Political Significance of Secondary Associations in the Economy"
Department of Legal Studies and Business Ethics, The Wharton School
- Nov 2006 "A Challenge to Pettit's Republican Theory of Freedom"
Northwest Philosophy Conference, Portland, Oregon
- Oct 2006 "Corporations and Consequentialism"
Transatlantic Business Ethics Conference, Philadelphia, PA
- Aug 2006 "Democratic Capitalism and the Value of Freedom"
Annual Meeting, Society for Business Ethics
Atlanta, Georgia
- June 2006 "German Codetermination and the Free Society"
Annual Meeting, Association for Legal and Social Philosophy
University College Dublin, Ireland
- April 2006 "Judith Miller, the New York Times, and the Authority of Law"
Penn Ethics Forum, University of Pennsylvania
- March 2006 Moderator, Panel Discussion, "Manufacturing and Outsourcing"
Wharton China Business Forum, Philadelphia, PA
- Feb 2006 "An Alternative to the Fiduciary Theory of the Firm"
McCombs School of Business, University of Texas at Austin
- Feb 2006 "Freedom and Democracy in Economic Life"
Department of Philosophy, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign
- Feb 2006 "Freedom and Democracy in Economic Life"
Department of Philosophy, Carleton University

- Jan 2006 "Democratic Capitalism,"
27th Annual World Congress on Corporate Governance, McMaster University
- Jan 2006 "Freedom and Democracy in Economic Life"
Department of Philosophy, Columbia University
- Nov 2005 "An Alternative to the Fiduciary Theory of the Firm"
The Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania
- Sept 2005 "Freedom, Corporatism and the Economy"
Nth year Seminar, Department of Philosophy, Harvard University
- April 2005 "Moral Luck"
Penn Ethics Forum, University of Pennsylvania
- Jan 2005 "Personal Autonomy,"
PHILAMORE Philosophy Colloquium, University of Pennsylvania
- Nov 2004 Panel Chair
"Contractarian Approaches to Business Ethics"
The Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania
- Feb 2004 "Corporate Capitalism and the Value of Freedom"
The Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania
- Jan 2004 "Corporate Capitalism and the Value of Freedom"
Department of Philosophy, Middlebury College
- Nov 2003 "A Critique of Pettit's Republican Theory of Freedom"
Workshop in Political Philosophy, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
- March 2003 "Development as What Kind of Freedom?"
Economics and Philosophy Reading Group, Harvard University
- Jan 1999 "Interpreting the Tradition: Modernism and the Sources of Islam"
Institute for Islamic Studies, McGill University

Work in Progress

"AUTONOMY, FRANKFURT AND REFLECTIVE ENDORSEMENT" (under review)

According to Harry Frankfurt's well-known theory, an agent is autonomous when his conduct flows from desires that he endorses on reflection. I agree with the reflective endorsement theory in general, but I disagree with Frankfurt's particular account of reflective endorsement. I argue that his view misunderstands the nature of our relation to our desires when we reflect and it misunderstands

the role that evaluation and decision play in the process. By critically engaging with Frankfurt's writings, I formulate a better view of reflective endorsement, and the result is a conception of autonomy that takes our evaluative nature to be more central to our agency than our capacity to decide. I conclude by defending this rationalist version of the reflective endorsement theory against an important objection.

"CORPORATIONS AND CONSEQUENTIALISM"

Consequentialist theories of the corporation contend that corporations and their managers have a duty to act in certain ways because acting in these ways will lead to the best social state of affairs. My aim in this paper is to motivate a non-consequentialist approach to the duties of corporations and their managers by demonstrating that the most important consequentialist theories in the literature today suffer from several fundamental weaknesses. Among these weaknesses is that they fail to recognize that the corporation belongs to a sphere of life that is shielded from the demands of social welfare—what I call the "sphere of partiality." Throughout my discussion, I focus on two theories in particular, namely the theory advocated by Michael Jensen and the theory advocated by Frank Easterbrook and Daniel Fischel.

"A CONTRACTUALIST THEORY OF THE CORPORATION"

According to the fiduciary theory, corporate managers have an obligation to maximize returns for shareholders because they act as their agents. I argue that this view fails to accommodate an essential aspect of a corporation, which is its impersonal character. I go on to formulate a better view based on the contractualist theory of morality as articulated by Rawls and Scanlon. Drawing an analogy between capital markets and consumer markets, I argue that if consumers have a right to expect that the products they buy are safe, then investors have a similar right to expect that their investments are profit-oriented. When understood in this way, however, the rights of shareholders are not nearly as demanding as on the fiduciary view and must be understood in the context of the interests of other parties in the market, particularly employees.

"ALIENATION AND POLITICAL FREEDOM"

The traditional liberal view says that people enjoy political freedom to the extent that their basic institutions protect their civil and political liberties, including liberties such as the freedom of expression, the freedom of conscience, and the freedom to participate in the political process. I argue that this traditional view is mistaken because it fails to account for the importance of the relationship that people have with their basic institutions, that is, the degree to which people must actually embrace the ideals behind their institutions in order to achieve political

freedom. After developing a theory of social integration to substantiate this criticism, I present a novel account of political freedom to make up for the weaknesses in the traditional liberal view, and indicate some of the implications of my position. Throughout I focus on Rawls's theory of justice, both to illustrate the failings of the traditional liberal view and to develop an account of how to overcome its weaknesses.

FREEDOM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY (book manuscript)

Most everyone would agree that societies should respect the value of freedom, but there is widespread disagreement about what this means. Libertarians argue that societies respect the value of freedom by enforcing private property rights. Liberals argue that they respect the value of freedom by enforcing a wide range of civil and political liberties, including rights such as the freedom of expression and the freedom of conscience, as well as private property rights. Socialists argue that societies respect the value of freedom by eliminating hierarchical systems of authority and replacing them with more collaborative forms of decision-making.

My central claim in this book is that our concern for freedom in political philosophy is best understood as an aspect of a deeper concern for autonomy. According to what I call *the social democratic conception of freedom*, a society respects the value of freedom to the extent that it respects the value of the personal and political autonomy of its members. I develop a view of personal autonomy by engaging critically with Harry Frankfurt's second-order desire theory of the will, and I develop a view of political autonomy by extending this view of personal autonomy to the political domain. I argue that the resulting conception of freedom improves on the most important contemporary conceptions, including those advocated by Robert Nozick, John Rawls, Philip Pettit and Amartya Sen. It does so by providing us with a better account of the relationship between freedom and democracy, on the one hand, and a better account of the relationship between freedom and education on the other.

The most significant implication of the social democratic conception is that freedom does not require that we liberalize markets, as libertarians contend, but that we deepen the role that democracy plays in the economy – and in social life more generally. A genuine concern for freedom is not compatible with a social arrangement that allows corporate and political elites to impose their views on everyone else. True respect for this value requires that we structure our institutions so that groups who represent various outlooks will have a voice in shaping the rules of social interaction. By encouraging deliberation among these groups, society helps to ensure that the rules will not simply be imposed on us, but will emerge from within an evolving consensus among various points of view. A free society is not a society of free markets, but a deliberative republic – an association whose basic institutions aim to ensure that the rules of social and economic life evolve in ways that allow each person to participate simply on the basis of his own reflective understanding of what reason demands.

Teaching

“Markets, Morality and the Future of Capitalism” (LGST 226, PPE 226, PHIL 280)

Markets play a central role in the life of a capitalist democracy. But is this a good thing? Should we let markets decide who is rich and who is poor? Who makes decisions and who follows them? Whose ideas get heard and whose ideas do not? The goal of this class will be to examine the market from the perspective of various social values to see whether we should want a market system and, if so, what kind of market system we should want. Among the issues we will examine are the following. Does the market contribute to the common good? If so, how? Does the market conflict with the idea that all human beings are of equal value? What is the relation between the market and freedom? Can we reconcile the market with our democratic ideals? What role should markets play in an increasingly globalized world? Readings will be drawn from philosophers, economists and political theorists, including Adam Smith, John Rawls, Amartya Sen, Friedrich Hayek, Karl Marx, Robert Nozick, Ronald Dworkin, Jürgen Habermas, Peter Singer, and others.

“Corporate Responsibility and Ethics” (LGST 210)

This course offers a multifaceted, philosophical introduction to business ethics. We start with some of the “big” questions about the economy: Who should make the most money? How should we decide who does the hard work? What role (if any) does deception play in our system? We then turn to more concrete questions about the obligations of corporations, managers and employees. Do corporations have any obligations besides making money for their shareholders? Can a manager fire an employee just because he doesn’t like him? If a multinational operates in a country where child labor is the norm, does that make it alright for the company to hire children? Readings are drawn from philosophy, business reviews, economics, magazines, and popular literature. Special emphasis on issues relating to labor and employment.

Tutorials at Harvard

Social Freedom (Fall 2002)
Economic Freedom and Hegel’s Philosophy (Fall 2000)
Social Freedom (Spring 1999)

Teaching Assistant at Harvard

Moral Reasoning about Social Protest (Spring 2004)
Biomedical Ethics (1998-2002)
Hegel (Spring 2002)
Recent Ethical Theory (Fall 2001)

Equality and Democracy (Spring 2001)
Reasoning in and about the Law (Fall 1998 and Spring 2000)
Introduction to Philosophy (Fall 1999)

Service

Member, Committee for the Doctoral Program in Business Ethics
Journal Referee, *Political Theory*
Judge, Wharton Undergraduate Case Competition (2005)

References

Thomas M. Scanlon
Alford Professor of Natural Religion, Moral Philosophy and Civil Polity
Harvard University

Joshua Cohen
Leon and Anne Goldberg Professor of the Humanities
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Richard Moran
Brian D. Young Professor of Philosophy
Harvard University

Michael Blake
Associate Professor of Philosophy
University of Washington