



universität
wien
Institut für Philosophie



Stadt
Wien



Österreichische
Hochschüler_innenschaft

VDP Summer School 2023

INCLUSIVITY AND ETHICS

With Instructors:

Luz Ascarate

Edwin Etieyibo

Paul*A Helfritsch

Carlo Salzani

Sunaura Taylor



10-12 July 2023

NIG, Universitätsstraße 7, 1010

Rooms 3D, 3F

Instructor abstracts:

1. Edwin Etieyibo (University of the Witwatersrand, South Africa and the University of Alberta, Canada)

Philosophy and Decolonizing Everything, Something, and Nothing

2. Luz Ascarate (University Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne, France)

Seeing the Unseen: From Absolute Exclusion to Radical Hospitality

3. Paul*A Helfritsch (University of Vienna, Austria)

Inclusion, Exclusion, Assimilation: An Attempt to DRAG Oneself Out of This Register

4. Sunaura Taylor (University of California, Berkeley, USA)

Beasts of Burden: Solidarity Across Species

5. Carlo Salzani (University of Innsbruck, Austria and the Messerli Research Institute, Austria)

Tools for an Inclusive Multispecies Ethics: Compassion, Sympathy, or Empathy?

Philosophy and Decolonizing Everything, Something, and Nothing

Discourse on decolonizing philosophy raises questions not concerning *philosophy* itself but its *practice*, which historically has been non-inclusive and marginalizing. This makes decolonization, in general, and epistemic decolonization, in particular, useful projects insofar as they are about the injustice of knowledge paradigms and productions, on the one hand, and aim for inclusivity, on the other hand. So, for example in ethics or moral philosophy, a decolonized approach to knowledge questions who is/ought to be the moral agent and philosopher, whose views are/should be considered moral, and what ethical beliefs, intuitions, and values are/ought to form part of the philosophical canon. In this presentation, I discuss some of the more recent debates on decolonization. My central aim is to engage with the question of why decolonize philosophy. Ultimately, by demonstrating the importance of decolonizing philosophy, my presentation points to the nature of *philosophical justice* and the *proper practice* of philosophy.

EDWIN ETIEYIBO is a Professor of Philosophy at the University of the Witwatersrand and an Adjunct Professor at the University of Alberta. He is the Co-founder and Secretary of the African Philosophy Society and works primarily in ethics, social and political philosophy, epistemology, African philosophy, critical thinking, and philosophy for children. He is the author/co-author and editor/co-editor of 12 books, and 6 journal special issues, among which is the recently published *A Case for Environmental Justice* (Rowman and Littlefield, 2022).

Seeing the Unseen: From Absolute Exclusion to Radical Hospitality

We cannot think about inclusion as an ethical response to social problems without measuring the ultimate extent of exclusion. However, if we think about the excluded entity, a paradox emerges: everyone defined as excluded is included, methodologically, in a theory of inclusion. If every theory is constituted by the conditions of power of its historical epoch, there is an undetermined or theoretically undefined excluded entity, that escapes all theories, and this is due to the political presuppositions of each current theory that makes it impossible for us to determine who are the excluded that the theories of inclusion, historically determined, do not allow us to see. We will try to think of different solutions to this paradox, using the ethical model of absolute hospitality in relation to poetic listening and feminist critique, model where the ethical normativity reach the point where ethics meets aesthetics to account for the conditions of power that structure our perception.

LUZ ASCARATE holds a PhD in philosophy and social sciences from the EHESS in Paris. She has taught philosophy at the University Paris 1 Panthéon Sorbonne and at the University of Franche Comté. Her PhD dissertation focused on imagination and emancipation according to Paul Ricoeur. She is currently working on a second PhD dissertation, on the phenomenology of the possible, under the supervision of Renaud Barbaras, at the University Paris 1 Panthéon Sorbonne. She is the author of the book *Imaginer selon Paul Ricoeur. La phénoménologie à la rencontre de l'ontologie sociale* (Hermann, 2022).

Inclusion, Exclusion, Assimilation: An Attempt to DRAG Oneself Out of This Register

Based on texts, rants and interviews from Silvia Rivera, Miss Major, Leslie Feinberg and some fellow persons in drag, I will try to address some practical and conceptual points on how inclusion, exclusion and assimilation are not opposites to each other but work together as terms of a register of possession/ownership. Hence, my claim here is—and that is perhaps nothing surprisingly new—that the three terms are based on a capitalistic logic which puts ownership as the only criterion for any decision and social interactions. Starting from this I will focus my descriptions on the effects and links that the use of these terms result in. With Silvia Rivera and Miss Major, I will state that inclusion and exclusion are different ways of pushing people and groups towards a practice of assimilation and that there will be no change towards an ethical way of living together without a change of the system—a change of how we value, treat, and threaten people.

Regarding the way the Pyrrhonian scepticism is narrated by Sextus Empiricus, there will be a part where I will talk about the problem of the criterion and one where I will talk about its implications for everyday life. The second one will be part of a general argumentation, the first one will be a polemic.

PAUL*A HELFRITZSCH teaches philosophy at the University of Vienna with a methodological focus on phenomenology and post-structural theory. Their current research interests are based in the areas of social philosophy and radical democracy theory as well as in the performative relationship between assemblies and politics and questions about gender equality. Paul*A is currently working on a project called *Drag Yourselves Out: Lavender, Red, and Fire*.

4

Sunaura Taylor

University of California, Berkeley, USA

Beasts of Burden: Solidarity Across Species

In her recently published book *Beasts of Burden*, artist Sunaura Taylor proposes that issues of disability and animal justice - which have heretofore primarily been presented in opposition - are in fact deeply entangled. Fusing philosophy, memoir, science, and the radical truths these disciplines can bring—whether about factory farming, disability oppression, or our assumptions of human superiority over animals—Taylor draws attention to new worlds of experience and empathy that can open up important avenues of solidarity across species and ability. How can thinking about disability help us to see animals differently?

SUNAURA TAYLOR is an Assistant Professor in the Division of Society and Environment. Taylor is a scholar and artist who works at the intersection of disability studies, environmental humanities, animal studies, environmental justice, feminist science studies, and art practice. Her research situates disability and ableism as central forces shaping human relationships to the more-than-human world. Concerned with relationships between altered bodily capacity, vulnerability, and systems of exploitation across species and ecological boundaries, her works crosses a range of disciplines, mediums, and audiences.

Taylor is author of *Beasts of Burden: Animal and Disability Liberation* (The New Press, 2017), which received the 2018 American Book Award. Along with academic journals, Taylor has written for a range of popular media outlets. Her artworks have been exhibited at venues such as the CUE Art Foundation and the Smithsonian Institution and is part of the Berkeley Art Museum collection. Among other awards, she has received a Joan Mitchell Foundation MFA Grant, two Wynn Newhouse Awards, and an Animals and Culture Grant.

5

Carlo Salzani

University of Innsbruck, Austria and the Messerli Research Institute, Austria

Tools for an Inclusive Multispecies Ethics: Compassion, Sympathy, or Empathy?

Although the prevailing currents in animal ethics still rely on traditional rationalist foundations, the past few decades have seen the emergence of ethical positions that focus primarily on emotions and refer back to the tradition of moral sentimentalism. There is no consensus, however, on which emotions are ethically relevant and appropriate. This debate is very complex and diverse, so I will briefly present it through three possible paradigms, represented respectively by Martha Nussbaum (compassion), Josephine Donovan (sympathy), and Lori Gruen (empathy).

CARLO SALZANI is a Research Fellow in the Department of Philosophy of the University of Innsbruck, Austria, Guest Scholar at the Messerli Research Institute of Vienna, Austria, and faculty member of the Paris Institute for Critical Thinking (PICT). His research interests focus on animal ethics, posthumanism, and biopolitics. Among his recent publications are the edited volumes *The Biopolitical Animal* (2023) and *Animality in Contemporary Italian Philosophy* (2020), and the books *Agamben and the Animal* (2022) and *Walter Benjamin and the Actuality of Critique: Essays on Violence and Experience* (2021).

Student abstracts:

1. Mariá Castello López (University of Murcia, Spain)

Pedagogical Gestures of Hospitality in Contexts Of Vulnerability: Social Sector Educational Practice from the Pedagogy Of Alterity

2. Jeanne To Man Pang (University of Vienna, Austria)

Social and Epistemic Barriers to Non-Men Participation in East Asian Philosophy Communities and Their Ethical Implications

3. Julita Maria Skotarska (Charles University, Czech Republic)

Let's Talk About Glaciers: Between Animacy and Agency

4. Edwin Louis-Maerten (University of Basel, Switzerland)

Including Veterinary Species into the Ethics Of Body Donation

5. Andrés Salazar Abello (Université catholique de Louvain, Belgium)

Securing Effective Justice by Including Immigrants

6. Uri Brun (Tel Aviv University, Israel)

Moral Individualism, the Ordinary, and Ethics

7. Anna Milioni (King's College London, England)

Methodological Nationalism and Hermeneutical Injustice

8. Pak-Him Lai (Texas A&M University, USA)

Can Technical Artifacts be Moral Patients?

9. Tina Obermayr (University of Vienna, Austria)

Carrying The Heaviness of the (Un)bearable: A Dialogue-Phenomenologically Based Reconsideration of Pain (Accompaniment) in the Context of Inclusive Education

10. Noemi Calidori (Roma Tre University, Italy)

A Twofold Exclusion: Energy Poverty and Moral Consideration

11. Shabnam Singla (Central European University, Austria)

Ethics of Inclusivity: Who Should Bear the Burden of Bringing Forth Inclusivity?

12. Ana Carolina Gómez Sierra (Purdue University, USA)

The Problem of Universality of Human Rights

13. Moritz Bürchner (University of Vienna, Austria)

Reification of Non-Human Life Forms

14. Katharina Kora Kreiner (University of Vienna, Austria)

Do We Owe Future People a Moral Status?

15. Jan Greguš (Masaryk University Brno, Czech Republic)

Reproductive Ethics: The Need to Promote Smaller Families Worldwide

16. Anita Wallner (University of Vienna, Austria)

Abled Assessment of Cognitively Disabled Quality Of Life

17. Abdul Awal (University of Lodz, Poland)

Navigating the Ethical Landscape of Language: Implications for Use, Education, and Policy

18. Zia Ullah Akhunzada (The Chinese University of Hong Kong, China)

Minimum Age for Marriage: A Rational Standard or an Emotional Response?

19. Alida Vettorelli (Paris Lodron Universität Salzburg, Austria)

Marking The Unmarked: For an Ethical Approach to the Narration of Masculinity

20. Leah Jule Ritterfeld and Gareth Pearce (University of Vienna, Austria)

The Right to Sex

21. Scarlett Olivia Drews (University of Vienna, Austria)

The Moral Anti-Progress of New Eugenics

1

Mariá Castello López
University of Murcia, Spain

Pedagogical Gestures of Hospitality in Contexts of Vulnerability: Social Sector Educational Practice from the Pedagogy of Alterity

This PhD project focuses on social exclusion processes from the pedagogy of alterity model, an ethical- pedagogical perspective based on Emmanuel Levinas' philosophy. Following Levinas (1961/2002), humanity consists of giving pre-eminence to the Other through the establishment of an ethical relationship. Our research questions are: Could we speak about *pedagogical hospitality*? How could we relate ethically to others within socio-educational practice? Consequently, the main purpose is exploring gestures, behaviours, attitudes that materialise hospitality within the educational relationship in contexts of vulnerability, specifically within the Social Sector. From a qualitative paradigm, semi-structured interviews are being conducted with social workers from several institutions of Murcia (Spain). Five interviews were analysed for this presentation. Three main themes have been identified: companionship from the bond, the value of silence and the negotiation of physical contact. The aim is to invite the research community to reflection and dialogue on the results and their ethical implications.

2

Jeanne To Man Pang
University of Vienna, Austria

Social and Epistemic Barriers to Non-Men Participation in East Asian Philosophy Communities and Their Ethical Implications

This presentation focuses on the underrepresentation of non-men* in East Asian philosophy departments and communities. Despite an increasing interest in diversity and inclusion of different social groups in global academic philosophy communities, many philosophy departments in East Asia still have low ratios of non-men participants. The contributing factors to this phenomenon include socially and epistemically disfavoured or even oppressing practices, rooted in the social-cultural background of these regions and the academic practices within these communities. This situation highlights that East Asian philosophy communities are highly gendered and raises ethical concerns about how this may affect present and potential non-men participants who may, owing to the gender bias in their communities, perceive themselves intellectually less capable or even incapable, or question their contributions and motivations to enter or stay in this field, in addition to the challenges they must overcome in order to take part in it in the first place.

The presentation will explore these social and epistemic barriers and exclusions and discuss their ethical implications. My arguments are framed with the help of Sally Haslanger's concept of structural explanation, Iris Marion Young's conception of oppression and structural injustice, and Miranda Fricker's concept of epistemic injustice.

3

Julita Maria Skotarska
Charles University, Czech Republic

Let's Talk About Glaciers: Between Animacy and Agency

In this paper I would like to consider the possibility of accommodating glaciers within normative ethics. Going beyond their mere vulnerability in the unfolding climate crisis, I would like to bring closer attention to the language we use when we talk about them. I believe this could be a useful entry point for considering how animacy mediated by anthropomorphic language can feed into a presumed or perceived agency. I would like to investigate how useful these concepts can be in extending ethics to include inorganic nature for its own sake. Can they be used as a basis for a more care-driven way of thinking and relating to nature, without having to rely on categories of consciousness, sentience or even life? I try to address this question through Mel Y. Chen's mapping of animacy, as well as Jane Bennett's vital materialist concept of agency.

4

Edwin Louis-Maerten
University of Basel, Switzerland

Including Veterinary Species into the Ethics of Body Donation

Our reflections on biomedical ethics have so far poorly included, even marginalized, the questions related to nonhuman animals. This calls for the development of veterinary ethics as a hole discipline. In this presentation, I want to bridge this gap by exemplifying the problem of body donation. The use of animal bodies in veterinary education is widely accepted, but ethical considerations regarding how to obtain and use them are often lacking. I want to argue that the use of animal bodies should be guided by principles similar to those regulating the collection of human bodies for scientific purposes. Accordingly, as for humans, body donation programs appear to be the only acceptable source of bodies. These programs should also comply with specific requirements related to both general biomedical considerations and the uniqueness of veterinary practice. Applying such principles can better ensure that the use of animal bodies in education and training is conducted in a respectful and responsible fashion.

5

Andrés Salazar Abello
Université catholique de Louvain, Belgium

Securing Effective Justice by Including Immigrants

Liberal egalitarian theories of justice that uphold Rawls' original position assume that societies are stable and closed. However, they face increasing challenges as international mobility continues to rise. In the Rawlsian thought experiment, individuals in ideal context reach a reasonable consensus for the configuration of a just society but immigrants fail to have a seat at the table. Mobile peoples test the conceptualisation of the original position, driving scholars to deploy and reframe it and producing two leading positions: one that solidifies the assumption of closed and stable societies, where migrants are fully excluded; and another which extends the original position to include potential and actual immigrants. I engage with the debate on how to amend the original position to account for justice in international mobility and argue that even exclusive accounts must come to terms with an interest of the already settled to include foreigners. I conclude that considering an interest to include foreigners by current citizens within host political communities entails redefining the boundaries of membership and solidarity. An interest to include of some members in the original position thus lead towards including immigrants into the sphere of distributive justice, even in the ideal conditions of the original position.

6

Uri Brun
Tel Aviv University, Israel

Moral Individualism, the Ordinary, and Ethics

In my presentation, I suggest drawing from Cora Diamond's alternative to the orthodox view in animal ethics, moral individualism. Diamond rejected the view that "merely being human" does not play a role in ethics because the moral status of individuals should be determined by their own status-conferring properties. My overall aim is to show that Jeff McMahan's criticism of Diamond fails to appreciate the metaethical level at which her defense of the concept 'human being' is meant to operate. Diamond does not only challenge moral individualism as a normative doctrine but rejects the metaethical assumptions that underlie the debate about moral status in normative ethics. She does not mean to provide a justification for the moral status of human beings, but to dismantle the picture of moral thought that demands such grounds. Diamond believes that the demand to ground our ordinary moral judgments concerning the treatment of others in their morally significant properties reflects the "metaphysical requirement" to justify a mode of thought by features of what is thought about. Her Wittgenstenian attempt to think about ethics "not in the thrall of metaphysical requirements" entails important lessons for the effort to reflect philosophically about inclusivity in ethics.

7

Anna Milioni
King's College London, England

Methodological Nationalism and Hermeneutical Injustice

Even though mobility has always been a part of human history, most contemporary analyses portray migration as an exceptional, and often problematic, phenomenon. Social scientists suggest that this is the result of *methodological nationalism*, that is, of a tendency to assume that states are the most basic form of social organisation. In my paper, I argue that methodological nationalism gives rise to a form of hermeneutical injustice and should thus be avoided. First, I explain in what sense methodological nationalism constitutes a "nationalism" and I argue that it is best understood as a cognitive bias. I then focus on the case of two socially disadvantaged groups affected by methodological nationalism: (a) Roma, and (b) mobile people. I argue that methodological nationalism is unjust because it prevents members of these social groups from accessing the hermeneutical resources that would enable them to conceptualise and communicate their circumstances, and therefore participate as equals in society.

8

Pak-Him Lai
Texas A&M University, USA

Can Technical Artifacts be Moral Patients?

Environmental ethicists have engaged in active debates regarding the moral status of inanimate entities, such as rocks, water, and soil, and whether they should be granted moral considerability. In a recent publication, Magdalena Hoły-Łuczaj (2019) advocates for the inclusion of technical artifacts, especially physical ones, within the realm of entities worthy of moral consideration. She claims that granting moral considerability to technical artifacts would enable us to treat them with greater respect and care. As a result, this can have a beneficial effect on the entire ecosystem.

While Hoły-Łuczaj's innovative perspective is appealing, I think that there are still significant issues that remain unexplored in her article. My aim in this paper is to investigate the theoretical underpinning of her argument. Through this examination, I intend to show that our assessment of whether an entity deserves moral consideration should not extend beyond the criteria of "being alive". The rationale behind this claim is that living things can intelligibly be said to have interests, whereas inanimate objects cannot. The notion of interests is critical in our moral thinking because the concept of morality is intrinsically linked to the principles of beneficence or maleficence. These ideas become entirely irrelevant to the kind of entities that are incapable of experiencing either benefit or harm. Therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that technical artifacts do not meet the criteria for moral consideration.

9

Tina Obermayr
University of Vienna, Austria

Carrying the Heaviness of the (Un)bearable: A Dialogue-Phenomenologically Based Reconsideration of Pain (Accompaniment) in the Context of Inclusive Education

Pain and pain accompaniment – largely unreflected terrain within the field of inclusive education. In order to bring this disciplinary omission into the realm of the visible and to counteract it, the project focuses on both a (body-oriented) phenomenologically and pedagogically grounded reconsideration of pain and an education-theoretical approach to contexts of (irritating) experience in the field of inclusive education. In a (micro)phenomenological manner, the question of the nature of the phenomenon at the center will be posed: In what does the nature of recurring pain consist, with special consideration of the relationship between self and world, and to what extent can the (body-oriented) dialogue in the sense of an (inclusive) pedagogically oriented pain accompaniment of adolescents with chronic pain be recognized as an intersubjective experiential space of formative relationships? These questions outline the epistemological interest of the PhD project.

10

Noemi Calidori
Roma Tre University, Italy

A Twofold Exclusion: Energy Poverty and Moral Consideration

Eurostat reported that in 2020 around 35 million citizens in Europe were unable to heat their homes adequately. The literature on the negative social consequences and marginalization of energy-poor households is extensive. However, the effects of energy poverty on moral choices are underexplored. I would like to argue that energy deprivations might represent a concrete obstacle to extending moral sensitivity and consideration towards non-human and non-living nature. Drawing from Nussbaum's capability approach, I suggest that in a time of sustainable transition when a state does not secure basic energy services, many central capabilities are not guaranteed, thus not allowing energy-poor individuals the real opportunity to appreciate the intrinsic value of nature, and fostering, instead, an opposition between social (anthropocentric) and ecological demands. Eventually, two types of exclusion occur. That of natural entities not yet widely regarded as morally significant and that of people whose difficulties may seem far removed from abstract academic discourses.

11

Shabnam Singla

Central European University, Austria

Ethics of Inclusivity: Who should bear the burden of bringing forth inclusivity?

In this presentation, I argue that often in attempts at inclusivity and justice, the additional responsibility of explaining and bringing forth the relevant marginalized experiences falls on the shoulders of the already marginalized groups. I illustrate my argument by using the paradigmatic example of hermeneutical injustice (Fricker 2007) where women who were sexually harassed had to come up with the term 'sexual harassment' for it to be recognized and reported as a crime. Through this (and other examples of marginalized experiences like disability, queerness, social status, etc.), I want to bring attention to the fact that on top of being hermeneutical marginalized, and being harassed, these women were additionally pushed into the asymmetrical role where they were responsible for sharing their vulnerable experiences or coming up with a legitimate concept. I will tackle questions: Who should bear the burden of bringing forth inclusivity? Should we expect that the marginalized share their experiences in order for us to implement inclusive policies? In doing so, are we not putting an extra responsibility/burden on the marginalized? Hence, I want to show how we need to be careful while designing inclusive policies.

12

Ana Carolina Gómez Sierra

Purdue University, USA

The Problem of Universality of Human Rights

I propose a case to think about the (lack of) inclusivity in the foundations of a well-known institution. We say that human rights are applicable to everyone regardless of any characteristics. In other words, human rights are universal. However, their application is inconsistent around the world. This infrequency is what I call the practical problem of universality of human rights. In the literature, philosophers and lawyers independently debate issues of ethnocentrism (cultural norms) and norm dissonance (cooperation of international and domestic systems of law) to account for the infrequency of the application of human rights in different countries. To tackle the concern of inclusivity, I will trace the ways in which contemporary human rights fail to represent languages of dignity, especially from marginalized groups in the global south, and how the fact that there are two subjects in law, namely, the individual and the state, creates a restrictive dynamic which contributes to their legal and judicial inaccessibility. A higher level of difficulty explores the relation between culture (informal norms) and law (formal norms) where the former influences the processes of the latter in the context of human rights.

13

Moritz Bürchner

University of Vienna, Austria

Reification of Non-Human Life Forms

Phenomena of reification can be described in short as perceiving or acting towards certain in world entities like they are mere things, which they are not. Usually there are different kinds of reifying phenomena described, the reification of oneself, of fellow human beings, of human relationships or of the non-human world around us. The position exists that there is no possibility of a direct reification of the non-human world around us.

I want to make the case that there indeed exists this possibility, at least with regards to non-human life around us. The conceptualization I want to present has the basic form that reification of non-human life forms can be understood as a lack of recognition of the life inherent to these. The perception and acting towards these as mere things can be described as reification. Possibly, reification phenomena can be seen and understood as ontological phenomena that are basis and reason for the lack of acknowledgment of moral statuses.

14

Katharina Kora Kreiner

University of Vienna, Austria

Do We Owe Future People a Moral Status?

Doing the right thing concerning future generations, inter alia, in topics of climate crisis is a challenge for decision makers in the first quarter of the 21st century. The moral status of this blurry and undefined collective is not prioritised in contemporary ethical discussions. This prevents us from feeling responsible for future generations and is another factor that stops us in taking action concerning the climate crisis. I want to argue that future people indeed have a moral status. Moreover, I will show that these future individuals do not differ from us (Nolt 2015). I will conclude by demonstrating the discrimination against this group by proposing a dilemma that shows how the responsibility is decreasing the further they are away in time (Jamieson 2007). The aim of this presentation is to raise the curtain of this blurry and undefined collective and show that they also matter, just like us.

15

Jan Greguš

Masaryk University Brno, Czech Republic

Reproductive Ethics: The Need to Promote Smaller Families Worldwide

The goal of this presentation is to discuss the link between overpopulation and our profession, and to present the steps that are necessary to end, and ultimately reverse, population growth.

Methods: This presentation is based on a critical analysis of the *World Scientists' Warning to Humanity* and other scientific literature on sustainable development.

Outcome: Overpopulation exacerbates environmental and health problems, from climate change to biodiversity loss and pandemics. It is the “up-stream” driver of numerous existential threats and also a major obstacle for achieving the Sustainable Development Goals. Currently, the human population increases by over 80 million people a year. This growth could be reduced, stopped and ultimately reversed through (1) greater focus and investments into voluntary family planning methods and services, i.e., achieving full availability of contraception to all who want it, (2) greater education and empowerment of girls and women, (3) providing environmental education for all on how unsustainable human population risks humanity’s future—and all planetary life, and (4) promoting small-family reproductive ethics on principle worldwide (a maximum of two children per family, i.e., replacement level, and ideally less).

Conclusion: Addressing overpopulation and population growth compassionately—always—should be axiomatic for ethicists, especially ethicists thinking beyond the lifespan. Ethicists must be uniquely motivated to (1) sound the alarm on how overpopulation risks all planetary life and (2) promote small families worldwide as a new ethical norm.

16

Anita Wallner

University of Vienna, Austria

Abled Assessment of Cognitively Disabled Quality of Life

In general, most would agree that the assessment of a persons Quality of Life (QOL) is solely their own to make. However, this notion seems to go out of the window as soon as people with disabilities are concerned. Especially those with cognitive disabilities. Despite continuous efforts to disprove these misconceptions through extensive empirical studies about the quality of life of people with cognitive disabilities, these personal accounts are still discredited on the basis of such people not meeting non-disabled standards determining the quality of life. This negative assessment of QOL by abled people in turn serves in reinforcing ideas of (cognitive) disabled life having less worth than abled life.

In my presentation I intend to discuss the problematic nature of non-disabled assessment of cognitively disabled quality of life through addressing theories of adaptive preferences along with discussing possible implications of eugenic practices stemming from such notions of disabled QOL.

17

Abdul Awal

University of Lodz, Poland

Navigating The Ethical Landscape of Language: Implications for Use, Education, and Policy

This study explores the multifaceted intersection between ethics and language. As a fundamental tool for communication, representation, and identity construction, language use inevitably carries substantial ethical implications. The misuse of language can inadvertently or intentionally perpetuate stereotypes, propagate harmful rhetoric, and disseminate misinformation, thus contributing to systemic social injustices. This presentation underscores the importance of maintaining ethical awareness in language use, promoting respect, equality, and fairness.

Furthermore, the ethical dimensions extend into the realm of language education. With a particular focus on English as a Second Language (ESL) teaching, this study highlights the need for inclusivity, respect for students' linguistic and cultural backgrounds, and the application of teaching methodologies that foster mutual understanding and critical thinking.

Finally, the study delves into ethical considerations intrinsic to language policies. It emphasizes the profound societal and individual impacts of these policies, necessitating careful attention to linguistic diversity, the rights of minority language speakers, and the potential socio-cultural consequences of language marginalization or promotion.

This exploration of the ethical landscape of language endeavours to advocate for a more holistic, ethically conscious approach to language use, teaching, and policy-making.

18

Zia Ullah Akhunzada

The Chinese University of Hong Kong, China

Minimum Age for Marriage: A Rational Standard or an Emotional Response?

According to the UN agencies, early marriage is rampant in the developing countries of sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia. While governments across the regions have lent diverse child protection programs, eighteen years as the minimum age for marriage is universally advocated and implemented in most developing countries. Driven by the 'best interest of the child,' it is argued that early marriage harms children's physical and psychological health. However, although the argument might sound logical in some cases, love marriages among teenagers and the emergence of the sociology of childhood as a separate discipline essentially challenges the moral grounds of the minimum age thesis. Against this backdrop, the presentation discusses the validity and thinness of the minimum age argument and seeks to evoke discussion centering on the age for marriage in the background of a child's positionality, ethical underpinning, and the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

Marking the Unmarked: For an Ethical Approach to the Narration of Masculinity

The discussion on gender appears to be a central issue that today's society is called to face. A concept so fluctuating in its meaning as “masculinity” gets almost automatically opposed to the concept of femininity, as one of the most powerful binary dichotomies determining our thoughts sets those concepts in opposition to each other. A close analysis of the history of masculinity has shown that what is meant by “man” is often undefined. Although recent historiography of masculinity has taken this concept as its main research focus and although such interest seems to be necessary to mark a category that has long been unmarked, the emphasis on bringing out the masculine can cause problems for a radical historicization of masculinity. Already Stefan Dudink has shown how modern attempts to mark masculinity often lead to an “obliteration of the changing and contradictory nature of this category”. Rather than trying to deconstruct masculinity head-on, a more inclusive and ethical approach to (re)write the history of men, often attacked as the “powerful” gender, could be done by observing the transformations of this category in stories that, in a paradoxical way, are *not* stories of masculinity.

The Right to Sex

Inspired by Amia Srinivasan’s book, “The Right to Sex” (2021), this presentation aims at speculatively exploring the ethical and political implications of sexual preferences and sexual exclusions. Today’s increasing ‘economization’ of sex and intimacy, produced in part by dating apps and more relaxed social norms, highlights structural sexual preferences (e.g., based on racial biases, ableism, or transphobia). While the exclusions faced by certain marginalized groups (e.g., Asian men and Black women) are problematized within philosophical debates, it is noteworthy that the similar claims of structural exclusion by incels (‘involuntary celibates’) are oftentimes dismissed. This raises questions about the possibility of distinguishing permissible from impermissible sexual preferences (and thus, exclusions). Contemplating this, we wish to investigate what a ‘right to sex’ could entail. By conceptualizing it as a Generic Right to Sex, where no specific individual is obligated to fulfill it, we challenge the argument that there cannot be a right to sex.

*This abstract was partially formulated with the help of ChatGPT.

The Moral Anti-Progress of New Eugenics

Recently, the so-called "newgenics" has aimed to distance itself from earlier ideology, seeking to align itself with science, autonomy and human "betterment," while fallaciously claiming the sanctimonious moral high ground in the realm of human existence. In this paper, I argue that the distinction between old and new eugenics is disingenuous. New eugenics is simply the original ideology with more palatable terminology, perpetuated by anti-disability propaganda and ableist biases. It pretends to be on the side of progress, but at its core, it is still the culmination of discriminatory beliefs about which kinds of people are worthy of inclusion, ethical considerations, and ultimately, worthy of life itself.