



Society for Philosophy in the Contemporary World

25th Annual Meeting

**Portland State University
Portland, OR**

July 14-19, 2018

**Society for Philosophy in the Contemporary World
2018 Annual Conference**

July 14

- 1:00-3:00 Check-In, Introductions, and Orientation
- 3:30-4:30 PM Sanjay Lal, "Gandhi's Thought and Liberal Democracy"
- 4:30-5:30 PM West Gurley and Charles Royal Carlson, "Challenging the Way We Pay Attention Through P4C"
- 5:30-7:30 PM Dinner
- 7:30-8:30 PM Elizabeth Portella, "New Times, New Reflections, Neoliberalism: On the Politics of Novelty"
- 8:30-9:30 PM Albert Spencer, "Make Pragmatism Great Again: Obama, Trump and American Philosophy"
- 9:30 -11:00 PM Reception

July 15

- 9:00-10:00 AM Larry Busk, "Right-Wing Populism and Democratic Values: A Challenge from the Frankfurt School"
- 10:00-11:00 AM Joan Braune, "'Don't Tread on Me': Negative Freedom and Authoritarianism on the Far Right"
- 11:00-12:00 Nick Braune, "Marcuse on Positivism (Order and Progress), Workers and Freedom"
- 12:00-1:00 PM Lunch
- 1:00-2:00 PM Eddy Souffrant, "Patriotism and the Foreigner"
- 2:00-3:00 PM Howard Ponzer, "Cosmopolitanism and Patriotism: A Case for Social Universals Against the Threat of Ethnocentric Nationalism"
- 3:00-4:00 PM Willow Mindich, "Fake News, Historical Revisionism and the Suppression of Information: An Investigation into Post-Truth Politics, Net Neutrality and Historical Instances of Censorship"
- 4:00-5:00 PM Ray Kolcaba, "Freedom, Universal Surveillance, and the Life of the Mind"
- 5:00-7:00 PM Dinner

7:00-8:00 PM Kate Padgett-Walsh, "Beyond Good Debt': Freedom and the Ethics of Debt"

8:00-10:00 PM Reception

July 16

9:00-10:00 AM Michael Ball-Blakely, "Self-Respect and the Difference Principle"

10:00-11:00 AM Seth Mayer, "Decentralized Criminal Justice, Democratic Accountability, and Non-Domination"

11:00-12:00 AM Rick Werner, "Freedom's Just Another Word"

12:00-1:00 PM Lunch

1:00-2:00 PM Geoff Pfeifer, "Citizenship and the Return of Right-Populism"

2:00-3:00 PM Wendy Lynne Lee, "Remaking the World One University at a Time: Turning Point USA and the White Nationalist Dispossession of the Academy"

3:00-4:00 PM Daniel Tutt, "The Inequality of Civic Love: Towards a New Form of Solidarity"

4:00-5:00 PM Melissa Burchard, "The Meaning of Ongoing Slavery in Supposed Freedom"

5:00-7:00 PM Dinner

7:00-8:00 PM Business meeting

8:00-9:00 PM Business meeting

9:00-11:00 Reception

July 17

9:00-10:00 AM Lilith Don, "Of Which World is This? A Heideggerian Approach to PTSD"

10:00-11:00 AM Sam Garcia, "Foucauldian Parrhesia, Microaggressions, and the Pitfalls of Anger"

11:00-12:00 Janet Donohoe, "Cities Remade: On Deciding the Fate of Building in the City"

12:00-1:00 PM Lunch

1:00-2:00 PM Excursion

- 2:00-3:00 PM Excursion
 3:00-4:00 PM Excursion
 4:00-5:00 PM Excursion
- 5:00-7:00 PM Dinner
- 7:00-8:00 PM Karen Lancaster, “Nonconsensual Personified Sexbots:
 An Intrinsic Wrong”
- 8:00-9:00 PM Jeremy Wisnewski, “Affordance, Embodiment, and Moral Perception: A
 Sketch of Moral Theory”

July 18

- 9:00-10:00 AM Wade Roberts, “Freedom, Renewal and the Ambiguity of Political
 Beginnings: Reflections on the Normative Foundations of Arendt’s Theory
 of Action”
- 10:00-11:00 AM Hans Pedersen, “The Contemporary Relevance of Arendt’s Account of
 Political Freedom”
- 11:00-12:00 Stanley Konecky, “Liberty, Law, Freedom, Ethics”
- 12:00-1:00 PM Lunch
- 1:00-2:00 PM Paul Churchill, “Why Do Poor Whites Vote for Republicans When
 Republicans Hate Them?”
- 2:00-3:00 PM Jack Weir, “The Meaning and Logic of ‘Way of Life’ in Way of Life
 Arguments”
- 3:00-4:00 PM Jeffrey Fry, “Sports, Neuroplasticity, and Freedom”
- 4:00-5:00 PM Robert Brooks, “Teaching Philosophy of Science to Civil Engineering
 Materials Students for Building Vibrant Civic Communities in New York
 and Huston”
- 5:00-7:00 PM Dinner
- 7:00-8:00 PM Lara Trout, “Phenomenology, Conscientization, and Agape: Social Justice
 Pedagogy Using Paulo Freire and C. S. Peirce”

July 19

- 9:00-10:00 AM Elina Minullina, “Freedom of the Subject in Modern Political
 Communication”
- 10:00-11:00 AM Rafael Fernandes, “Hume and Institutions”

11:00-12:00	Christian Matheis, "Surrender: Obediential Power and the Feasible Surrender of Dominant Regimes"
12:00	Farewell and Bon Voyage

Presenter Bios and Abstracts

Michael Ball-Blakely

Bio: Michael Ball-Blakely is a Ph.D. student at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville. He lives in Knoxville with his partner and his two dachshunds. He is primarily interested in social and political philosophy, with specific interests in Rawlsian political philosophy; the distributive implications of self-respect and meaningful work; international distributive justice; and immigration. He is currently beginning work on his dissertation where he articulates a conception of the site of justice domestically, applies this to international justice, develops principles of international distributive justice, and then shows why robust principles are needed in order to provide the background conditions for the moral development of the parties as well as the stability of the practice.

Abstract: "Self-Respect and the Difference Principle"

In this project I consider the relationship between self-respect and inequality. I begin by articulating how self-respect is undermined through different work-related inequalities. These include indirect compensatory goods (income, wealth, and leisure) and direct compensatory goods (prestige, autonomy, and Rawls's Aristotelian Principle). Indirect compensatory goods are extrinsic to the work itself. Direct compensatory goods are ineliminably connected to, and constitute the meaning of, work. Self-respect is threatened when indirect and direct compensatory inequalities are connected. Justice requires an inverse compensatory scheme, where inequalities in direct compensatory goods are only justified if compensated for through an increase in indirect compensatory goods.

Joan Braune

Bio: Dr. Joan Braune is Lecturer in Philosophy at Gonzaga University and a member of the Council of Experts at the Gonzaga University Institute for Hate Studies. She works primarily in Critical Theory and Western Marxism, and her current work focuses on critiques of fascism. She is author of *Erich Fromm's Revolutionary Hope: Prophetic Messianism as a Critical Theory of the Future* and is writing a second book, applying Fromm's critique of fascism to the alt-right and Steve Bannon.

Abstract: "Don't Tread on Me': Negative Freedom and Authoritarianism on the U.S. Far-Right"

Critical Theorist Erich Fromm's 1941 *Escape from Freedom* warned that fascism would remain a danger in the modern world given the problem of "negative freedom." The modern individual according to Fromm enjoyed many negative freedoms, e.g. freedom from the state's encroachment on freedom of speech or religion, but lacked "positive freedom," a sense of what freedom could be for. Frightened, alone, and anomic, some individuals would "escape from freedom" by submitting to authoritarianism, Fromm warned. Building on Fromm's work and

exploring contemporary trends on today's far-right, I offer a critique of the U.S. neo-fascist alt-right, showing how Fromm's work helps explain what some have termed the "libertarian-to-fascist pipeline."

Nick Braune

Bio: Nick Braune is Emeritus Professor of Philosophy (retired 2017) at South Texas College, a community college in the economically hard-hit and over-policed area along the border with Mexico. He is an activist on peace and justice issues and has been writing recently on the psychoanalyst and ethical Marxist Erich Fromm. He became interested in "Marxist-Christian dialogue" (greatly through Fromm's lens) in the mid-1960s and keeps an interest in the question today.

Abstract: "Marcuse on Positivism (Order and Progress), Workers and Freedom"

Alt-right campaign coordinator Steve Bannon labeled himself as "always a rebel" and pro-labor, which occasions this paper to re-explore one philosophical origin of German and Italian fascism. According to Marcuse's *Reason and Revolution: Hegel and the Rise of Social Theory*, Saint-Simon's and Comte's vaunted "positivism" masked itself as "left." (Anti-church, pro-labor Saint-Simon had joined Washington's revolutionary army and hated the non-productive, exploitative rich.) However, Marcuse says positivism's leftist concern for labor's interests involved "the sharpest deviation from and opposition to Hegel's [and Marx's] philosophic theory" when the opting for freedom was wrested from individual rationality and placed in social-economic lawfulness. This paper explores that concern and answers three questions: why Marcuse attacks "positivism" and not the Enlightenment, why he attacks Saint-Simon differently than Engels does in *Socialism: Utopian to Scientific*, and why "Latin American Positivism" in Brazil, whose flag pledged "order and progress" expelled Paulo Freire, who read Marcuse.

Robert Brooks

Bio: Dr. Robert M. Brooks is an Associate Professor of Civil Engineering at Temple University. He has been teaching a wide variety of classes for the past 27 years focusing on the value of philosophy as an important component to engineering education. He is the winner of National Outstanding Teaching Award awarded by the American Society for Engineering Education, 2015.

Abstract: The focus of the proposal is to offer an overview of the value of philosophy as an important component to engineering education. The presenter will ask the participants to reflect with him on the role of philosophy in engineering-based civic-engagement learning objectives, and to share ideas on philosophy-based activities and course designs. The proposal models an important interactive pedagogical technique of motivating the students for civic engagement activity. The session will begin with a short survey of session participants on their knowledge of topics in civil engineering. From there, the presenter will lead group discussions that bring to bear concepts from the philosophy of science to develop interactive course modules. Participants will be encouraged to actively take part in discussion and written surveys on how these modules could be used with non-engineering students.

Melissa Burchard

Bio: Melissa Burchard is Professor and Chair of Philosophy at the University of North Carolina Asheville. Her research interests include issues in trauma studies, care ethics, mothering and ethical issues in popular culture, especially children's literature and film. Some of her publications include "What's an Adoptive Mother to Do? When Your Child's Desires Are a Problem" in *Coming to Life: Philosophies of Pregnancy, Childbirth and Mothering* (2012), and "Not a Matter of Will: A Narrative and Cross-Cultural Exploration of Maternal Ambivalences" with Keya Maitra in *Lived Experiences of Women in Academia: Metaphors, Manifestoes and Memoir* (2018), and her book on trauma, *Philosophical Reflections on Mothering in Trauma*, is coming out from Routledge in July or August of 2018.

Abstract: "The Meaning of Ongoing Slavery in Supposed Freedom"

How is it possible in a civilized world, where freedom is thought to be universally valued, and there is general understanding that all persons have inalienable rights, that slavery continues? An answer to these questions may be found in a deeper understanding of western conceptions of slavery and freedom. In this paper I draw on work done in history and sociology as well as philosophy to answer the question. I argue that if the terms "freedom" and "slavery" function as a dichotomous pairing, like the pairs good/evil and day/night, then their meanings are in opposition to and in tension with each other. This would then mean that, both conceptually and in practice, the dominant cultures still need slavery to ground its experience of freedom. Slavery continues to exist because people continue to need it as a grounding for their experience of freedom. My task, then, is 3-fold: first to make the argument that the liberal paradigm of freedom is indeed grounded in an assumption of its opposite, slavery. Second is to argue that slavery does continue to exist, and to show more empirically how it enables and is necessitated by the "lifestyle" that the first world, and particularly the US, has assumed as its "birthright." Finally, I will argue for a conception of freedom that is grounded not in slavery/oppression, but in the morality we claim rhetorically.

Larry Busk

Bio: Larry Alan Busk is a doctoral candidate in philosophy at the University of Oregon. His work has appeared in *Philosophy Today*, *Constellations*, and *Radical Philosophy Review*, among other places. In the fall he will defend his dissertation and begin a one-year teaching position at California State University, Stanislaus.

Abstract: "Right-Wing Populism and Democratic Values: A Challenge from the Frankfurt School"

This paper argues for a shift in critical theory's relationship to democracy in light of the growing prevalence of Right-wing populism. Against the notion of 'false democracy' (which regards the present conjuncture as not democratic enough), I draw on Adorno's "Opinion Delusion Society" and Marcuse's "Repressive Tolerance" to sketch an account of 'false *demos*.' This is an understanding of spurious and pathological political beliefs ("alternative facts") as generated and sustained by the contradictory necessities of an antagonistic society, or socially necessary delusion. The phenomenon of climate skepticism, I argue, provides a timely and illustrative model for elaborating this approach.

Paul Churchill

Bio: ROBERT PAUL CHURCHILL served for many years in the Department of Philosophy at George Washington University where he was chair of the department, director of the Peace Studies Program, and most recently, Romeo Elton Professor of Moral and Natural Philosophy. He has published on a wide range of issues centering on human rights, global ethics, just war theory, genocide, crimes against humanity, weapons of mass destruction, and nonviolence and toleration, as well as logic and political philosophy more generally. His published works include *Becoming Logical; Democracy, Social Values and Public Policy (ed.); The Ethics of Liberal Democracy (ed.); Human Rights and Global Diversity;* and most recently, *Women in the Crossfire: Understanding and Ending Honor Killing*, from Oxford University Press. He is presently at work on a book about gun violence in America, toxic masculinity, and sub-cultures of shame and honor.

Abstract: “Why Do Poor Whites Vote for Republicans when Republicans Hate Them?”

As history reveals, a perpetual threat to democracy arises from extreme inequality within the *demos*. Given that 1 percent now own almost 40 percent of the wealth in America, while the top 20 percent own almost 90 percent, we might expect the presence of a major conflict along economic and class lines. The possibilities for such a clash of economic interests have been blunted, however. The polarization between conservatives and liberals and the election of Donald Trump, along with the preeminence of the alt-right and its emphases on “fake news” and demagoguery, suggest why. Trump and the alt-right have enlisted poor and lower-income whites in red and rust-belt states in an uncompromising “cultural war” against liberals, minorities, and a formerly shared civic culture. This paper relies on research in the cognitive sciences, neurobiology, and moral psychology, to explain how this “cultural war” has come about, that is how traditional American politics of interest-groups and class differences has been supplanted by identity politics and “culture”-cum-lifestyle-conflict. This reorientation in American politics threatens civic culture and democratic order, just as it enables those in power to make common cause with those for whom the powerful have considerable antipathy. There is now a peculiar co-dependency between poorer and lower-income whites in America and Republicans. New research enables us to understand this apparent paradox: why poorer whites have voted for Republicans even though legislation sponsored by the latter continues to manifest contempt for those on the bottom.

Lillith Don

Bio: Lillith Don is a masters student in the George Washington University philosophy department. Lillith’s areas of interest include phenomenology, feminism, identity, and autonomy. More specifically, she aims to use phenomenology as a methodological tool and apply such method to experiences that are difficult to explain (i.e. PTSD). Secondary interests include political philosophy and the politicization of identity within social institutions.

Abstract: “Of Which World is This? A Heideggerian Approach to PTSD”

This paper takes a Heideggerian approach to post-traumatic stress disorder. I seek to describe the world of those who experience post-traumatic stress/flashbacks after returning from war. Heidegger describes the world as one that opens up once Dasein projects herself onto a particular identity. This identity then allows her to find meaning within the entities in the world. Once the distinction between identities, and thus, worlds, is drawn out (civilian v. soldier), I will then introduce a third identity, a Veteran, whose world(3) consists of entities in which *das*

Man cannot find meaningful; entities that may not seem intelligible to *das Man*. Here, I will illustrate that, although Dasein's vocation towards a specific identity under specific circumstances is one that may not coincide with the world(3) in which *das Man* lives, entities continue to solicit Dasein as she projects onto that identity.

Janet Donohoe

Bio: Janet Donohoe is currently Dean of the Honors College and Professor of Philosophy at the University of West Georgia. She is the author of several articles on phenomenology and place, as well editor of a new book titled *Place and Phenomenology* (Rowman & Littlefield, Int. 2017), and a monograph *Remembering Places* (Lexington Books, 2014).

Abstract: "Cities Remade: On Deciding the Fate of Building in the City"

The last few decades have seen a revival of American city centers. Many cities struggle with a scarcity of space and attempt to be ever more dense in efforts to reduce sprawl, to preserve nearby wilderness, and to promote community. While these are perhaps laudable goals, they frequently lead to conflict between those who promote tearing down neighborhoods for the sake of high-density housing and those who call for historic preservation. This paper provides a phenomenological look at this tension and provides an analysis of possible responses through Heidegger's work on dwelling and Paul Ricoeur's hermeneutical work on narrative. I will argue that the goals of dwelling as outlined by Heidegger along with consideration of the role of testimony and memory yield a framework whereby the tension between replacing or preserving can be mediated. Drawing upon examples from Atlanta, we can explore the efficacy of this framework to real situations.

Rafael Fernandes

Bio: As a PhD student at IFHC-Unicamp, under the supervision of Luiz Orlandi, I study the relationship between Hume and Deleuze: the problem of formal renewal in philosophy and the use of the history of philosophy, the question of a decolonization of philosophy, the idea of philosophy as a critique of problems or questions.

Abstract: "Institutions and Philosophy, Freedom and Society"

The following paper is intended to be an exercise in a delicate matter in philosophical learning: how to deal with a philosopher "mistakes" in the studying and teaching of philosophy. My proposal here is to reflect on David Hume's personal opinion that Blacks were inferior to Whites. What could be a proper, critical approach in such instances? We should not discard the whole work of the philosopher because of such mistakes, should we? Besides a post-colonial matter, this is an exercise against extremisms, as well as a reflection on instituting freedom in our philosophical society.

Jeffrey Fry

Bio: Jeff Fry is an associate professor in the Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies at Ball State University. His recent research lies at the intersection of the philosophy of sport, philosophy of mind, ethics, and neurophilosophy. He co-edited with Mike McNamee in 2017 a

special issue of the journal *Sport, Ethics and Philosophy* (Volume 11, Issue 3) entitled *Sport, Ethics, and Neurophilosophy*.

Abstract: “Sport, Neuroplasticity, and Freedom”

This paper plumbs the breadth and depth of neuroplasticity in connection with sport. Neuroplasticity functions across developmental stages, and is implicated in learning, habit formation, recall, and execution. Neuroplasticity has profound implications for sport and our lives. These implications have descriptive and normative dimensions. To explicate these dimensions I utilize H.R. Niebuhr’s notion of responsibility as entailing *responsiveness* and Charles Hartshorne’s notion of “divine relativity.” I examine how neuroplasticity relates to freedom and its constriction. Neuroplasticity relates to our embrained, embodied, and embedded existence (indebtedness to Walter Glannon). It is implicated in the formation, maintenance, transformation, and dissolution of sporting identities.

Sam Garcia

Bio: Samuel Garcia is an independent scholar and an adjunct instructor of philosophy at Biola University where he has taught for the past six years. His scholarship lies at the intersection of moral, social, and political philosophy; more specifically, his more recent research interests include virtue ethics, epistemic privilege and ignorance, the philosophy of race, the final phase of Foucault’s work, and the nonviolent resistance tradition. A fundamental impetus of his work is the desire to elucidate virtuous social practices that enable communities to resist their own marginalization in a way that affirms vibrant pluralism without lapsing into moral relativism.

Abstract: “Foucauldian Parrhēsia, Microaggressions, and the Pitfalls of Anger”

Contemporary resistance to marginalization takes three primary forms: denunciation, protest, and litigation. In this paper, I zero in on public denunciation of microaggressions as an instantiation of Foucauldian parrhesia—courageously speaking truth to power at some risk to oneself—which can itself be practiced virtuously or viciously. Building on Martha Nussbaum’s analysis of anger, I argue that vicious parrhesia incorporates a retaliatory dimension involving a desire for retribution or the leveling of social status to the detriment of the general welfare. By contrast, virtuous parrhesia seeks to improve the general welfare by requiring a care of the self prior to provoking self-formation in the other. My central claim is that contemporary resistance is incapable of producing virtuous parrhēsia, and virtuous resistance in general, with the conceptual resources accorded by its own framework. On the other hand, I argue that Foucault’s “ethical turn” parallels the nonviolent resistance tradition in key ways and is an immediate improvement over contemporary resistance; however, it also necessitates communal practices beyond the three forms of modern resistance. The upshot is that the best elements of both Foucault’s late work and the nonviolent resistance tradition provide a basis for exploring more fruitful modes of communal resistance to marginalization.

West Gurley and Charles Royal Carlson

Bios: **S. West Gurley** is Assistant Professor of Philosophy at Sam Houston State University. His scholarly interests include the history of nineteenth and twentieth century continental

European philosophy (especially French and German) with emphasis on phenomenology, deconstruction, and post-modernism. Dr. Gurley is author of *Minding the Gap: What it is to Pay Attention Following the Collapse of the Subject-Object Distinction* (Scholar's Press, 2013) and co-editor with Geoff Pfeifer of *Phenomenology and the Political* (Rowman & Littlefield, 2016).

Charles Royal Carlson is Visiting Assistant Professor at Sam Houston State University. Research interests include American Philosophy, Philosophy of Biology, Applied Ethics, Existentialism and Philosophy for Children.

Abstract: "Challenging the Way We Pay Attention Through P4C"

There is a relationship between the way children interact with texts and the ways in which they attend to the world. This relationship is formative in the process of coming to adulthood and, thereby, has become habituated through the processes of standardized educational practices. Contemporary attempts to understand how we attend to the world are thoroughly beholden to certain assumptions that have arisen because of the habituated practices of attending to the world we describe when we describe our world. The distinct difference in the way that the concept of *attention* is treated in the pedagogy of Philosophy for Children (P4C) is waiting and ready to be mined to address these systemic problems. Through the lens of both pragmatic and continental philosophy we address various accounts of attention and contend that P4C presents a different way of thinking about attention that avoids the pitfalls of the current situation and offers insight on the path forward. Our paper provides an account of some of the concrete implementation of these programs in the classroom and in the summer Philosophy Bootcamps for teens we have facilitated.

Ray Kolcaba

Bio: I am a founding member of SPCW. I taught at Cuyahoga Community College for my career. I have been retired since 2008. Among my written works are two books: [The Brilliant Side of Growing Up](#) and [The Human Future: Seven Philosophical Dialogs](#). Last year I wrote a mystery, [The Backside of Thursday](#). It illustrates the elusiveness of historical explanation. I am presently working on the concept of wisdom--- a biggie from ancient Greece that oddly has been neglected. I enjoy traveling with wife Kathy, painting, and playing the harpsichord (although not well enough).

Abstract: "Freedom, Universal Surveillance, and The Life of the Mind"

Activities over the long arc of life often require solitude as well as social interaction. I argue that presently the life of the mind is in jeopardy because the new world of cyber environments threatens solitude. I discuss three forces that work to this end: Universal Surveillance, The Cyber-press, and Commercial Circles. Information technology offers new freedom but the devil's bargain imposes ominous controls. I close with Bertrand Russell's views about fruitful monotony.

Stanley Konecky

Bio: Stanley Konecky of Hartwick College is primarily concerned as a professional philosopher with any committed dialogue that moves ordinary being, thinking, acting and "teaching" to better understanding of and response to our human conditions.

Sanjay Lal

Bio: Sanjay Lal is a senior lecturer of philosophy at Clayton State University in Morrow, GA. Sanjay has published many articles on the philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi, is an associate editor of *The Acorn: Philosophical Studies in Pacifism and Nonviolence* as well as a board member of Concerned Philosophers for Peace. He currently has a book contract with Rowman & Littlefield publishers on Gandhian philosophy and liberal thought. His talk today is based on that project.

Abstract: “Gandhi’s Thought and Liberal Democracy”

In this paper I will consider issues that relate to the viability and justification of the liberal project from the standpoint of Gandhi’s philosophy. I will aim to go beyond simply showing Gandhi’s disagreements with modern day liberalism and seek to explicate specific remedies he offers regarding serious ailments that currently plague liberal society. My focus will not so much be on establishing Gandhi’s liberal bona fides but on showing the vast trove of resources his writings provide for those interested in better realizing a genuinely liberal society.

Karen Lancaster

Bio: I am studying a Masters in Philosophy at the University of Nottingham, England. My academic interests lie in moral, social, and political philosophy – in particular, philosophical problems which arise from emerging technologies. In October 2018 I will commence a PhD in which I will assess how AI robots should conceive of harm and consent, and how they should weigh the two concepts against one another. I have taught Sociology and Philosophy at A-Level (16-18 year olds) for 14 years, and I hope to teach at a university after I complete my PhD.

Abstract: “Nonconsensual Personified Sexbots: An Intrinsic Wrong”

We are on the brink of a robotic revolution; it is now possible to create sexbots which closely resemble real people. I argue that creating such a sexbot without the human subject’s consent is an intrinsic wrong, irrespective of any instrumental harms which may ensue. I argue that whilst creating ‘generic sexbots’ is permissible and non-objectifying, creating ‘personified sexbots’ amounts to objectification, and although objectification is permissible if consensual, it is an intrinsic wrong when it is nonconsensual. Ricky Ma’s Scarlett Johansson sexbot evidences that this is not merely science fiction, but our immediate (and disturbing) future.

Wendy Lynne Lee

Bio: Wendy Lynne Lee is Professor of Philosophy at Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania where she's taught for 26 years. Her areas of current scholarship include philosophy at the intersections of environmental, feminist, animal welfare, and food security issues, particularly the geopolitics of climate change. She recently published *Eco-Nihilism: The Philosophical Geopolitics of the Climate Change Apocalypse* and is completing *This is Environmental Ethics* for Blackwell. Some of her most recent work concerns the re-emergence of white nationalism, the Alt-Right, and its impact on academic freedom at U.S. universities.

Abstract: “Remaking the World One University at a Time: *Turning Point USA* and the White Nationalist Dispossession of the Academy”

This paper isn't about the traditional free will/determinism debate. It *is*, however, about freedom, and for organizations devoted to philosophy in the contemporary world, its topic is important and urgent. I'll argue that societies like the *Society for Philosophy in the Contemporary World* have a responsibility and an opportunity to confront the threat posed by thinly veiled white nationalist ventures like *Turning Point USA*. *TPUSA* advertises itself as a youth movement to advance free market values and limited government, but its mission statement is, in fact, lure and cover for the advance of its authoritarian white nationalist objectives. *TPUSA* targets higher education seeking to undermine university commitments to academic freedom and to conscript the *production of knowledge* to ends that support its ideological aims. My aim is to show how and why this should matter to SPCW.

Christian Matheis

Bio: Christian Matheis is visiting faculty in Community and Justice Studies in the Department of Justice and Policy Studies at Guilford College in Greensboro, NC. Matheis specializes in scholarship and practice that bridge social and political philosophy, ethics, public policy, and direct-action organizing. In particular, his work emphasizes how philosophy of liberation and liberatory movements can play a key role in addressing contemporary ethical and political problems. His teaching and research concentrations include topics such as solidarity, refugees, feminism, race, indigeneity, power and policy, and global justice. In addition to his regular teaching and research, he provides training in areas of human relations facilitation, intergroup dialogue, grassroots direct-action organizing, and on other topics.

Abstract: "Surrender: Obediential Power and the Feasible Surrender of Dominant Regimes"

This paper proposes a conceptual treatment of surrender as a liberatory virtue, one that may guide the practical abdication of unearned, unjustified power. Philosophical studies of oppression and social justice have made clear the need for systematic redistributions of economic resources, political representation, and cultural inclusion, but typically framing the general solution as a need for marginalized groups to "gain power." The notion that the disempowered must somehow act from positions of relative marginalization to demand power seems to indicate a lacuna in social philosophy: what about the virtuous, feasible surrender of power by rulers? Scholars of egalitarianism have said little about the need for members of dominant groups to surrender positions of cultural, political, and economic influence for the sake of social justice, usually positing surrender as a last-ditch effort following the failure of political regimes. Suppose that those who wield illegitimate power bear primary responsibility for surrendering their undue influence in the interests of social justice. This paper aims to retrieve concepts of surrender from philosophical and colloquial connotations as a reluctant act of contrition, or last resort, to suggest instead that considering surrender represents a fundamental condition of legitimate rule. To make the case, I draw on philosophy of liberation to argue the critical point that political systems absent a concept of surrender as a feasible alternative to unjust rule cannot clearly outline the terms of their legitimacy. I then argue for an Aristotelian understanding of surrender as both vice and virtue, offering a candidate list of conceptual resources from which political actors may better reason through their claims to, and abdications of power.

Seth Mayer

Bio: Seth Mayer is Assistant Professor of Philosophy at Manchester University in Indiana. He received his PhD from the Northwestern University philosophy department. His research focuses on democratic theory, global political philosophy, criminal law and philosophy, critical theory, and ethics.

Abstract: “Decentralized Criminal Justice, Democratic Accountability, and Non-Domination”

Given that criminal punishment is one of the most coercive actions a state can take against its citizens, criminal justice systems create an especially strong need for democratic accountability. Many have pointed out that the American criminal justice system falls far short of democratic ideals. In response, some have proposed a more decentralized system with a greater emphasis on local participation. These proposals promise to deconcentrate power and remove bureaucracy, but they frequently include a philosophical commitment to problematic forms of communitarian solidarity. Such communitarian stances threaten to demand unrealistic and potentially dominating forms of cultural unity in order to enact justice. These views aim to preserve a society’s ethos, rather than encourage necessary, transformative change. Instead, I defend decoupling proposals for local democratic control over criminal justice institutions from communitarian ideals. Rather than reflecting a unitary culture, criminal law institutions should enable citizens with divergent cultural identities to interact on equal terms. While pursuing democratic accountability, local legal institutions must also vigilantly avoid cultural domination. This approach has implications for understanding and structuring juries, problem-solving courts, and restorative justice institutions.

Willow Mindich

Bio: Willow Mindich graduated from Colorado College in 2016, where she received a B.A. in philosophy and founded *Anamnesis: The Colorado College Journal of Philosophy*. For a year after graduation, Mindich worked as an editorial intern for *The Other Journal*, an academic journal based out of the Seattle School for Theology and Psychology, with whom she published *Autobiographical Memory and the Art of Storytelling and Narrative Identity: A Poetics of the Self*. Mindich was also an intern with the Center for Philosophy for Children based out of the University of Washington, through which she taught philosophy classes in local fifth-grade classrooms. Mindich is currently an M.A. student at the University of Colorado—Denver, where her research explores the political dimensions of remembering, and their ethical consequences—such as, epistemic subjugation, institutional amnesia, and misrepresentation in the media.

Abstract: Information provided by the mass media has historically been subject to manipulation. The escalation of fake news, compounded with partisanship and sensationalism, has compromised access to comprehensive and accurate information. Misrepresentation in the media has impacted the domain of history as well, which indicates the value of a revisionist approach. An awareness of the impressionability of public information encourages the reinvestigation of current and historical events. Critical reinterpretation gives credence to marginalized epistemic-sources and thereby uncovers information that has eluded public representation. With the fate of net neutrality uncertain, effective participation in democracy requires an awareness of epistemic manipulation.

Elina Minnullina

Bio: Elina Minnullina, PhD, DSc in philosophy (social philosophy). Head of the Department of Philosophy and Media communications, Kazan State Power Engineering University. Domains of research: communication theory, social philosophy, philosophy of science. Main books (in Russian): *Essence as a Social Cognition Objective*. Kazan State Power Engineering University, 2005; *Communicative Space. Rationality. Discourse*. Kazan State Power Engineering University, 2014. Member of the International Society of Universal Dialogue, member of Russian Philosophical Society. Disciplines: philosophy, theory of communication, social linguistics.

Abstract: “Freedom of the subject in modern political communication”

The paper is aimed at studying political communication as a factor of formation of subjectivity. The initial premise is the idea that perverse forms of power (dictatorships) are rooted in communicative rationality. In the modern world, the communicative infrastructure is threatened by two interrelated and mutually complementary tendencies: a systematically conditioned reification and a cultural decline (conformist consciousness – das Man of Heidegger). The liberation of the individual from traditional dependencies entails his/her removal from moral landmarks and causes the increase of his/her dependence on the system.

Plato's Utopia demonstrated the danger that the notion of universal truth carries within itself: it is totalitarianism, forcing everybody to think and act according to one pattern. Ideas of freedom were generalized in philosophy by T. Hobbes, B. Spinoza, G.W.F. Hegel and F. Engels with the concept of freedom as a recognized necessity. Freedom is not only the absence of limits, but also a possibility that allows a person to compensate for lacks.

One of the most important questions is if ideological freedom is an essential foundation for private freedom and human development. This distinction can be linked with Isaiah Berlin's paradigm of the negative and positive freedom.

Freedom in political communication is directly connected with the moral statements coordinating individuals' actions: if we demand behavior from others or justify our behavior, then we should turn to such norms that are intersubjectively meaningful. However, in any world outlook morality is intertwined with the notion of the good, the reference point of which is the life pattern. Thus, the first difficulty of freedom realization in political communication is due to the fact that the moral norms governing the communication interaction are not universal.

Kate Padgett-Walsh

Bio: Kate Padgett Walsh is an Associate Professor of Philosophy at Iowa State University. Her research explores intersections between Hegel's ethical thought and contemporary ethics, and she is currently writing a book on the ethics of debt.

Abstract: “Beyond Good Debt’: Freedom and the Ethics of Debt”

This paper examines the philosophical origins of the notion of good debt. To counter traditional arguments that usury was exploitative, early modern philosophers redefined debt as a form of investment for both borrowers and lenders. Today, this notion underlies the rhetoric of those who profit from debt. Close examination of the realities of contemporary debt, however, reveal that this rhetoric is misleading and false. It exhorts borrowing for investment while aggressively encouraging individuals to borrow for consumption. And it promises a better future even though the lived reality of most debt is one of constraint and the loss of freedom.

Hans Pedersen

Bio: Hans Pedersen is an Associate Professor of Philosophy at Indiana University of Pennsylvania. His research is mainly focused on phenomenology and existentialism, particularly on issues surrounding agency, freedom, and responsibility.

Abstract: “The Contemporary Relevance of Arendt’s Account of Political Freedom”

Most of the scholarship on Arendt’s account of freedom focuses on the concept of natality—the idea that political freedom is about bringing something new into existence, and there is good reason for this, as Arendt comes back to this concept in various works and clearly sees it as central to her vision of political freedom. However, in this paper, I want to consider some other aspects of Arendt’s discussion of freedom that are usually given less consideration, both by scholars and Arendt herself. First, I will show how Arendt traces the historical development of the metaphysical free will of the individual thought of as individual sovereignty to understanding political freedom as sovereignty. By doing so, we can better understand the tendency in some current political discourse of those who proclaim most strongly that they value freedom to endorse and engage in oppressive practices. Second, I will show how Arendt provides a different paradigm of freedom—not as sovereignty or natality—but rather as making oneself into a political agent through the manifestation of political principles in one’s actions in the public sphere.

Geoff Pfeiffer

Bio: Geoff Pfeiffer is Associate Teaching Professor of Philosophy and International and Global Studies at Worcester Polytechnic Institute in Massachusetts. In addition to a number of book chapters, his work can be found in *Human Studies*, *The European Legacy*, *Crisis and Critique*, *Continental Thought and Theory*, *Contemporary Perspectives in Social Theory*, and *The Journal of Global Ethics*. He is also the co-editor (with West Gurley) of *Phenomenology and the Political* (Roman and Littlefield International, 2016) and author of *The New Materialism: Althusser, Badiou, and Žižek* (Routledge, 2015).

Abstract: “Citizenship and the Return of Right-Populism”

Hannah Arendt has famously pointed out that, despite ideas about universal human rights, only citizenship actually confers rights in the modern world. In this way, to be a citizen is to be one who has “the right to have rights.” Arendt’s analysis emerges out of her recognition that there is a contradiction between this way of conferring rights that emerges in the nation-state system and the more philosophical and ethical conceptions of the “rights of man” and/or “human rights” based on systems like that championed by Immanuel Kant that see sets of rights universally belonging to humans as a result of some set of facts about what it means to be a human. Etienne Balibar, in his recent work, elaborates on this problem pointing out, in part, that there is a contradictory movement between on the one hand, this universalizing tendency in philosophical thought and the popular imagination of the democratic nation-state and on the other, the production of the citizen-subject out of the exclusionary act of law and force. Balibar goes on to argue that the modern citizen subject is marked by this double-movement. As citizen, she is both the product of exclusion and thereby her subjectivity is that through which the nation-state system perpetuates in existence, and also the potential block to such social reproduction as she is also marked by the modern narrative of universality.

In this paper I put Balibar's work in the context of the contemporary moment where we are witnessing the re-emergence of a nativist politics of right-populism around the world. I use it to help distinguish between three modes of political existence that we find today. Two of these three modes are more or less well understood. They are the non-citizen, who has no, or almost no rights in a given nation-state and the citizen who enjoys the full benefit of all the rights a nation has to give. The third category is what I term the 'nominal citizen'.

This last category is somewhere in-between full citizenship and non-citizenship. Individuals in this last category have rights in name but are largely unable to exercise them. Understanding this category can, among other things, help us at least partially make sense of the return of right-populism but help us see the ways in which the modern conception of citizenship offers a powerful corrective to this as well as an ethical imperative that transforms our conception of citizenship in ways that reject its foundation in exclusionary practices. Thus I show how, much like Marx's famous claims about the proletariat being both the creation of capitalism and its downfall, modern citizenship is similarly structured.

Howard Ponzer

Bio: Howard Ponzer is Professor of Philosophy at Molloy College where he's taught for 12 years. His current areas of scholarship include cosmopolitanism, human rights, and a rethinking of the value of universality from a progressive left point of view. He is currently working on three related articles: *Cosmopolitanism and Patriotism: A Case for Social Justice Universals*, *The Danger of Particularity: A Warning to the Progressive Left*, and *The Metaphysics of Particularity*. Some of his most recent research focuses on global citizenship, white supremacy, the Alt-Right (Richard Spencer), and a reevaluation of leftist politics in the United States.

Abstract: "Cosmopolitanism and Patriotism: A Case for Social Justice Universals"

The author presents a case for a cosmopolitan moral theory to address the threat of ethnocentric nationalism in the US, not in the abstract, but in the real-time context of the Trump administration's allegiance to an 'America First' policy predicated a history of exclusionary practices. It addresses the specific threats that arise when a political administration prioritizes the interests of one *particular* group of people to the exclusion of others and proposes, as a remedy, the implementation of non-metaphysical universals of inclusion, what the author calls 'social justice universals.'

Elizabeth Portella

Bio: Elizabeth Portella is a PhD student at the University of Oregon. Her interests include social and political philosophy in the Continental tradition (esp. Marx and Frankfurt School critical theory). Her other scholarly interests include philosophy of history, feminist philosophy, and the history of philosophy (esp. German Idealism). Her work has appeared in *Theoria & Praxis*, *Rethinking Marxism* and is forthcoming in *Philosophy Today* and the *Journal for the Philosophy of History*. Currently, her dissertation research focuses on the role of philosophy of history in shaping contemporary political philosophy. In particular, her project consists of an analysis of historical citation and interpretation as the site of claims about political novelty as well as obsolescence.

Abstract: "'New Times,' 'New Reflections,' Neoliberalism: On the Politics of Novelty"

This paper undertakes a comparative analysis of the work of Iris Marion Young, Ernesto Laclau, and Stuart Hall with an eye to their views on political novelty. My aim is to evaluate the relation between their critical methodological practices and the historical moment in which they emerge (i.e., neoliberalism). In particular, I consider the relation between economic justice and the politics of difference in their works. Through a comparative reading of these exemplary figures, I analyze the conditions for the appearance of theoretical and practical political novelty in contemporary political philosophy.

Wade Roberts

Bio: Wade Roberts is an Associate Professor of Philosophy at Juniata College. His primary areas of research are Continental philosophy, contemporary political theory and ethics. He is currently writing a book on Hannah Arendt, liberal education and the neoliberal transformation of American universities.

Abstract: “Freedom, Renewal and the Ambiguity of Political Beginnings: Reflections on the Normative Foundations of Arendt’s Theory of Action”

One of the leitmotifs which unites Arendt’s mature work is the indelible link between human freedom and the possibility of human renewal. Yet while the a great deal has been written about Arendt’s discussion of freedom, significantly less has been said concerning its normative dimensions, particularly as it relates to the connection between freedom and the arbitrariness of political beginnings. In this essay I propose to make a contribution towards remedying that deficit. The paper begins with an attempt to sketch out a conception of freedom which Arendt criticized, and it also highlight tendencies in the life-world which were, at least on her reading, undermining the struggle for autonomy. This initial and essentially negative task is important both because it permits us to sharpen the conceptual demarcation of freedom as it is developed in Arendt’s work, and it also helps to illuminate why Arendt believes that freedom has normative importance. The next part of the essay then provides an overview of her positive account. The final section of the paper offers reflections/observations about the broader theory, and there I develop the argument that Arendt tends to valorize political commencements as goods in themselves without adequately addressing the concern that beginnings can give rise both to renewal as well as chaos. I then conclude with brief reflections on how we can preserve the hope for renewal which are inherent in beginnings while also minimizing the attendant risks that often accompany them.

Eddy Soufrant

Bio: Eddy M. Soufrant is a faculty member of the Department of Philosophy at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte. He teaches Ethics, Social and Political Philosophy, and Ethics and International Affairs. He has research and teaching expertise in the areas of African American, Francophone and Caribbean Philosophy. His recent publications examine the issues Collective responsibility, International ethics, and Conceptions of Political Identities. He is currently working on a manuscript that explores the intersection of International Development, Ethics and Disaster.

Abstract: “Patriotism and the Foreigner”

In his inaugural address, the president of the U.S.A. buttressed his philosophy of governance with a specific brand of nationalism. He endorses a patriotic nationalism that is antagonist to the foreigner and is ultimately inconsistent with cosmopolitanism. His address supports the exclusionary disposition and that is presumably justified because his endorsement of the nationalist program is to benefit the patriotic citizen. I question whether our times needs the brand of governance that the president favors, and I propose that we adopt by contrast a robust cosmopolitanism. This work attempts to disentangle the president's position to explore the philosophical ramifications of such an approach. I determine that his restrictive political philosophy cannot take hold without the contribution of the foreigner and conclude that his position is internal inconsistent unless he willingly opts to mistreat the foreigner, the Other.

Albert Spencer

Bio: Albert Spencer is a Senior Instructor of Philosophy. His scholarship focuses on American Pragmatism, Existentialism, and Environmental Philosophy. He is also interested in Indigenous Philosophy, Plato, and Eastern Religious Philosophies. His most recent article is "Loyalty to Nature: Royce's Latent Environmental Philosophy" (*The Pluralist*, Fall 2017) and he is completing an introduction to pragmatism for Polity Press. Follow Albert on Twitter @AlbertRSpencer1

Abstract: Intrigued and disturbed by Donald Trump's lack of ideology and methodological bombast, some have drawn connections between his approach and the American philosophical tradition of pragmatism. Ironically, his predecessor, Barack Obama, has also been associated with pragmatism. How can two political figures so diametrically opposed in worldview, methods, and goals both be labeled pragmatists? This paper differentiates between a thin pragmatism based on anti-dualism, practice over theory, and truth as what works, verses a thick pragmatism that incorporates liberation, fallibilism, meliorism, pluralism, verification, and hope into its aims and methods. It contrasts popular assessments of Trump's pragmatism against scholarly assessments of Obama's pragmatism to show how the current president employs a thin version of pragmatism for the advantage of himself and his nativist allies in contrast with the former president's thick pragmatism which sought to achieve the higher aspirations of the American experiment.

Lara Trout

Bio: Lara Trout (preferred pronouns she/her/hers) is an Associate Professor of Philosophy at the University of Portland in Oregon, where she has taught for 13 years. She was born and raised in the Midwest of the United States. Her pedagogy is deeply influenced by her undergraduate study of elementary education (where she was introduced to Paulo Freire's *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*) and by her experience in the Jesuit Volunteer Corps. Her research interests involve applying philosophy to social justice issues, drawing on insights from classical American pragmatism, Paulo Freire, and epistemologies of ignorance. Her 2010 book *The Politics of Survival: Peirce, Affectivity, and Social Criticism* focuses on helping those in socio-politically dominant groups (especially white people, like herself, in the U.S.) address blind spots towards those in corresponding non-dominant groups. Her most current project involves a dialogue between Argentine philosopher Enrique Dussel and U.S. philosopher Charles Sanders Peirce.

Abstract: Paulo Freire describes a phenomenological aspect of the conscientization process that problem-posing education promotes for members of oppressed groups, whereby they attune their observations to phenomena previously taken for granted, which can now be critically addressed. I apply this phenomenological insight to help white students in the U.S. address privilege-informed blind spots they may have about race. Some of these students resist the conscientization process, however, due to the emotional discomfort it can cause. To address this, I couple my use of Freirean pedagogy with insights from C. S. Peirce's phenomenology and his work on agapic love.

Daniel Tutt

Bio: Daniel Tutt is a lecturer in philosophy at George Washington University, Marymount University and Georgetown University's Prisons and Justice Initiative, where he teaches philosophy at the Washington, DC jail. His research is concerned with psychoanalysis, ethics, theology, Islamic thought, Marxism and post-Marxist thought. He is also an active media producer and documentary producer having produced several documentaries for PBS. Daniel is the co-editor of a new book, *Theologies and Ethics of Justice: New Directions in 21st Century Islamic Thought* (IIIT Press) and some of his latest essays include: "Love, Psychoanalysis and leftist Political Ontology" in *Sex and Nothing: Bridges from Psychoanalysis to Philosophy* (Karnac, 2016), "Cohle and Oedipus: The Return of the Noir Hero" in *True Detective and Philosophy* (Blackwell Publishing, 2017), "Deleuzian Theology and the Immanence of the Act of Being" published in the *Journal of the Society for Contemporary Thought and the Islamicate World* (2015).

Abstract: "Sublimation, Community and Asymmetrical Love: Towards a New Form of Solidarity"

This paper puts forward a critique of contemporary identity politics as a form of political fatalism that must be understood as a problem of desire and love. Following this critique of identity politics, the paper then argues that the universal, liberatory form of desire Herbert Marcuse develops in *Eros and Civilization* does not resonate or apply to resolving the impasses of today's identity politics. The body of the paper presents a new theory of sublimation for our times that is inspired from Gilles Deleuze's idea of quasi-cause and the wound, and the thought of the philosopher Bernard Stiegler in his *Symbolic Misery* (2003 –) series. After developing this new form of sublimation, the paper then turns to the category of political love, looking specifically at more practical strategies for cross identity solidarity as a means to re-introduce "asymmetrical love" in social and political life.

Jack Weir

Bio: At the end of the Spring Semester 2018, Jack Weir retired as Professor of Philosophy at Morehead State University (Kentucky). He hopes now to complete projects started in the past, such as the paper for this meeting, and to begin new ones.

Abstract: "The Meaning and Logic of 'Way of Life' in Way of Life Arguments"

This paper is an attempt to begin an analysis of 'way of life' arguments, and thereby start a conversation toward clarity and precision. In the past and even today, appealing to a 'way of life' allegedly justified and still justifies such strongly morally counterintuitive practices as slavery, sexual mutilation, dueling, and honor killing. At issue is whether every 'way of life' is

sacrosanct and incorrigible, and consequently justifies the moral permissibility of every disposition, behavior, practice, and institution necessary for its continuation. After presenting a particular case, the four best recent accounts of the concept are assessed. A definition inclusive of these usages is proposed: a 'way of life' is some kind of allegedly internally self-justifying moral relativism. Against the internal self-justification claimed by moral relativists, two lines of argument are proposed: (a) some 'ways of life' are *internally* self-defeating, and (b) every 'way of life' can be assessed *externally* by appealing to shared universal human character traits, experiences, values, and rights. The paper concludes with an invitation and prospectus for future inquiry.

Rick Werner

Bio: Rick Werner is John Stewart Kennedy Professor of Philosophy Emeritus at Hamilton College where he taught for 43 years. His scholarship focuses on ethics including pragmatic pacifism, medical ethics, and ethical realism. Rick has a strong interest in moral psychology especially relating to human flourishing and well-being, philosophical pragmatism, and existential phenomenology. He has published in *Social Theory and Practice, Analysis, Ethics, The Monist*, and *Contemporary Pragmatism* as well as several anthologies and co-edited with Duane Cady, *Just War, Nonviolence and Nuclear Deterrence*.

Abstract: "Freedom's Just Another Word"

Suppose Hitler won WWII. White supremacy would be accepted fact while personal freedom would be considered dangerous, immoral. Suppose white supremacists gain control in the US. Their "alternate facts" would become the accepted facts, including that Trump had the biggest inaugural crowd, that white western male culture is the source of all progress in the world, and that it should rule. Kellyanne Conway was correct. Accepted facts are whatever those with power deem them to be. The people could have the power or an autocrat or anything between. "Mind-independent facts" are a philosophical fantasy based on other philosophical fantasies like a sense of objectivity or neutrality that goes beyond intersubjective agreement, solidarity. Not the Truth nor Progress nor History will save us from fascism or anything else. We must save ourselves, increasingly in a Land of Babble that lacks a normal political paradigm to reconcile our differences. Only collective action, solidarity will return us to normal politics. Our collective action will decide. As Heidegger wrote, "But where danger grows, the saving power also." As Marx wrote, "the philosophers have only interpreted the world, the point however is to change it."

Jeremy Wisnewski

Bio: Jeremy Wisnewski earns his keep teaching undergraduates at Hartwick College. He has written widely on issues in moral philosophy, applied ethics, and phenomenology. His books include *Wittgenstein and Ethical Inquiry* (Continuum, 2007), *The Politics of Agency* (Routledge/Ashgate, 2008), *The Ethics of Torture* (with R.D. Emerick. Continuum, 2009), *Understanding Torture* (EUP, 2010), and *Heidegger* (Rowman & Littlefield, 2012). He has also edited six books in Blackwell's Philosophy and Pop Culture series.

Abstract: "Affordances, Embodiment, and Moral Perception: A Sketch of a Moral Theory"

In this paper, I will argue that understanding perceptual experience on the model of perceptual affordances allows us to acknowledge the centrality of embodiment to moral phenomenology, on the one hand, and to see more transparently the place of the emotions in the moral life, on the other.