

MANCHESTER
1824

The University of Manchester

THE MANCEPT WORKSHOPS

Full Panel Overview

2nd - 4th September 2026

Organised by Maurits Bekkers, Timothy Siew, and Anthony McMullin

Panels

WELCOME	4
AGAINST PARTICIPATION: WITHDRAWAL, EXIT, AND POLITICAL AGENCY	5
DOING DEMOCRACY DIFFERENTLY? DEMOCRATIC INNOVATION IN AN AGE OF BACKSLIDING	9
EPISTEMIC DEMOCRACY AND THE LURE OF EPISTOCRACY: QUESTIONS IN METAETHICS AND POLITICAL NORMATIVITY	14
EPISTEMIC INJUSTICE AND BACKLASH	19
ETHICAL AND POLITICAL CHALLENGES IN CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION	23
ETHICS OF ACADEMIA	28
GENOCIDE AND DEMOCRATIC THEORY	32
HISTORICAL INJUSTICE	36
INTIMATE (IN)JUSTICES	39
JUSTICE IN CLIMATE LITIGATION	41
LAND, TERRITORY, AND JUSTICE	45
NEW DIRECTIONS FOR COSMOPOLITANISM AND GLOBAL DEMOCRACY	49
PLEBEIANISM, POPULAR GOVERNMENT, AND THE CHALLENGE OF MODERN OLIGARCHY ...	54
POLITICAL ORDINARY LANGUAGE	58
REPUBLICAN POLITICAL ECONOMY	61
RESPECT FOR PERSONS: FOUNDATIONS, VARIETIES, AND CHALLENGES	65
RETHINKING THE POLITICAL THEORY OF MIGRATION FOR OUR TIMES	68
RETHINKING THE RADICAL RIGHT: TRANSNATIONAL NETWORKS, POLICY CONVERGENCE, AND DISCURSIVE POWER ACROSS GENDER, HEALTH, AND ENVIRONMENT	72

SPECIESISM, POWER AND HUMAN PREJUDICE.....	76
TECHNO-(E)UTOPIAS OF ABUNDANCE, SUSTAINABILITY AND SUFFICIENCY	79
THEORIES OF PUBLIC REASON.....	82
THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE NON-PROFIT SECTOR.....	86
THE POLITICS OF GENAI GOVERNANCE.....	89
TOLERANCE AND EDUCATION: CONCEPTS, JUSTIFICATIONS, AND LIMITS	93
WHO "KNOWS" WHAT GENDER IS? ARGUMENTS AND DEBATES AT THE INTERSECTION BETWEEN EPISTEMIC INJUSTICE, THE METAPHYSICS OF GENDER, AND GENDER IDENTITY...	96

Welcome

From every member of the Manchester Centre for Political Theory (MANCEPT), we would like to extend you a warm welcome to Manchester for our annual Workshops in Political Theory, one of the largest annual gatherings of political and moral philosophers worldwide.

MANCEPT is among the strongest and most active research groups in analytical political theory in the UK, with a long tradition of international excellence. Based in the Politics department at the University of Manchester, it provides a vibrant forum for ongoing research and education within political theory, being home to a diverse range of researchers that includes academic staff, postdoctoral and postgraduate researchers with interests across the discipline. Beyond the Workshops, it has also for more than thirty years hosted the Brave New World conference for postgraduate research, alongside frequent one-off conferences on specific research topics and a bi-weekly seminar series that runs throughout the academic year.

Thank you for your contributions to this year's edition of the Workshops. We hope you will enjoy your time here and that we will have a chance to welcome you back to Manchester again in the future as part of our wider activities.

Against Participation: Withdrawal, Exit, and Political Agency

Location: Room 4.07, Williamson Building

Convenor(s): Bailey Thomas

Political theory has long treated participation as the paradigmatic expression of political agency. From deliberative democratic models to theories of civic virtue and resistance, agency is typically associated with voice, engagement, visibility, and contribution. Non-participation—whether in the form of withdrawal, silence, exit, or refusal—has correspondingly been framed as apathy, failure, or political loss. This workshop challenges that assumption by treating non-participation not as the absence of politics, but as a distinctive and under-theorized mode of political agency.

The workshop asks what political theory becomes when participation is no longer taken as its normative baseline. Rather than presuming that political subjects ought to engage, deliberate, or remain within institutional frameworks, participants will examine the conditions under which withdrawal, exit, and non-participation emerge as rational, strategic, or ethically significant political responses. These practices often arise in contexts where participation is constrained, coercive, ineffective, or morally compromising, raising fundamental questions about agency, legitimacy, and political responsibility.

Wednesday 2nd September	
11:30-13:00	Registration
12:30-14:00	Lunch
14:00-16:00	Session 1: Participation, Coercion, and Legitimacy Joonas S. Martikainen <i>On “Inclusive” Participation and Political Impoverishment: When Is Withdrawal of Political Participation a Choice?</i>
16:00-16:30	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
16:30-17:30	Session 1 (continued) Extended Workshop Discussion
17:45-19:00	Wine Reception
19:30	Conference Dinner
Thursday 3rd September	
9:30-11:30	Session 2: Silence, Visibility, and Epistemic Refusal Eirini Vryza <i>Silence as Counterspeech</i>
11:30-12:00	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
12:00-13:00	Session 2 (continued) Free Writing
13:00-14:00	Lunch

14:00-16:00	Session 3: Exit, Separation, and Political Agency Elizabeth Levinson <i>Exit as Agency: Self-determination, Secession, and Persistent Political Minorities</i> Martha Crowe <i>Political Withdrawal: An Exploration of the Phenomenon and its Consequences for Democracies Today</i>
16:00-16:30	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
16:30-17:30	Session 3 (continued) Extended Workshop Discussion
Friday 4th September	
9:30-11:30	Session 4: Withdrawal as Critique and World-Making Sabrina Muchová <i>"Only a saint can resist not joining in": Adorno on the political power of withdrawal</i> Tom Bailey <i>Graeber against participation</i>
11:30-12:00	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
12:00-13:00	Session 4 (continued) Collective discussion and working-group responses
13:00-14:00	Lunch
14:00-16:00	Session 5: Refusal, Abolition, and Politics Beyond Participation

	Lucie Maughan <i>Divine Violence, Abolition, and Lessons for Liberation</i> Closing roundtable and collective synthesis discussion
16:00-16:30	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
16:30-17:30	Session 5 (continued) <i>N/A</i>
17:30	End of Conference

Doing Democracy Differently? Democratic Innovation in an Age of Backsliding

Location: Room G35, Humanities Bridgeford Street Building

Convenor(s): Jessica Sutherland

The current global political landscape is characterised by democratic backsliding, the erosion of trust and institutional failures. This panel will explore how democracy can be reimagined, restructured or practiced in new ways in the face of these challenges. Moving beyond accounts and diagnoses of democratic decline, this panel invites discussions around democratic innovation – both institutional and grassroots – that have the potential to expand participation, (re)distribute power, and protect and progress democratic values.

When thinking about democratic innovation, it is often deliberative processes like citizens' assemblies that have become the overarching framework (Smith, 2019). However, the field is of course much broader and, as Mike Saward (2021) has noted, is and should move away from purely deliberative systems and focus on democratic innovation, not just deliberative innovation.

This panel therefore invites discussion of various forms of innovation that aim to increase participation; enhance deliberation, inclusion and equity; strengthen (institutional) accountability; and create meaningful changes in the ways we practice democracy.

The panel seeks to critically engage with the tensions inherent in democratic innovation, for example around scale, legitimacy, distribution of power, and the relationship between our existing institutions and innovation, to explore how democratic innovation can help us to respond to our contemporary crises in democracy.

Contributions to this panel may focus on but are not limited to:

- Innovative participatory and deliberative mechanisms including citizen assemblies and mini publics
- The potential role of digital and/or AI in democratic innovation
- Civic led practice
- Approaches to direct democracy
- New forms of representation
- Forms of resistance and adaptation
- Sustainable innovation
- Overcoming democratic short-termism

Wednesday 2nd September	
11:30-13:00	Registration
12:30-14:00	Lunch
14:00-16:00	Session 1 <i>Oscar Basnier</i> Can Innovation Save us? Democratic Imagination in the Face of Blind Idealism <i>Julian Tobias Klar</i> Publics, Councils, and Experimental Democracy: Arendt and Dewey on Democratic Innovation Beyond Deliberation
16:00-16:30	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
16:30-17:30	Session 1 (continued) <i>FREE SESSION</i>
17:45-19:00	Wine Reception
19:30	Conference Dinner
Thursday 3rd September	
9:30-11:30	Session 2 <i>Eike Düvel</i> AI and the value of public deliberation <i>Dannish Kashmiri</i> A Future of Democracy without Voting: In favour of Political Consensus through AI
11:30-12:00	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
12:00-13:00	Session 2 (continued) <i>Eemil Moisio</i> For sovereign ministries

13:00-14:00	Lunch
14:00-16:00	Session 3 <i>Luke Beesley</i> Democratising Disability Services: Enacting Inclusion and Contestation in Street-Level Democratic Projects <i>Mona Nymphijs</i> The Conceptual Aptness of Strike in Digital Labour Domains: Resistance, Justice, and What's to Come
16:00-16:30	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
16:30-17:30	Session 3 (continued) <i>FREE SESSION</i>
Friday 4th September	
9:30-11:30	Session 4 <i>Kinley Gillette</i> Epistemic trespassing our way to democratic science <i>Belén Pueyo-Ibáñez</i> Argumentation in We-mode: Communicative Action beyond Intersubjectivity
11:30-12:00	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
12:00-13:00	Session 4 (continued) <i>TBC</i> – Either additional speaker or roundtable on the future of democracy
13:00-14:00	Lunch
14:00-16:00	Session 5 <i>FREE SESSION</i>
16:00-16:30	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
16:30-17:30	Session 5 (continued)

17:30	End of Conference
-------	-------------------

Epistemic Democracy and the Lure of Epistocracy: Questions in Metaethics and Political Normativity

Location: Room 4.08, Williamson Building

Convenor(s): Roger Ventura Cossin; Joshua Clarke

Expressing the political anxieties of our moment, the term 'technocracy' has become increasingly popular in political discourse. Largely orthogonal to the debate on technocracy, the connate term 'epistocracy' (i.e., rule of the knowers) has made its fortune in normative democratic theory due to the rise in popularity of epistemic theories of democracy (Gauss 1996; Anderson 2007; Estlund 2008; Landemore 2013; Peter 2023). These theories have developed increasingly sophisticated normative political epistemologies, arguing that ""epistemic success"" (i.e. the extent to which political decisions, procedures, or institutions realize, or are reliably oriented towards the achievement of some epistemic good that is relevant to political decision-making) is either a necessary or even a sufficient condition to ground political legitimacy and/or authority. Epistemic democrats thus go against the grain of traditional approaches which ground political legitimacy solely upon fairness, equality, or self-authorship.

Epistemic theories suffer from unresolved questions. First, except for Jason Brennan (2016), the literature lacks a systematic conceptualization of epistocracy. While epistocracy is frequently invoked by epistemic democrats as a negative contrast, it often functions implicitly rather than as a fully theorized position (Estlund 2008; Landemore, 2022). Epistocracy plays a crucial boundary-setting role: it marks the point at which epistemic considerations are taken to unduly override equality or fairness, thereby rendering a theory of legitimacy incompatible with democratic norms. Second, the metaethical dimension of

epistemic democratic theories remains underdeveloped. What constitutes epistemic success is often underspecified, even though it does significant work. Epistemic democrats frequently argue that one cannot have an “epistemically abstinent” normative theory since non-epistemic values such as fairness or equality presuppose epistemic claims (Talisie 2009). However, the precise sense in which non-epistemic considerations have an epistemic character, and how this affects their normative significance, is rarely made explicit. Thirdly, clarifying these metaethical commitments is crucial because they determine the boundary between epistemic democracy and epistocracy. How demanding one’s notion of truth or epistemic success is, and how it relates to other democratic values, will shape how epistemic considerations ground legitimacy.

In this workshop, we seek to delve deeper into the meta-normative commitments of epistemic democracy and explore the relation between knowledge and political normativity. This should provide a venue for epistemic democrats to clarify these commitments and an opportunity for its critics to sharpen their criticism. This workshop will tackle the following questions:

1. Can knowledge ground political legitimacy? Should it?
2. What is the relation between epistemic considerations and non-epistemic democratic considerations at the level of normative justification? Can there be a strict demarcation between epistemic and non-epistemic considerations? Are democratic values simply a species of epistemic value or distinct from the latter? If so, when do epistemic and democratic values diverge or conflict and what should we do when they conflict?
3. What counts as “epistemic success” and how demanding should it be? What are the different ways in which truth enters political justification? Are there more benign and less benign ways from a democratic standpoint?
4. What is epistocracy and why might it be dangerous? What core normative and metaethical commitments constitute an epistocratic theory?

Wednesday 2nd September	
11:30-13:00	Registration
12:30-14:00	Lunch
14:00-16:00	Session 1 <i>Joshua Clarke and Roger Ventura Cossin (KU Leuven):</i> The normative structure of epistocratic justification. Part I. <i>Joshua Clarke and Roger Ventura Cossin (KU Leuven):</i> The normative structure of epistocratic justification. Part II.
16:00-16:30	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
16:30-17:30	Session 1 (continued) <i>Rafael Ruiz-de-Lira-Manzano (LSE):</i> Appealing to Moral Expert Consensus for Morally Progressive Policymaking
17:45-19:00	Wine Reception
19:30	Conference Dinner
Thursday 3rd September	
9:30-11:30	Session 2 <i>Brian Kogelmann (Purdue University):</i> The Varieties of Political Ignorance

	<i>Giacomo Sbrozi (Antwerp University): Is Mass Democracy Societally Wasteful?</i> Rethinking the Epistemic Case for Large Electorates
11:30-12:00	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
12:00-13:00	Session 2 (continued) <i>Mathis Nicole Desmau (University of Lyon): Against Belief-Based Conceptions of Political Legitimacy</i>
13:00-14:00	Lunch
14:00-16:00	Session 3 <i>Marie-Kristin Reisch (University of Vienna): Are We Still Fit for Democracy? Rethinking Democratic Competence in Times of Regression</i> <i>Simo Kylönnen and Ninni Suni (Helsinki University): Epistemic political authority: a mission impossible</i>
16:00-16:30	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
16:30-17:30	Session 3 (continued) <i>Santiago Favière (EHESS Paris): Epistocracy, Epistemic Democracy, and Climate Change Governance</i>
Friday 4th September	
9:30-11:30	Session 4

	<i>Xintong Wei (American University of Armenia): Can There Be Epistemic Democracy Without Mass Participation?</i> <i>Susan Dielman (University of Lethbridge): "Getting Things Right" with Rorty</i>
11:30-12:00	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
12:00-13:00	Session 4 (continued) <i>Jonathan Benson (University of Manchester): TBD</i>
13:00-14:00	Lunch
14:00-16:00	Session 5 <i>Paul Gunn (Goldsmiths - University of London): TBC</i> <i>Speaker Name: Talk Title</i>
16:00-16:30	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
16:30-17:30	Session 5 (continued) <i>Speaker Name: Talk Title</i>
17:30	End of Conference

Epistemic Injustice and Backlash

Location: Room 1.04, Williamson Building

Convenor(s): Nick Clanchy; Han Edgoose

Recent years have been characterized by significant backlash to progressive social movements and social changes such as the #MeToo movement, the Black Lives Matter movement, and the increased visibility of trans people in public life. Dimensions to this backlash include the electoral (i.e., the rise of far-right political parties), the legal (legislation, executive orders and judicial decisions e.g. overturning rights to abortion and gender-affirming healthcare, banning affirmative action and DEI initiatives, and excluding trans people from participation in sport), and the necropolitical (e.g. the misogynistic murder of Renée Good, rising anti-trans violence). A further important dimension to this backlash is the epistemic (e.g. the repudiation of the testimonies of Christine Blasey Ford and Amber Heard, the ridiculing of slogans such as ‘defund the police’, the widespread dissemination of disinformation concerning trans people). This dimension to the backlash has recently begun to receive philosophical attention, with aspects of it being theorized variously as *hermeneutical backlash* (George & Goguen 2021), *hermeneutical sabotage* (Edgoose 2024), and *hermeneutical disarmament* (Morgan 2025) – all phenomena thought either to constitute or to result in epistemic injustices. It has also been argued that previously proposed strategies for preventing epistemic injustices are frequently ineffective when confronted by backlash, prompting a search for other strategies which might be pursued more effectively towards this end (Clanchy forthcoming). Much work on epistemic injustice and backlash remains to be done, however – especially in light of the epistemic injustice literature’s ‘methodological commitment to the primacy of the nonideal’ (Medina 2013: 11). The aim of this workshop is to provide a space for the development of such work.

Questions that papers may address include:

- How is the epistemic dimension related to other dimensions of backlash?
- Is *epistemic injustice* (Fricker 2007) an adequate framework for thinking about these issues? What about these issues might this framework miss but e.g. *epistemic oppression* (Dotson 2014) or *epistemologies of ignorance* (Mills 2005) capture?
- How should previous work on epistemic injustice and e.g. the #MeToo movement (e.g. Jackson 2018) or the Black Lives Matter movement (e.g. Anderson 2017) be rethought in light of the subsequent backlash?
- What can thinking about epistemic injustices add to extant discussions of backlash in political theory and/or political science?
- What did the epistemic dimension to previous backlashes involve (e.g. Faludi 1991)? What practical lessons can be drawn for the present moment?
- Which strategies for preventing epistemic injustices are most effective in times of backlash? What kinds of epistemic agency can be exercised by members of targeted groups (Pohlhaus 2020)?
- Who bears responsibility, in both backward- and forward-looking senses (Young 2011), for the epistemic dimension of backlash?
- How can thinking about epistemic injustice and backlash inform methodological debates concerning the relative merits of ideal and nonideal theory?

Wednesday 2nd September	
11:30-13:00	Registration
12:30-14:00	Lunch
14:00-16:00	Session 1 <i>Talita Ferrantelli</i> : On Standpoints, Advantages, and Social Privilege <i>Sara Kok</i> : Epistemic Appropriation, Backlash, and Power
16:00-16:30	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
16:30-17:30	Session 1 (continued) <i>Puja Raj & Shivi Singh</i> : Emerging Impact of Manosphere Pedagogies and the Cruel Pleasures of Epistemic Injustice
17:45-19:00	Wine Reception
19:30	Conference Dinner
Thursday 3rd September	
9:30-11:30	Session 2 <i>Yinmei Wu</i> : Perspectival Hermeneutical Injustice and Resistance <i>Gabriel de Sousa</i> : Perspective as a Condition for Robust Hermeneutical Change
11:30-12:00	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
12:00-13:00	Session 2 (continued) <i>Sigrid Wallaert & Michiel De Proost</i> : From 'Hermeneutic Harm' to Hermeneutic Sabotage

13:00-14:00	Lunch
14:00-16:00	Session 3 <i>Lovro Savíc</i> : This is Not a Laughing Matter! Against Funny Protest Signs <i>Ana Cristina Pires</i> : Engineering Invisibility: Smothering and Epistemic Injustice
16:00-16:30	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
16:30-17:30	Session 3 (continued) <i>Nick Clanchy</i> : Second-Order Hermeneutical Breakthroughs
Friday 4th September – No Speakers	

Ethical and Political Challenges in Climate Change Adaptation

Location: Room 2.016/2.017, Arthur Lewis Building

Convenor(s): Kyle Ferguson; Morten Fibieger Byskov

Climate change adaptation is rapidly becoming one of the most urgent challenges of our time, one fraught with ethical and political issues. Failure to reduce emissions has led to significant global warming, and climate risks are likely to grow more extreme. We are hurtling toward a future where climate change threatens the health, lives, and livelihoods of millions, especially vulnerable populations in the Global South who already live with the worst consequences.

However, adaptation remains under-prioritized in ethics, political philosophy, and policymaking, resulting in unanswered questions, underdeveloped plans, and costly maladaptation. Adaptation financing falls far short of need. No effective appeal mechanisms exist, and strict immigration policies undermine climate migration. Entrenched power imbalances distort decision-making, and poor adaptation governance amplifies existing injustices or creates new ones (Byskov et al. 2021).

This neglect persists despite growing recognition that adaptation raises distinctive questions of value, responsibility, justice, legitimacy, and power (Shue 2014; Jamieson 1996, 2014; Thompson 2020; Byskov et al. 2021; Byskov & Hyams 2022; Ferguson et al. 2026; Ferguson, forthcoming). Climate adaptation is no mere technical problem but a contested political domain pervaded by conflicting values, competing interests, resource-allocation dilemmas, and administrative confusion (Dolšák & Prakash 2018).

This workshop asks: How might moral, social, and political philosophers contribute to understanding what just, responsible, and effective adaptation is and how it ought to be achieved?

Possible topic areas:

- *Conceptual foundations*: What is adaptation? When is it successful (Singh et al. 2022)? What constitutes mis- and maladaptation (Schipper 2020)? How should adaptation relate to other climate-action pathways (mitigation, geoengineering, L&D) and neighboring concepts (e.g., resilience)? What spatial and temporal scales are appropriate for adaptation planning and policy (Orlove 2022)?
- *Goals and goods*: What should adaptation protect—material interests, capabilities, cultural identity, place, nonhuman nature (Heyward 2017; Hourdequin 2021; Shockley 2023; Pepper 2018; Palmer 2021)? How ought we to navigate value pluralism, conflict, and incommensurability between adaptation means and ends? How might adaptation include transforming normative concepts (Thompson & Bendik-Keymar, eds. 2012)? What roles do community authority and self-determination play in defining adaptation goals?
- *Rights, duties, and responsibilities*: Is there a right to adaptation (Byskov 2024)? If so, what are its correlative duties, and how should they be allocated (Caney 2014)? What are adaptation responsibilities, who bears them, and on what grounds (Baer 2006; Hartzell-Nichols 2011; Jamieson 2015; Ferguson et al. 2026)? Who are adaptation's 'agents of justice' and how do they 'realize justice' (Hickey et al. 2021)?
- *Varieties of justice*: How should adaptation decision-making represent vulnerable groups—Indigenous peoples, women, and people of color? How does adaptation involve various forms of justice—distributive, corrective, procedural, recognitional, transitional, epistemic (Zimm et al. 2024; Buxton 2019)? How can feminist, anti-racist, decolonial, and non-ideal theories enhance understanding of adaptation justice?
- *Governance and policy beyond legal mechanisms*: What does responsible adaptation governance look like? What normative commitments should guide adaptation policy? How should authority be distributed across governance levels?

Format: 12 presenters allocated 1 hour each (30 mins., presentation; 30 mins., discussion); plus, 2 roundtables to identify and discuss emerging themes, future directions, and potential collaborations.

Wednesday 2nd September	
11:30–13:00	Registration
12:30–13:45	Lunch
13:45–14:00	<i>All Participants</i> : Introductions
14:00–16:00	Session 1: Adaptation Responsibilities and Rights <i>Säde Hormio (University of Helsinki)</i> : Adaptation Responsibilities of Super-Polluters <i>Josep Recasens (Pompeu Fabra University)</i> : A Duty to Adapt? Victims' Responsibilities in Climate Adaptation
16:00–16:30	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
16:30–17:30	Session 1: Adaptation Responsibilities and Rights (continued) <i>Göran Duus-Otterström (University of Gothenburg)</i> : The Right to Climate Adaptation: Defending the Corrective Conception
17:45–19:00	Wine Reception
19:30	Conference Dinner

Thursday 3rd September	
09:30–11:30	Session 2: Knowledge, Power, and Epistemic Justice <i>Clare Heyward & Kerstin Reibold*</i> [*in absentia] (<i>UiT The Arctic University of Norway</i>): Epistemic Injustices in Climate Adaptation <i>Futura Venuto & Sapna Kumar (University of Bern)</i> : A Feminist Perspective on Climate Change Adaptation Knowledge
11:30–12:00	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
12:00–13:00	Roundtable I <i>All Participants</i> : Roundtable on Emerging Themes and Issues
13:00–14:00	Lunch
14:00–16:00	Session 3: The Ends of Adaptation <i>Nils Wendler (Kiel University)</i> : Efficiency in Allocating Scarce Climate Adaptation Finance: Trivial Constraint, Substantive Demand, or Something Else? <i>Kyle Ferguson (Hunter College, CUNY)</i> : Objectivity, Intersubjectivity, and the Aims of Adaptation
16:00–16:30	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
16:30–17:30	Session 3: The Ends of Adaptation (continued) <i>Allen Thompson (Oregon State University)</i> : Ethical Adaptation Is Adapting Our Humanity

Friday 4th September	
09:30–11:30	Session 4: The Limits of Adaptation <i>Morten Fibieger Byskov (Tilburg University):</i> How Much Adaptation? The Right to Climate Adaptation and Its (Ecological) Limits <i>Ivo Wallimann-Helmer (University of Fribourg):</i> Climate Adaptation, Overdemandingness, Emergency and the Epistemic Limits of Justice
11:30–12:00	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
12:00–13:00	Session 5: Beyond Human Interests <i>Arthur Obst (University of Chicago) & Linde De Vroey* (University of Antwerp)</i> [*in absentia]: Conservation as Climate Adaptation? Opportunities and Challenges
13:00–14:00	Lunch
14:00–15:00	Session 5: Beyond Human Interests (continued) <i>Clare Palmer (Texas A&M University):</i> Wild Animals, Ethics and Climate Adaptation: It's Complicated
15:00–16:00	Roundtable II <i>All Participants:</i> Roundtable on Future Directions and Collaborations
16:00–16:30	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
16:30	Workshop Close and Social Gathering (optional)

Ethics of Academia

Location: Room G.017, Arthur Lewis Building

Panel Convenor(s): Kritika Maheshwari; Brian Berkey; Martin Sticker

Recent resurgence of interest in the ethics of academia has sparked debates about the ideals and ongoing practices within academic institutions. These debates often highlight the tension between the aspirational goals of academia – such as promoting systemic equity, inclusion, and access – and the constraints imposed by socio-political realities, including discrimination, bias and lack of diversity, institutional backlash against specific disciplines, and budgetary and financial pressures. Our panel contributes to these debates by focusing on challenges that academics face specifically in their role as academics. We focus on three important themes: Special relationships, exploitative structures, and the impact of AI.

Firstly, academics find themselves embedded in special relationships, most notably with students. Their duty of care for students increasingly extends beyond education to emotional support and counselling. However, financial pressures, such as rising tuition and student debt, complicate this duty, as universities treat students as economic assets while academics seek to prioritize their well-being. The commercialization of higher education further raises questions about power dynamics: if students are framed as paying customers, do they gain leverage over educators who are performing a service, and how should this inform norms of care, assessment, and authority in academia?

Beyond students, professional and personal relationships among academics with fellow colleagues, elite institutions, politicians, and wealthy donors play a significant role in shaping norms, influencing research agendas and funding priorities, and reinforcing power imbalances and structural inequalities. These dynamics raise a variety of questions: What forms of transparency and accountability are ethically required when research is shaped by powerful institutional or financial interests? Who bears responsibility for protecting academic integrity when such relationships distort disciplinary priorities or public debate?

What are the responsibilities of academics towards the public? What are the legitimate boundaries of academic freedom?

Our second theme on exploitative structures focuses on the recent erosion of academic pay, working conditions and job opportunities in many countries. Academia relies on unpaid labour, working beyond contractual hours, engaging in unacknowledged service work, such as refereeing journal papers and grant applications while private corporations' profit from their contributions. In many countries, academic work is now performed by part time or casually employed staff on insecure contracts, often with a high teaching load. These conditions raise questions about fairness, accountability, and the moral limits of professional obligation.

Our third theme focuses on the questions AI raises. Is there a distinct value of human research and human teaching, and what if any role should AI play in academic research and teaching? Can AI be a co-author of academic publications? Should students be prepared for a world of AI or rather shielded from AI use? How are universities to react to the rise in AI use on the part of students? Are there general principles to deal with cases of (suspected) AI cheating, and are the ways universities currently do this unjust (e.g. because they disproportionately penalize non-native speakers who use AI translations). How is the relationship between staff and student altered by the existence of AI?

Wednesday 2nd September	
11:30-13:00	Registration
12:30-14:00	Lunch
14:00-16:00	Session 1 <i>“New Challenges to Academic Freedom”</i> Constanze Binder (Erasmus Universiteit Rotterdam) & Annalisa Costella (Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam) <i>“Value Conservatism and the Scope of Academic Freedom”</i> Alexander Christian (Heinrich Heine University)
16:00-16:30	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
16:30-17:30	Session 1 (continued) <i>“Loving My Teacher, Teaching with Love: A Feminist Reflection”</i> Alix Dietzel (Bristol University)
17:45-19:00	Wine Reception
19:30	Conference Dinner
Thursday 3rd September	
9:30-11:30	Session 2

	<i>“Philosophical Efficiency”</i> Peter Gildenhuys (Lafayette College) <i>“Injustice in the game of philosophy”</i> Ray Pedersen (Oxford)
11:30-12:00	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
12:30-14:00	Coffee and Lunch
14:00-16:00	Session 3 <i>“The Case for Class-Based Affirmative Action in Academic Hiring”</i> Thomas J. Spiegel (Miyazaki International University) <i>“The Ethics of Ideological Affirmative Hiring”</i> Gina Schouten (Harvard University)
16:00-16:30	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
16:30-17:30	Session 3 (continued) <i>“Military Research and the University. Rethinking Institutional Integrity in a Context of Normative Fragmentation”</i> Bianca Curioni (Politecnico di Milano)
Friday 4th September – No sessions planned	

Genocide and Democratic Theory

Location: Room 3.1, Williamson Building

Convenor(s): Torsten Menge; Tereza Hendl

As Israel continues its genocide in Gaza and genocidal violence continues to be waged against the Rohingya in Myanmar, Uyghurs in China, the people of Sudan, Ukraine, Yemen and other places, this calls for the re-examination of the basic contours of democratic theory. What are the implications for our thinking about democracy and democratic ideals when a genocide is perpetrated, in the case of Israel, by a regime that understands itself and is understood by many to be a democracy? What does it mean when genocidal violence is supported and facilitated in one way or another by democracies? When some genocides are sidelined, minimized, or denied by democratic publics or even by left movements that appeal to democratic ideals? How should this affect our analyses of democracy, of its central commitments and tensions, its values and authority, its current crises and its futures? The goal of the workshop is to bring political philosophy and democratic theory into conversation with insights from genocide studies and other relevant fields.

Wednesday 2nd September	
11:30-13:00	Registration
12:30-14:00	Lunch
14:00-16:00	Session 1 <i>Anne O’Byrne: Genocidal Foundations of Democracies</i> <i>Max Schindler: tbd.</i>
16:00-16:30	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
16:30-17:30	Session 1 (continued) <i>Imge Oranli: Citizen-Subjects, Racial Ideology, and the Democratic Aftermath of Genocide</i>
17:45-19:00	Wine Reception
19:30	Conference Dinner

Thursday 3rd September	
9:30-11:30	Session 2 <i>Dirk Moses: Repairing the Flawed Foundations of the UN Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Genocide.</i> <i>Rasa Davidaviciute: A Problem for Expressivism about Genocide Law</i>
11:30-12:00	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
12:00-13:00	Session 2 (continued)

13:00-14:00	Lunch
14:00-16:00	Session 3 <i>Imogen Lambert: When the war machine takes over the state: genocide beyond the nation</i> <i>Chungxi Tong: How Can National Consciousness Be Emancipatory?: 'Singular Historicity' Beyond Carl Schmitt's Nationalist Trap</i>
16:00-16:30	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
16:30-17:30	Session 3 (continued) <i>Leire Urricelqui: Dehumanization, Hyperpoliticization, and the Legitimization of Eradicatory Violence</i>
Friday 4th September	
9:30-11:30	Session 4 <i>Sarah El-Bulbeisi: tbd.</i> <i>Torsten Menge: tbd.</i>
11:30-12:00	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
12:00-13:00	Session 4 (continued) <i>Tereza Hendl: tbd.</i>
13:00-14:00	Lunch
14:00-16:00	Session 5 <i>Sabeen Ahmed: Democracy and its Others: Fascism, Coloniality, and the Work of Genocide</i> <i>Adejare Taofeek Somorin: Democratic Backsliding as a Pathway to Genocide</i>
16:00-16:30	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
16:30-17:30	Session 5: Reflections

17:30	End of Conference
-------	-------------------

Historical Injustice

Location: Room 4.050, Arthur Lewis Building

Convenor(s): Alexander Motchoulski

Problems of historical injustice range over a number of deep questions in political philosophy. Many past injustices have not been rectified, and the severity of such injustices is sometimes thought to have some important implications contemporary political communities. This panel aims to bring together scholars working on philosophical questions that fall within the general scope of the topic of historical injustice. This includes substantive questions which concern certain kinds of past injustice, such as racial injustice, colonialism, or territorial possession, among others. Relevant also are theoretical questions about the ethics and politics of contemporary responsibilities for historical injustice. Among such theoretical questions are those that concern the grounds of responsibility for repairing past injustice, what such repair must consist of when it is owed, whether (and if so, how) those grounds can be superseded over time, and how facts about past injustice matter for contemporary political communities, which includes questions about how (if at all) past injustice bears on normative features of contemporary political communities such as their justice, legitimacy, or authority.

Wednesday 2nd September	
11:30-13:00	Registration
12:30-14:00	Lunch
14:00-16:00	Session 1 <i>Paula Bruder: Sincere State Apology</i> <i>Giovanni Martino: Reparations for Colonial Legacies</i>
16:00-16:30	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
16:30-17:30	Session 1 (continued) <i>Alexander Motchoulski: Wrongdoing Across Time</i>
17:45-19:00	Wine Reception
19:30	Conference Dinner
Thursday 3rd September	
9:30-11:30	Session 2 <i>No speaker for the first part session 2, panel will start at 12:00</i>
11:30-12:00	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
12:00-13:00	Session 2 (continued)

	<i>Robin Lockyer-Von Dorrien: Three 'Good' Memory Practices</i>
13:00-14:00	Lunch
14:00-16:00	Session 3 <i>Lena Wang: Re-remembering the Archives</i> <i>Kieran Dunn: Structural Disrepair</i>
16:00-16:30	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
16:30-17:30	Session 3 (continued) <i>Heng Ying: Revisiting Enduring Injustice</i>

Intimate (In)Justices

Location: Room 2.05, Williamson Building

Convenor: Kristin Käuper, Isobel Logan, Charlotte Curran

This workshop will explore the relationship between intimacy and (in)justice. We aim to better understand the ways in which hegemonic norms, institutions, and intersecting forms of oppression structure intimate life, governing who is able to form certain relationships, which relationships are socially valued, and how power operates within them. We seek to explore the potential of intimate practices and communities of care as sites of resistance, solidarity, and social transformation.

Wednesday 2nd September	
11:30-13:00	Registration
12:30-14:00	Lunch
14:00-16:00	Session 1 <i>Giannis Vassilopoulos</i> : The Oppressive Force of Intimate Secrets <i>Jonas Zorn</i> : The Economisation of Personal Relationships as Collective Epistemic Oppression
16:00-16:30	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
16:30-17:30	Session 1 (continued) <i>Isobel Logan</i> : Gaslighting or confronting implicit bias? Distinguishing

	gaslighting from mere criticism
17:45-19:00	Wine Reception
19:30	Conference Dinner
Thursday 3rd September	
12:00-13:00	Session 2 <i>Nia Large: Domination and Close Relationships</i>
13:00-14:00	Lunch
14:00-16:00	Session 3 <i>Paloma Morales: Love and Leniency</i> <i>Giulia Basile & Vittoria Campisi: "Sex where we don't matter": navigating the erosion of agency in grey sex</i>
19:00	Intimate (In)Justices Dinner
End of Conference	

Justice in Climate Litigation

Location: Room 2.06, Williamson Building

Convenor(s): Megan Blomfield; Laura Garcia Portela; Santiago Truccone

This workshop will focus on questions of justice raised by efforts to litigate the climate crisis.

As climate change progresses, individuals and groups are increasingly turning to the courts in pursuit of climate justice. As of March 31, 2026, the Climate Litigation Database maintained by the Sabin Center for Climate Change Law lists over 4800 climate court cases, nearly 70% of which were filed in the USA. Climate lawsuits have been used to pursue a variety of goals, including injunctions on fossil fuel extraction, stronger regulation of greenhouse gas emissions, the implementation or funding of adaptation measures, compensation for climate loss and damage, and even punishment of those who contribute to severe climate-related harm. Climate litigation may also be undertaken for strategic reasons, in an effort to promote awareness of the climate crisis, undermine the social license of those contributing to it, and spur more systemic change.

Though climate litigation is often used in an attempt to pursue goals of climate justice, its use for this purpose raises various normative questions. These include questions about the legitimate role of the courts in climate governance, and the potential for litigation to reproduce patterns of disadvantage due to the unequal accessibility of legal remedies. Some have also raised concerns that climate litigation could prove strategically counterproductive, for example by spurring political backlash.

This workshop will examine how litigation might be used as a tool in the pursuit of climate justice, new concerns of justice that are raised by such efforts, and how such concerns might be addressed.

Wednesday 2 nd September – No sessions planned	
Thursday 3 rd September	
10:00-10:30	Introductions
10:30-11:30	Session 2 <i>Lea Raible (University of Glasgow), Structural climate injustice in human rights litigation</i>
11:30-12:00	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
12:00-13:00	Session 2 (continued) <i>Jameela Joy Reyes and co-authors tbc (LSE), Non-neutrality of corporations: A systematic review of the responsibility of private actors around climate harm</i>
13:00-14:00	Lunch
14:00-16:00	Session 3 <i>Clara Kammeringer, Hearing the outside voice: A right to justification in climate litigation</i> <i>Constanze Binder, Human rights-based climate litigation</i>
16:00-16:30	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)

16:30-17:30	Session 3 (continued) <i>Paula Nieto Hernández & Laura García-Portela, Climate Change, Human Rights Law and Legal Imagination</i>
Friday 4th September	
9:30-11:30	Session 4 <i>Megan Blomfield (University of Sheffield), The politics of extreme event attribution for climate litigation</i> <i>Matthias Petel (Université Libre de Bruxelles & Harvard Law School), Neutralizing climate adjudication: scientific consensus, judicial legitimacy and equity in rights-based European climate litigation</i>
11:30-12:00	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
12:00-13:00	Session 4 (continued) <i>Nehir Arslan (Université Paris 8 Vincennes–Saint-Denis), Climate litigation beyond institutional scientific frameworks</i>
13:00-14:00	Lunch
14:00-16:00	Session 5 <i>Santiago Truccone, The Need for Punishment in Global Climate Justice</i>
16:00-16:30	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
16:30-17:30	Session 5 (continued) Group discussion

17:30	End of Conference
-------	-------------------

Land, Territory, and Justice

Location: Room 4.051, Arthur Lewis Building

Convenors: Kaitie Jourdeuil; Michael Luoma

There is now a rich debate within and across diverse traditions of political and moral thought about the meaning, use, and desirability of the concepts of land and territory, and their relation to justice.

For example, the past fifteen years have been marked by the dedicated theorizing about territorial rights in contemporary Anglo-American moral and political philosophy (see for example: Miller, 2012; Moore, 2014, 2015, 2019; Nine, 2012; Ochoa-Espejo, 2020; Simmons, 2016; Stilz, 2019). While the first wave focused on core conceptual questions about the nature and scope of various territorial rights (including jurisdiction, self-determination, resource control, and immigration), the kinds of agents who hold these rights, and the normative justifications for them, this literature has now self-reflexively entered a “second wave” characterised by a deeper concern for questions of global inequality, decolonization, overlapping projects of self-determination, and the environmental crisis (Moore & Ugalde, 2025). For example: What is the extent of morally mandatory restitution in cases of territorial wrongdoing, including settler colonialism (Luoma, 2023; Luoma and Moore, 2024; Moore, 2019; Stilz, 2024; Riebold, 2022, 2023)? How may multiple peoples, with distinct normative and ontological systems, overlap in the same place without retrenching relationships of structural injustice and inter-group domination (Jourdeuil 2024, 2025a, 2025b; Luoma, 2022, 2023, 2024, 2025)? What forms of governance are required in ecologically integrated regions spanning borders (Nine, 2022)? How are territorial rights contingent on respect for biodiversity and ecological integrity (Moore, 2023; Kwan, 2025)? How can the benefits and burdens of natural resources, energy transition, and climate change mitigation/adaptation be fairly distributed between groups (Armstrong, 2017; De Biaso 2024a, 2024b; Li, 2022; Moore, 2019)?

Concurrently, Indigenous scholars, environmental philosophers, and eco-phenomenologists interrogate the core normative, ontological, and epistemological

assumptions of these discourses. Indigenous theorists challenge the hegemony of rights-based territorial frameworks, contending that the natural world is not a stockpile of “resources” to be distributed and controlled according to a theory of justice, but is better conceived of as a kinship network populated by beings deserving of intrinsic concern and respect with whom we must live harmoniously (e.g., Allard-Tremblay 2023, 2025; Burkhart, 2019; Mills 2017, 2018, 2019; Simpson 2011, 2017; Temin 2023). Eco-phenomenologists challenge conceptions of land as a neutral background container against which we exercise our agency, demonstrating how land and place structure our lived experience and subjectivity, our ethical encounter with the alterity of the other-than-human, and the possibilities for political agency (Casey, 1993, 2018; Ingold, 2010; Malpas, 1998; Rose, 2005; Seamon, 2018; Smith, 2001, 2011; Toadvine, 2019).

Beyond political theory, land and territory are at the heart of intensifying international political conflicts, including attempted territorial annexations, rising majority and minority nationalism, struggles against (neo-)colonialism, and the global climate crisis. Consequently, this workshop welcomes submissions that investigate conceptual, normative, and applied questions at the intersection of land, territory, and justice, from diverse methodological perspectives including, but not limited to analytical moral and political philosophy, environmental philosophy and eco-phenomenology, Indigenous political thought, critical theory, and comparative dialogue.

Wednesday 2nd September	
11:30-13:00	Registration
12:30-14:00	Lunch
14:00-16:00	Session 1 <i>David Rischel: Is Land Special</i> <i>Martin Jacobson: Conditions of Consent</i>
16:00-16:30	Tea and Coffee Break
16:30-17:30	Session 1 (continued) <i>Chia-Hung Huang: Threefold Territorial Boundary Problem</i>
17:45-19:00	Wine Reception
19:30	Conference Dinner
Thursday 3rd September	
9:30-11:30	Session 2 <i>Virginia de Biasio & Kieran Dunn: Conserving Colonialism: Protecting Nature, Dispossessing People</i> <i>Kaitie Jourdeuil: Confronting Disjunctures: Indigenous Redirections in Territorial Rights Theory</i>

11:30-12:00	Tea and Coffee Break
12:00-13:00	Session 2 (continued) <i>Michael Luoma: The Restitution of Settler Private Property and the Lesser Evil</i>
13:00-14:00	Lunch
14:00-16:00	Session 3: Contemporary Challenges <i>Matias Volonterio: More-Than-Human Liberation in the Commons</i> <i>Robert Dillon: Justice in the Marketplace of Cultures: Transcultural Migration and Indigenous Self-Determination</i>
16:00-16:30	Tea and Coffee Break
16:30-17:30	End of Conference

New Directions for Cosmopolitanism and Global Democracy

Location: Room 1.45, Williamson Building (Thursday);

Room G.14, Williamson Building (Wednesday & Friday)

Convenor(s): Maximillian Afnan

The political optimism of the post-Cold War period was accompanied by sustained scholarly attention to questions of global justice and democratic global governance (Caney, 2005; Held, 1995; Archibugi, 2008). Yet the past decade and a half has seen a 'globalisation backlash' that has called into question the feasibility and, for some, the desirability of cosmopolitan aspirations, and of the strong global institutions sometimes associated with them (Walter, 2021). Alongside these political developments, growing scholarly interest in the subaltern has prompted accusations that cosmopolitan and global democratic thought, particularly where it emerges from the liberal tradition, is guilty of a 'false universalism' that masks parochial moral views (Chakrabarty, 2000).

These developments raise numerous questions for cosmopolitanism and global democracy alike, which share a common concern with extending moral and political principles beyond the state, and face parallel challenges regarding feasibility, legitimacy, and the accommodation of diversity. Is democratic global governance compatible with cultural and national diversity? Is it possible to construct a truly inclusive cosmopolitan theory, or is the tradition irredeemably particular? What institutional forms might a legitimate global order take? And what methodological approaches are best suited to theorising such questions?

Recent scholarship has sought to address these challenges from a variety of angles. Some scholars have engaged with non-Western philosophical traditions, or the methods of comparative political theory, to diffuse charges of Western-centrism (Graness, 2018; Xu, 2018; Shapcott, 2020). Others have turned to 'grounded normative theory', using empirical research into lived experience to inform normative theory (Cabrera, 2020). Scholars have also

examined the relationship between cosmopolitan commitments and pluralist visions of global political order (Ulaş, 2025). A further strand of literature has brought insights from empirical political science into conversation with normative political theory, testing assumptions about the feasibility of global democratic institutions (Koenig-Archibugi, 2024; Agné, 2022). Meanwhile, scholars continue to debate the relative merits of polycentric approaches to global governance against proposals for more centralised supranational authority (Smith, 2018; Scholte, 2014).

This panel invites papers that engage with these debates. It welcomes contributions focused on cosmopolitanism, on global democracy, or on both, including (but not limited to) their relationship to questions of diversity. It aims to bring together scholars working across different theoretical traditions and methodological approaches to reflect on substantive questions of global political order, and the methods by which such questions are best addressed.

Wednesday 2nd September	
11:30-13:00	Registration
12:30-14:00	Lunch
14:00-16:00	Session 1 <i>Luke Ulas</i> : What should we make of empirical claims about cosmopolitan attitudes? <i>Tejas Luthra</i> : In the Shadow of Sovereignty: Against Liberal-Statist Distributive Justice
16:00-16:30	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
16:30-17:30	Session 1 (continued) <i>Runan Jin</i> : Independence as a Gradient: Revisiting the Coercion–Prevention Distinction
17:45-19:00	Wine Reception
19:30	Conference Dinner
Thursday 3rd September	
9:30-11:30	Session 2

	<i>Rafael Ruiz de Lira</i>: Moral Overlapping Consensus and the Case for Global Wealth Redistribution <i>Shruti Pandey</i>: Progressive Statism: Sovereignty, National Interest, and Global Climate Governance
11:30-12:00	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
12:00-13:00	Session 2 (continued) <i>Tadhg O’Laoghaire</i>: On the moral significance of state size
13:00-14:00	Lunch
14:00-16:00	Session 3 <i>Cheng-Chia Tung</i>: International Rule-making and the Freedom of Association of the State <i>Jules Wong</i>: Concrete Universalism: A New Approach to Human Needs
16:00-16:30	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
16:30-17:30	Session 3 (continued) <i>Petr Prášek</i>: Fake Democracy Rather than Fake News: Climate Politics, Democratic Conflict, and the Future of Cosmopolitanism
Friday 4th September	
9:30-11:30	Session 4 <i>Hans Agné</i>: Global democracy: Variable or perspective?

	<i>Maximillian Afnan</i> : What is global society?
11:30-12:00	Tea and Coffee Break, with Lunch from 13:00

Plebeianism, Popular Government, and the Challenge of Modern Oligarchy

Location: Room 2.53, Humanities Bridgeford Street Building

Convenor(s): Janosch Prinz & Matthew Haji-Michael

The reality of oligarchic power is increasingly undeniable. As the world approaches levels of inequality last seen in the 19th century (Piketty, 2014), the consolidation of oligarchic class power has become explicitly evident. The oligarchs are not at the gates: they're inside the White House. In light of this, our workshop invites participants from all branches of anti-oligarchic thought to discuss how to conceptualize oligarchy and oligarchic power, and to develop responses to its resurgence.

The primary challenge for political and democratic theorists today is to forge new conceptual and normative tools that adequately comprehend and respond to the threat of oligarchy. The first goal for such a theoretical reformation must be to secure an intellectually solid conceptualisation of oligarchy and oligarchic power. Oligarchy – literally: *arkhein*, 'rule', of the *oligoi*, 'few' (Indridason, 2008) – is an ancient idea, associated with the rule of the numerically few rich since antiquity (Aristotle, 1996). More recent work has focused on Winter's empirically informed definition, which conceptualises oligarchy as concentrated minority power characterised by 'the politics of wealth defence by materially endowed actors' (Winters, 2011: 7). But are either of these definitions still fit for purpose?

Armed with a conceptualisation of oligarchy, however provisional, the second aim of political and democratic theory must be to outline potential solutions. Two approaches towards this goal have begun to crystallise. The first is the plebeian tradition (McCormick, 2011; Vergara 2020). Such plebeian theorists argue for a dichotomous understanding of the political world that distinguishes wealthy elites from the plebeian masses. They seek to control and constrain these wealthy elites through institutional innovations such as renovated tribunes (Arlen & Rossi, 2021; Prinz & Westphal, 2024) or citizen tax-juries (Arlen, 2021), but may also range beyond this (e.g. McCormick, 2025).

A second grouping, emerging from new republican interpretations of Marx, has been the socialist republicans (Muldoon, 2019; Leipold, 2025). Equally committed to a notion of ‘popular government’, such thinkers differ from plebeian thought in emphasising the need for institutional measures that not only contain but eventually transcend social divisions between rich and poor (O’Shea, 2022; Harting, 2023). But are these approaches really so different?

Questions for contributors might include one or many from the following non-exhaustive list:

- What, if anything, is special about modern oligarchy?
- In what ways is modern oligarchy different from capitalism?
- What affinities and tensions exist between the plebeian and socialist republican positions?
- What, if anything, do these traditions help us see about liberal democracy?
- What tools (institutional or otherwise) should plebeians and other proponents of popular government seek to promote?
- In what ways, if any, are these tools superior to liberal or standard republican approaches?
- How are the historical roots, and the challenges with regard to translatability of such historical inspirations, to be addressed?
- What other ideas, concepts or tools within the history of political thought might be added to supplement existing anti-oligarchic theories?
- What relation do these traditions have to existing mechanisms of controlling power in liberal democracy, such as the rule of law?

Wednesday 2nd September	
11:30-13:00	Registration
12:30-13:45	Lunch
13:45-15:45	Session 1 <i>Haozhe Huang</i> : Digital Oligarchy and the Rethinking of Contestability: A Radical Republican Lens <i>Lawrence Hamilton</i> : Title TBC
15:45-16:00	Bathroom break
16:00-18:00	Session 1 (continued) <i>Matthew Haji-Michael</i> : Recovering the Plebeian Horizon: The Case of the Rule of Law <i>Maxim van Asseldonk</i> : Oligarchy and the Rule of Law Beyond State Power
18:00-19:00	Wine Reception
19:30	Conference Dinner
Thursday 3rd September	
9:30-11:30	Session 2 <i>Andreas-Johann Sorger</i> : Oligarchy and Racial Capitalism: Some Historical Considerations <i>Ondřej Lánský</i> : Oligarchization and Democratic Adaptation in Central and Eastern Europe: The Czech Case
11:30-12:00	Tea and Coffee Break

12:00-13:00	Session 2 (continued) <i>Niklas Plautzer</i> : Planetary Aediles: Democratic Counter-Power against Fossil Oligarchy
13:00-14:00	Lunch
14:00-16:00	Session 3 <i>Sean Irving</i> : Beyond Imperium and Dominion: Economic Constitutionalism and Popular Rule <i>Lore-Marie Junghans</i> : Trade unions' anti-oligarchic credentials. The case for organizing
16:00-16:30	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
16:30-17:30	Session 3 (continued) <i>Alessandro Volpi</i> : From Sovereignty to Suzerainty: A Neo-Feudal Diagnosis of Modern Oligarchy
18:00	Panel Drinks & Dinner
Friday 4th September No panel events – free to attend others or depart	

Political Ordinary Language

Location: Room 3.077, Arthur Lewis Building

Convenor(s): Corrado Fumagalli; Martina Rosola

Political philosophy has long privileged public speech and institutional political discourse as central sites of analysis. Increasingly, however, attention has shifted toward the normative dimensions of ordinary language use and the dynamics of linguistic change in non-ideal social contexts.

Language is a social practice through which shared forms of understanding, coordination, and mutual orientation are sustained over time. Shifts in linguistic conventions can reshape how individuals relate to one another, influence how social differences are marked or obscured, and affect patterns of inclusion within pluralistic and diverse societies. The ways in which linguistic expressions are used, repeated, and taken up also structure expectations about what can be said and contribute to the reinforcement or attenuation of prejudices and stereotypes. In this sense, language plays a constitutive role in shaping the normative environment in which social and political life unfolds.

This constitutive role gives rise to a range of philosophical questions concerning the emergence, stability, and contestation of norms governing language use. It invites reflection on how such norms are maintained over time and on the extent to which participants in shared linguistic practices are answerable to one another for their contributions to evolving communicative environments.

This panel seeks to bring together normative and descriptive perspectives on how patterns of language use emerge, stabilize, and transform across different settings. It therefore welcomes contributions that offer conceptual, normative, or empirically informed philosophical analyses of language as a social practice.

These include, but are not limited to, the following areas:

- language in social construction
- the relationship between language use and social coordination
- feminist philosophy of language
- communicative responsibilities
- normative views on stereotyping and discrimination in communication
- social/political speech and social norm change
- linguistic injustice
- the distribution and justification of normative expectations across different speakers and contexts
- methodological issues in language and analytic ideology critique
- counterspeech

Wednesday 2nd September – No sessions planned	
Thursday 3rd September	
9:30-11:30	Session 2 Matt Cull: “What are the words you do not yet have?” And how do you get them? Sara White: What is a “woman”?
11:30-12:00	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
12:00-13:00	Session 2 (continued) Eirini Vryza: Shifting Speakers The Politics of Illocutionary Agency
13:00-14:00	Lunch
14:00-16:00	Session 3 Francesca Cesarano: Blame for Structural Injustice: An Agency Scaffolding Account Corrado Fumagalli and Martina Rosola: Misgendering: harmful and undemocratic
16:00-16:30	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
16:30-17:30	Session 3 (continued) Suzanne Whitten: When Is a March a 'Hate March'? Labelling, Legitimacy, and the Limits of Dissent
Friday 4th September – No sessions planned	

Republican Political Economy

Location: Room G.018, Alliance Manchester Business School

Convenor(s): Miikka Jaarte

Since the publication of Quentin Skinner (1997) and Philip Pettit's (1999) groundbreaking analyses of the republican tradition and the notion of freedom as non-domination associated with it, political theorists and philosophers have applied the "neo-republican" lens to a wide variety of political issues. One domain where the implications of neo-republicanism are particularly contested is political economy. While some neo-republicans posit that republicans should simply want a familiar type of competitive market economy supplemented by a universal basic income (Pettit 2006, Lovett 2009), many others have argued that the implications of republican values may well be more radical. To truly realize freedom as non-domination, they have argued, we may need a property-owning democracy (Thomas 2017), an economy of worker cooperatives (Gourevitch 2014), or even some form of socialism (O'Shea 2020, Muldoon 2022). In addition to these big-picture questions about economic systems, however, neo-republican theory has much to offer for the normative analysis of more particular economic phenomena, such as work, debt, housing, financialization, trade, and many others. This panel will serve as a venue for republican theorists to further interrogate the implications of republican values for normative political economy.

Wednesday 2nd September	
11:30-13:00	Registration
12:30-14:00	Lunch
14:00-16:00	Session 1 Tom Ladendorf: ""Blind Power:" Marx on Capital, Accumulation, and Unfreedom" Kate Petroff: "Freedom and Politics in Marx's Vision of Socialism"
16:00-16:30	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
16:30-17:30	Session 1 (continued) Alan Coffee: "Wollstonecraftian Political Economy"
17:45-19:00	Wine Reception
19:30	Conference Dinner
Thursday 3rd September	
9:30-11:30	Session 2 Miikka Jaarte: "What's So Special About the Working Class?" Stuart White: "A Republican Internationalist Argument for Degrowth"
11:30-12:00	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
12:00-13:00	Session 2 (continued) Paul Forester: "What is Free Labor? Dependence without Domination"
13:00-14:00	Lunch

14:00-16:00	Session 3 Alan Thomas: "Should Liberal-Republicans be Keynesians?"
16:00-16:30	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
16:30-17:30	Session 3 (continued) -
Friday 4th September	
9:30-11:30	Session 4 Paul Pumsenberger: "Democratic Precarity: Why Republicans Should Care about an Expansive Notion of Precarious Work" Sean Irving: "Monetary Domination and Republican Political Economy"
11:30-12:00	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
12:00-13:00	Session 4 (continued) -
13:00-14:00	Lunch
14:00-16:00	Session 5 Tejas Luthra: "Global Production and Non-Domination: Why Republicans should be Cosmopolitan against Corporate Power" Hannah McHugh & James Hickson: "Republican Internationalism Reconsidered: Citizenship and Solidarity in an era of Domination Across Borders"
16:00-16:30	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
16:30-17:30	Session 5 (continued) Jenna Zhang: "Economic Domination, Productive Freedom, and the "Duty to Share": A Republican Theory of the Essential Facilities Doctrine in

	Antitrust”
17:30	End of Conference

Respect for Persons: Foundations, Varieties, and Challenges

Location: Room G.34, Humanities Bridgeford Street Building

Convenor(s): Nethanel Lipshitz

Among Kant's most enduring contributions to modern moral and political philosophy is the idea that there is a moral duty of respect for persons, and that persons are owed respect simply in virtue of being persons. This Kantian insight reshaped subsequent debates by suggesting that the fundamental moral relation among citizens is not primarily one of benevolence, utility, or shared ends, but of reciprocal recognition of equal status. In contemporary political theory, respect for persons has become a central idiom for expressing ideals of legitimacy, civic equality, and the just state. Rawls describes a just society as "a social cooperation on a footing of mutual respect between citizens regarded as free and equal" (Justice as Fairness: A Restatement, p. 28). Dworkin maintains that "individuals have a right to equal concern and respect in the design and administration of the political institutions that govern them" (Taking Rights Seriously, p. 180). Nussbaum characterizes her capability approach as providing "the philosophical underpinning for an account of basic constitutional principles that should be respected and implemented by the governments of all nations, as a bare minimum of what respect for human dignity requires" (Women and Human Development, p. 5).

Despite its influence, the idea that persons are owed respect (and that there is a corresponding duty of respect for persons) raises persistent puzzles and theoretical concerns. What kind of thing is respect: an attitude, a pattern of conduct, or a relation? How, if at all, can the duty of respect be justified? And does the language of respect for persons illuminate debates about justice, or does it risk obscuring them?

The proposed MANCEPT panel will bring together scholars working on these and related issues.

Wednesday 2nd September	
11:30-13:00	Registration
12:30-14:00	Lunch
14:00-16:00	Session 1 <i>Ian Carter</i> : Opacity Respect <i>Leo Rogers</i> : Opacity respect, Lookism and the Value of Relating as Equals
16:30-17:30	Session 1 (continued) <i>Chandler Hatch</i> : Kantian respect
17:45-19:00	Wine Reception
19:30	Conference Dinner
Thursday 3rd September	
9:30-11:30	Session 2 <i>Colin Bird</i> : Dignity, Vanity, and Awe: A Genealogy <i>Yotam Benziman</i> : Spite as Disrespect

11:30-12:00	Tea and Coffee Break
12:00-13:00	Session 2 (continued) <i>Endalkachew Abera Mekuriya: Affirmative Action and the Limits of Administrative Origination in Rawls.</i>
13:00-14:00	Lunch
14:00-16:00	Session 3 <i>Jonathan Seglow: Self-Respect as Normative Accountability</i> <i>Nethanel Lipshitz: What can Respect for Persons Do?</i>
Friday 4th September – No sessions	

Rethinking the Political Theory of Migration for Our Times

Location: Room G.6, Humanities Bridgeford Street Building

Convenor: Davide Pala

The reality endured by migrants worldwide has changed dramatically in recent years. Powerful and wealthy states now exercise expanded and extraterritorial control over migration, so that migrants encounter obstacles not only at the border but also throughout their journeys, often from the start. They may face highly restrictive visa requirements while still in their countries of origin, which are often hard to meet. After leaving their countries of origin, then, many are exposed to prolonged and harmful detention in transit countries such as Libya, due to agreements with rich states aimed at reducing departures. When migrants' rights are violated, moreover, the extraterritorial, dispersed, and hybrid public-private nature of new migration controls makes access to legal remedies exceedingly difficult. Hence, many migrants are forced to rely on smugglers to flee, with all the dangers this entails. In this context, private actors such as NGOs have sought to compensate for state failures by assisting migrants, yet their activities have increasingly been criminalised.

New vulnerabilities also arise once migrants reach destination countries. Status determination procedures are more and more arbitrary and intrusive, and the statuses migrants obtain thereafter have become increasingly precarious due to the expanded use of temporary protection, detention centres, and deportation, or the constant threat thereof. Furthermore, once inside destination societies, migrants are more exposed to violence, domination, and stigma, often due to a hostile climate fuelled by right-wing politics. Importantly, such vulnerabilities are now also experienced by citizens, who see their rights and freedoms eroded by inward migration controls, as recent actions by U.S. ICE sadly illustrate.

Political theory of migration has started grappling with this new reality by rethinking its methods, concepts, and objects of inquiry. Methodologically, many have urged moving beyond methodological nationalism to better address new migration controls. Others have argued for greater attention to migrants' own voices, to grasp the new vulnerabilities they face and devise suitable responses. More broadly, there has been a push to shift from fairly abstract debates toward more grounded, empirically informed political theorising. Substantively, theorists have called for focus on emerging themes, including new threats to migrants' human rights posed by current border practices; the racism inherent in contemporary migration governance; the expanding use of technologies such as AI, biometrics, and big data in migration management; the duties of NGOs and citizens in this landscape, including the legitimacy of novel forms of resistance; the ethics of smuggling; the ethics of sanctuary cities; and the connections between migration controls and democratic backlash, to mention but a few, new questions.

This workshop aims to advance these and related discussions by inviting contributions that rethink the political theory of migration in light of recent transformations, whether methodologically or through the exploration of new and existing themes.

Wednesday 2nd September	
11:30-13:00	Registration
12:30-14:00	Lunch
14:00-16:00	Session 1 Ciaran O'Brien: Non-Arrival and Asylum. Border Externalisation, Political Disappearance and Abolitionist Ethics Anna Closas: Asylum Law. Domination or Government?
16:00-16:30	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
16:30-17:30	Session 1 (continued) Lukas Schmid: Should Egalitarian City-Dwellers Oppose Expat Residence?
17:45-19:00	Wine Reception
19:30	Conference Dinner
Thursday 3rd September	
9:30-11:30	Session 2 Rebecca Valerio: Care and Control at Europe's Doorstep: the "Humanitarian Border" in the Mediterranean Sea Clara Sandelind: Borders and the Social Bases for Solidarity

11:30-12:00	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
12:00-13:00	Session 2 (continued) Matthew Lister: Exploring the Ethics of Indirect Immigration Regulation
13:00-14:00	Lunch
14:00-16:00	Session 3 Jan Turlej: Reasonable Costs of Refugee Assistance: Embracing Prioritarianism Leonardo Menezes: When Legal Protection Becomes a Liability: Refugee Status and Structural Injustice (on line presentation)
16:00-16:30	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
16:30-17:30	Session 3 (continued) Felix Bender: Political Realism and the Refugee Regime: Democratizing UNHCR
Friday 4th September	
9:30-11:30	Session 4 Anna Milioni - Reconceptualising Sanctuary Patti Tamara Lenard: Sanctuary, Immigration Enforcement and Democratic Decision-Making
11:30-12:00	Tea and Coffee Break (optional) – End of panel

Rethinking the Radical Right: Transnational Networks, Policy Convergence, and Discursive Power Across Gender, Health, and Environment

Location: Room G.016, Arthur Lewis Building

Convenor(s): Corrado Piroddi; Valentine Berthet

Liberal and democratic institutions are facing unprecedented challenges. The recent rise of radical right-wing populist movements and their transnational networks and the access to government in several European countries of radical-right populist parties is testified by restrictive norms on migration, equality rights, and welfare. Scholarly attention has focused on far-right stances concerning anti-migration and EU scepticism.

The panel aims to explore and deepen the intersecting role that reproductive rights, environmental and wider health policies play in shaping the political offer of the European and American far right. Furthermore, building on existing studies, this panel examines the existence of common underlying ideologies of conservative, libertarian, and radical right-wing populist actors enabling them to collaborate across borders to reshape policy agendas at national and EU-level. It also investigates the transnational role of conservative think tanks in the broader dynamic of far-right discourses and their interplay in domestic policy outcomes.

This panel brings together research on a range of interconnected topics, including health, digital environments, gender, race, and climate scepticism. Collectively, the contributions examine the relationships between conservative and reactionary forms of thought, political practice, and ongoing discursive struggles. Particular attention is paid to the emergence and

consolidation of socially conservative policies that challenge or roll back established equality frameworks and progressive norms.

The panel seeks to foster interdisciplinary dialogue across political science, global health, gender studies, environmental policy, and critical theory. By placing these perspectives in conversation, it aims to generate new insights into how conservative agendas are articulated, contested, and institutionalized across different domains.

Following the presentations, a roundtable discussion will bring together all speakers to deepen the exchange and identify emerging avenues for collaboration, including the potential development of shared research strategies.

Wednesday 2nd September	
11:30-13:00	Registration
12:30-14:00	Lunch
14:00-16:00	Session 1 <i>Marie Cazes (University of Jyväskylä):</i> Populist Health and Social Policies: a Historical Perspective of the Finnish Case <i>Annemijn Kwikkers (University of Amsterdam):</i> Right-Wing Ideology Disguised as Entertainment in the Digital Space: Digital Propaganda and the Case of the Tradwives
16:00-16:30	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
16:30-17:30	Session 1 (continued) <i>Lynda Gilby (Tampere University):</i> Beyond Opposition to 'Gender'. Interlinkages with Climate Scepticism and the Pandemic Agreement
17:45-19:00	Wine Reception
19:30	Conference Dinner
Thursday 3rd September	
9:30-11:30	Session 2 <i>Sonja Pietiläinen (University of Helsinki), Tero Toivanen (University of</i>

	<i>Helsinki</i>): Racial Ecology. Theorising Far-Right Environmentalism and its Racialised Ideological Logic <i>Peter Chase (Boston College)</i>: Whose Common Good?
11:30-12:00	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
12:00-13:00	Session 2 (continued) <i>S. N.</i> : The (Im)possibility of Consent: Enthusiasm for the Nonconsensual as the Alt-Right Response to Liberalism
13:00-14:00	Lunch
14:00-16:00	Session 3 <i>Corrado Piroddi (Tampere University)</i>: From <i>Lebensreform</i> to Wellness Capitalism. Holistic Health, Organicist Ideology, and Antimodernist Critique <i>Chiara Caterina Arena (KU Leuven)</i>: "Numbers, data and facts": Statistical authority and the Great Replacement in German far-right vodcasts
16:00-16:30	<i>Round Table</i> : Health, Social Sciences, Politics

Speciesism, Power and Human Prejudice

Location: Room G.7/G.33 (please check with panel organiser),
Humanities Bridgeford Street Building

Convenor(s): Matthew Wray Perry; Valerie Topf; Hannah Battersby

Speciesism has become a central concept in moral, social and political scholarship and movements concerning animals. Broadly understood, speciesism refers to discrimination based on species-membership and is often compared to racism and sexism. Nonetheless, unlike racism and sexism, speciesism is still generally regarded as an acceptable bias by the public and, also amongst philosophers, opinions diverge. Nowadays, most philosophers reject forms of speciesism which rely merely on membership in the human species. However, anthropocentric approaches which are justified in more indirect terms are widespread. Indeed, these have received renewed defences recently – including accounts which rely on rationality or social categories, among others.

This raises pressing metaphysical, normative and epistemic concerns about what it means to be a human, whether anthropocentric approaches to moral and political theory can be successfully defended, and a wider question about why philosophers might be compelled to defend them at all. At the same time, there are a variety of related concerns that are more overtly political in character, which theorists of race and gender attend to, but which are under-addressed in the literature on animals. These include issues regarding systems of power, structural injustice, social hierarchy, domination and oppression. This panel is therefore broadly concerned with the following question: if speciesism is similar to racism and sexism, what lies behind the former's largely unchecked dominance in our thinking, conduct and social structures? And how might we better understand its continued socio-political power, within and beyond analytic political and moral philosophy?

Wednesday 2nd September	
11:30-13:00	Registration
12:30-14:00	Lunch
14:00-16:00	Session 1 <i>David Holroyd: Political Realism as Methodological Speciesism</i> <i>Marla Hasin: Speciesism and the Predation Puzzle</i>
16:00-16:30	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
16:30-17:30	Session 1 (continued) <i>Hannah Battersby: Interspecies Justice and Ableism</i>
17:45-19:00	Wine Reception
19:30	Conference Dinner
Thursday 3rd September	
10:30-11:30	Session 2 <i>Piia Vinnari: Speciesism versus racism – does the analogy hold?</i>
11:30-12:00	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
12:00-13:00	Session 2 (continued) <i>Yujiro Yamamoto: Anti-speciesiest epistocracy for the political inclusion of animals</i>

13:00-14:00	Lunch
14:00-16:00	Session 3 <i>Christian Golden: Loyalty to Humankind</i> <i>Maya von Ziegesar: What's in a Dreaded Comparison?</i>
16:00-16:30	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
Friday 4th September	
10:30-11:30	Session 4 <i>Valéry Giroux: Animals at the Intersection of Speciesism and Cognitive Ableism</i>
11:30-12:00	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
12:00-13:00	Session 4 (continued) <i>Valérie Topf (Online): TBC</i>
13:00-14:00	Lunch
14:00-16:00	Session 5 <i>Dominick Cooper: Species Beings: Reconciling Marxism and Speciesism</i> <i>Matthew Wray Perry: Dignity Without Speciesism</i>
15.00	End of Conference

Techno-(E)utopias of Abundance, Sustainability and Sufficiency

Location: Room 2.53, Humanities Bridgeford Street Building

Convenor(s): Roman Meinhold

This interdisciplinary conference panel aims to re-examine the political philosophy concept of utopia through the competing yet intertwined and probably complementary focal lenses of abundance and sufficiency, under conditions of increasing technological acceleration and deepening ecological constraints. Political and technological utopias have often relied on assumptions of material or productive abundance. Today, however, such assumptions collide with the realities of planetary boundaries, sharp increasing energy demands, critical element dependency, and fragile socio-technological systems.

The purpose of this interdisciplinary panel is to create a focused forum in which political theorist; ethicists; philosophers; technology, sustainability as well as Sci-Fi and Cli-Fi researchers critically interrogate whether emerging technological developments — such as artificial intelligence (AI, ASI AGI), quantum computation, blockchain infrastructures, and digital finance — revive, reconfigure, or undermine particular eutopian ideals, and whether sufficiency-based eutopias could also contribute viable alternative normative horizons.

A central guiding question is which aspects of emerging technological systems plausibly support (e)utopias of abundance, and which rather intensify the case for socio-political imaginaries grounded in sufficiency, sustainability, and ecological interrelatedness. There could be a risk that certain contemporary “techno-utopian” narratives — especially those associated with AGI, ASI, singularity, and centralized or decentralized digital infrastructures — mask potential, yet underappreciated, forms of “scarcity”, digital dependency, and asymmetrical power concentration, particularly in relation to progressive energy consumption, data center expansion, and the extraction, utilization and recycling of critical elements.

The panel adopts an explicitly pluralistic methodological inter- and transdisciplinary approach. Contributions are expected to engage in political theory; ethics; philosophy; technology, sustainability as well as Sci-Fi and Cli-Fi research while remaining empirically literate about both emerging technological systems and eco-environmental constraints.

For Wednesday 2nd and Thursday 3rd September 2026 please join other Panels	
Friday 4th September	
9:30-11:30	Session 4 <i>Yuko Miyazaki</i> (Showa University of Music, Japan) Beyond Technological Abundance: Bildung and Inner Alterity in the Age of AI <i>Kaylah Meinhold</i> (BIMM, Manchester) Rethinking Political Authority in the Age of Artificial Intelligence
11:30-12:00	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
12:00-13:00	Session 4 (continued) <i>Skander Mian</i> (Manchester Metropolitan University): Beyond Predictive Accuracy: Responsible AI and the Limits of Algorithmic Abundance in Automated Lending
13:00-14:00	Lunch
14:00-16:00	Session 5 <i>Joseph Rigby</i> (Andinn Ltd, Manchester) Who Holds the Flame? The Buddhist Sāsana as a Model for Decentralisation and the Case Against Technofeudal AI

	<i>Roman Meinhold</i> (Mahidol University International College, Mahidol University, Bangkok): Human intelligence in the age of Artificial General Intelligence: AGI Sustainability & existential risks
16:00-16:30	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
16:30-17:30	Session 5 (continued) <i>All Speakers:</i> Final Plenum Discussion
17:30	End of Conference

Theories of Public Reason

Location: Hansom Room, Humanities Bridgeford Street Building

Convenors: Gabriele Badano; Blain Neufeld; Collis Tahzib

This panel seeks to bring together those working on issues related to public reason, broadly conceived. Public reason is an influential framework for understanding how liberal democracies can make fair decisions for diverse citizenries. There is now an extensive literature around public reason: Alongside John Rawls's well-known account, variants of the idea have been developed in the work of Gerald Gaus, Jonathan Quong, Andrew Lister, Kevin Vallier, Christie Hartley, Lori Watson, and others.

This panel will have a broad remit within this topic. So, we will explore competing justifications of public reason and other classic debates, including the one pitting public reason liberals against liberal perfectionists. However, we will also explore key issues related to political liberalism that go beyond the role of public reason within it. Examples include the limits that the liberal state should impose on markets and how best to understand the wrong of discrimination.

Wednesday 2nd September	
11:30-13:00	Registration
12:30-14:00	Lunch
14:00-16:00	Session 1 <i>Gabriele Badano</i> : Handling Values in Science: Democratic Alignment, Contestation, or Public Reason? <i>Yonghao Huang</i> : The Duty of Pressure and the Politically Apathetic: The Role of Reasonable Citizens in Liberal Democratic Self-Defence
16:00-16:30	Tea and Coffee Break
16:30-17:30	Session 1 (continued) <i>Michael Schmidt</i> : The Idea of Full Reflective Equilibrium
17:45-19:00	Wine Reception
19:30	Conference Dinner
Thursday 3rd September	
9:30-11:30	Session 2 <i>Emil Andersson</i> : Global Public Reason: A Defence

	<i>Collis Tahzib</i> : It's Not Just About the Money: A Reply to Birks and Carroll (co-authored with Jonathan Quong)
11:30-12:00	Tea and Coffee Break
12:00-13:00	Session 2 (continued) <i>Nurit Matuk Blaustein</i> : Must Political Liberals Reject All Perfectionisms?
13:00-14:00	Lunch
14:00-16:00	Session 3 <i>Akira Inoue</i> : Civic Friendship and the Processual Idea of Public Reason <i>Ahmed Siddiqi</i> : Civic Partnership: A Novel Conception of Political Community for Grounding Public Reason
16:00-16:30	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
16:30-17:30	Session 3 (continued) <i>Blain Neufeld</i> : Rawls on Autonomy
Friday 4th September	
9:30-11:30	Session 4 <i>Vida Panitch</i> : Political Liberalism and the Limits of Markets <i>Susan Erck</i> : Public Reasoning about Needs: The Role of Open Impartiality
11:30-12:00	Tea and Coffee Break

12:00-13:00	Session 4 (continued) <i>Samuel Cole</i> : Discrimination as Violation of Reciprocity
13:00-14:00	Lunch – End of panel

The Philosophy of the Non-Profit Sector

Location: Room 4.04, Williamson Building

Convenor(s): Matthieu Debief

This panel examines the non-profit sector through the lens of political philosophy, addressing a notable gap in the discipline. It pursues two overarching lines of inquiry. Conceptually, it asks what distinguishes the non-profit sector from for-profit and governmental activities, and how it relates to adjacent notions such as the third sector, voluntary sector, or commons. Normatively, it interrogates the sector's role in democratic societies, its relation to justice versus individual conceptions of the good, the ethical responsibilities of non-profit organisations, and the specific challenges raised by their activities at the global scale.

Speakers:

1. **Matthieu Debief** (Université de Genève) – The normative significance of non-for-profitness
2. **Kato van Roey** (University of Antwerp) – Evidence-Based Policy and epistemic injustice in nonprofit organizations' action
3. **Sofia Duran** (Université Grenoble-Alpes) - Accountability in the non-profit sector: The case of humanitarian organizations
4. **Lorenzo Manuali** (University of Michigan) - Philanthropic Power Requires Democratic Transparency
5. **Florence Rochat** (Fondation Saint-Justin) - Developing a Sustainable Operating Model: The Case Study of St-Justin
6. **Maddalena Fazzo Cusan** (University of Groningen) - Hermeneutic injustice in global knowledge creation: challenges and opportunities for the non-profit

Wednesday 2nd September	
11:30-13:00	Registration
12:30-14:00	Lunch
14:00-16:00	Session 1 <i>Sofia Duran</i> : Accountability in the non-profit sector: The case of humanitarian organizations <i>Lorenzo Manuali</i> – Philanthropic Power Requires Democratic Transparency
16:00-16:30	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
16:30-17:30	Session 1 (continued) <i>No Speaker</i>
17:45-19:00	Wine Reception
19:30	Conference Dinner
Thursday 3rd September	
9:30-11:30	Session 2 <i>Kato van Roey</i> : Evidence-Based Policy and epistemic injustice in nonprofit organizations' action <i>Maddalena Fazzo Cusan</i> : Hermeneutic injustice in global knowledge creation: challenges and opportunities for the non-profit
11:30-12:00	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
12:00-13:00	Session 2 (continued)

	<i>Florence Rochat: Developing a Sustainable Operating Model: The Case Study of Saint-Justin</i>
13:00-14:00	Lunch
14:00-16:00	Session 3 <i>Matthieu Debief: The normative significance of non-for-profitness</i>
16:00-16:30	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
16:30-17:30	Session 3 (continued) <i>Speaker Name: Talk Title</i>
Friday 4th September – No speakers	

The Politics of GenAI Governance

Location: Room 2.16, Williamson Building

Convenor(s): João C. Magalhães; Klara Matusiewicz; Robert Gorwa

The governance of GenAI is often framed as a computational task (how can code and data ensure that AI systems reliably do what designers want them to do?), an abstract normative question (which norms should AI systems behave in accordance with?), or a narrowly legal challenge (how can different regulatory bodies define, codify, and enforce these norms, in computational and institutional terms?). Yet it is also, obviously and perhaps centrally, a political problem: which actors, representing whose interests, have less or more power and legitimacy to influence the mechanisms whereby GenAI is governed into being? Who's set to benefit and lose from these processes?

The need for perspectives rooted in political theory is made increasingly urgent by two trends in how GenAI governance is defined. First, the discourse about what governance means and what constitutes success is rapidly consolidating around a narrow set of actors and understandings. As it is often spurred by private companies which operate with limited public oversight, this kind of discourse and its related proposals call for an inquiry into the rights, responsibilities, and ideologies that underpin them, particularly as the datasets and training used for governing GenAI have previously resulted in bias, exclusion and the reinforcement of existing systems of oppression. Second, governance proposals aspire to a global scope, implicitly advancing claims about universal values. Such disregard for pluralism raises questions about legitimacy, and concerns about the associated asymmetries in geopolitical power. Importantly, these trends unfold amid a historical crisis of liberal democracy.

As GenAI becomes increasingly embedded in everyday life, its governance is no longer just about preventing reward hacking during training or the hypothetical, potentially catastrophic consequences of mis-specified goals. It is about institutionalising quotidian norms and inequities, thus encoding particular visions of social order into what is quickly becoming a pervasive, all-purpose sort of infrastructure.

To truly understand and intervene in the governance of GenAI, we need first treat it as a collective and contested political practice. This workshop addresses this urgent task by inviting contributions that grapple with the visible and covert disagreement, authorities, and rationalities that shape the emergence of GenAI under conditions of extreme uncertainty.

In particular, we welcome scholars working on topics related, but not limited, to the following guiding questions:

1. How should we conceptualise GenAI governance as a form of power, and in which ways does it differ (or not) from previous control systems?
2. How does GenAI governance intersect with theories and the current realities of democracy and authoritarianism?
3. Can traditional approaches explain the political economy of GenAI?
4. In what ways do existing GenAI governance proposals implicitly rely on contested political assumptions (e.g. moral realism, liberal individualism, etc)?
5. To what extent and how should GenAI governance be democratised?

Wednesday 2nd September	
11:30-13:00	Registration
12:30-14:00	Lunch
14:00-16:00	Session 1 <i>Bradley Ward (University of Southampton):</i> Can AI revive the state? AI and public sector reform under the UK Labour government. Respondent: Klara Matusiewicz & João C. Magalhães. <i>Elinor Carmi (City St George's, University of London):</i> Stop experimenting on us: What states can learn from the pharmaceutical industry about AI governance. Respondent: Jelena Belic.
16:00-16:30	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
16:30-17:30	Session 1 (continued) <i>Klara Matusiewicz & João C. Magalhães (University of Manchester):</i> Alignment moments: Mapping the politics of AI normativity. Respondent: Bradley Ward.
17:45-19:00	Wine Reception
19:30	Conference Dinner
Thursday 3rd September	

9:30-11:30	Session 2 <i>Charlotte Spencer-Smith (Austrian Academy of Sciences / University of Klagenfurt), Ricarda Drüeke (University of Salzburg, Austria), Corinna Peil (University of Salzburg, Austria):</i> Governing Discourse: Gender, Alignment and the Normativity of Generative AI. Respondent: / <i>Jelena Belic (Leiden University) & Bauke Wielinga (TU Delft):</i> Who is Responsible for Algorithmic Structural Injustice? Respondent: Katia Schwerzmann.
11:30-12:00	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
12:00-13:00	Session 2 (continued) <i>Katia Schwerzmann (Ruhr-Universität Bochum) & Alex Campolo (Durham University):</i> Alignment: From the Governance of Models to Geopolitics. Respondent: /
13:00-14:00	Lunch
14:00-16:00	Session 3
16:00-16:30	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
16:30-17:30	End of workshop (final notes, next steps etc)
17:30-	Drinks at local pub (self-organised)

Tolerance and Education:

Concepts, Justifications, and Limits

Location: Room 2.066, Arthur Lewis Building

Convenor(s): Christina Easton

Tolerance has long been a central concept in political philosophy, yet its role in education remains surprisingly under-theorised. Philosophers typically analyse tolerance as forbearance: refraining from interfering with practices or ways of life one disapproves of. By contrast, educational policy, public debate, and classroom practice often invoke tolerance in a thicker sense, associating it with open-mindedness and being “non-judgemental”. This divergence raises a set of questions about what tolerance should mean in educational contexts, and what schools can legitimately be expected to teach.

This panel will explore the concept, justification, and practical implications of tolerance in education. It will bring together work in political philosophy and philosophy of education to examine how tolerance should be understood when the subjects are children and young people rather than adults, and when the setting is the classroom rather than the public square.

One set of questions concerns conceptual analysis. In the educational context, is tolerance best understood as non-interference, as non-disapproval, as open-mindedness, or as something else entirely? Are these rival concepts in tension, or can they play complementary roles at different stages of education or in relation to different kinds of disagreement? Should tolerance be understood as a civic virtue, a moral attitude, an epistemic virtue, or a cluster of beliefs and practices? And how does tolerance differ from neighbouring ideals such as respect, recognition, and inclusion?

A second set of questions concerns legitimacy and justification. Liberal political theory has traditionally been wary of state efforts to shape citizens’ beliefs or attitudes. Yet schools routinely aim to influence how students think and feel about others, and educational policy

often treats certain attitudes – racism and sexism, for example – as objectionable in themselves. When, if ever, is it legitimate for the state, acting through its educational institutions, to promote or discourage particular attitudes? And does the justification for tolerance in education rest on harm prevention, autonomy, or something else?

Third, there are questions relating to feasibility and efficacy. Can tolerance be taught, and if so, what does successful teaching look like? How should philosophical accounts of tolerance respond to recent challenges questioning whether tolerant attitudes can be taught?

Wednesday 2nd September	
11:30-13:00	Registration
12:30-14:00	Lunch
14:00-16:00	<i>Margaret Cuonzo: The Paradoxes of Tolerance</i> <i>Hailey Power: Toleration as a Virtue</i>
16:00-16:30	Tea and Coffee Break
16:30-17:30	<i>Jordi Vilahur: Tolerance and the School</i>
17:45-19:00	Wine Reception
19:30	Conference Dinner
Thursday 3rd September	
9:30-11:30	<i>Anamica Sharma: Reframing Tolerance in Education: A Caste-Critical</i>

	Perspective <i>Christina Easton and Andy Mason: Open-Mindedness and Cultural Sensitivity: Two Multicultural Civic Virtues?</i>
11:30-12:00	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
12:00-13:00	<i>Reem Amarneh: Beyond Tolerance and Conversation: Appiah, Moral Disagreement, and Cosmopolitan Education</i>
13:00-14:00	Lunch
14:00-16:00	<i>Ruth Wareham: Warts and All: Truth, Tolerance and Religious Education</i> <i>Frauke Albersmeier: Educating for Moral Progress: The Forward-Looking Case for Judgemental Toleration</i>
16:00-16:30	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
16:30-17:30	Plenary discussion led by <i>Stephen Daniels</i>: Tolerance, the Rights Respecting School Award and human rights discourse
	Informal dinner for workshop attendees (contact Christina if you'd like to come) – approx. 7pm, following optional drinks
	WORKSHOP ENDS

Who "knows" what Gender is?

Arguments and Debates at the Intersection between Epistemic Injustice, the Metaphysics of Gender, and Gender Identity

Location: Room G.020/G.021, Arthur Lewis Building

Convenor(s): Miriam Ronzoni; Esa Diaz-Leon

In recent years, the "Gender Wars" have dominated public debates in several Western countries. Whilst in the US the debate is largely one between progressives and conservatives, the UK debate, and many other European debates, are often framed as being internal to feminism and what a feminist public policy should look like. Gender critical feminists argue that gender is an oppressive social construct; thus, the feminist thing to do with it is simply to destroy it (while failing to recognize trans identities). Trans-inclusive scholars contend that both gender and gender identity cannot be erased without committing very serious harms to some of the already most marginalised people. Predictably, very different public policy agendas follow.

At closer look, however, trans-inclusive scholars and activists agree that gender is largely a social construct. The idea that trans activists and scholars consider gender identity (whether cis or trans) as immutable and innate is largely a myth. The trans-inclusive claim is, however, that something can be a social construct yet be very real and serve important social purposes within a certain social context – such that destroying the concept *whilst maintain the broader social context* would produce significant harms. Most trans-inclusive actors also

agree that gender has many oppressive elements – yet contend that, all things considered, trans-inclusion is the most promising way to deconstruct those elements. Gender critical feminists usually counter-argue that this stand is simply confused: if gender and gender identity are not something innate but social constructs, then what are they if not just the oppressive creation of the patriarchy? What else can they be? Thus, according to gender critical feminism, either gender identity is conceived as something immutable and innate – and that is an implausible claim, or it is part of an oppressive ideology which should be dismantled. Everything else is mysterious.

This workshop aims to bring together this debate with developments in feminist epistemology. Recently, much has been written about how the marginalised can be wronged not just in material terms, but also in their “capacity as knowers” (Fricker 2007). This can happen because their very plausible accounts of their lived experiences are discredited; because mainstream language and knowledge lack the terms and concepts for their experiences; and because, as a result, marginalised people have struggled to make sense of their own experiences – both to themselves and to others. All of this is compatible with marginalised people being, in spite of all, very competent or even uniquely insightful knowers in certain domains (Medina 2013).

The workshop asks whether this can be the case for the concepts of gender and gender identity. Could it be that, when the opponent says that trans-inclusive accounts of gender identity are “confused,” “mysterious,” or “don’t make sense,” epistemic marginalisation is playing a role? It would not, after all, be the first time. A standpoint of uncertainty and puzzlement is not necessarily one of ignorance: it can indeed be the starting point of productive epistemic innovations. Indeed, paradigmatic cases of hermeneutical injustice confirm that: the working women who struggled to make sense of their experience of unwelcome sexual flirtation in the workplace are the very same women who went on and developed a new concept for it – workplace sexual harassment.

The aim is to explore whether this can apply to trans-inclusive conceptual innovations about gender and gender identity and, if so, how barriers of intelligibility can be overcome. Conceptions of gender identity are undergoing revisions in feminist philosophy (e.g., Barnes 2022, Cosker-Rowland 2023, Cull 2024, Hernandez & Bell 2025, Jenkins 2023). Our aim is to further explore the connections between debates about conceptual innovations on gender

and gender identity, on the one hand, and questions about epistemic injustice, epistemic marginalization and conceptual interventions, on the other hand.

Wednesday 2nd September	
11:30-13:00	Registration
12:30-14:00	Lunch
14:00-16:00	Session 1 <i>N/A</i>
16:00-16:30	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
16:30-17:30	Session 1 (continued) <i>N/A</i>
17:45-19:00	Wine Reception
19:30	Conference Dinner
Thursday 3rd September	
9:30-11:30	Session 2 1. <i>Esa Díaz León</i> – Gender Identity and Hermeneutical Injustice 2. <i>Miriam Ronzoni</i> – Hermeneutical Injustice and Epistemic Privilege:

	Not Necessarily Incompatible. The Case of Gender Identity
11:30-12:00	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
12:00-13:00	Session 2 (continued) 3. IRENE ADÁN SÁNCHEZ-INFANTES Gendered by what?? Gender categorisation and misgendering in facial and gender recognition
13:00-14:00	Lunch
14:00-16:00	Session 3 4. Nikolas Urban: Gender as Self-Ascription: Political not Metaphysical 5. Matilda Carter: Reasonable Disagreement About Gender Identity
16:00-16:30	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
16:30-17:30	Session 3 (continued) 6. Amanda Moreira: The Metaphysics of the Feminist Quest
Friday 4th September	
9:30-11:30	Session 4 7. Cristina Pellegrino Jimenez : ‘He/him lesbians’: identities at the intersection of epistemic justice and social recognition. 8. Milo Koot: Looking for solidarity: the epistemic value of Trans [] Crip access needs

11:30-12:00	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
12:00-13:00	Session 4 (continued) 9. Robert Herissone-Kelly: The Hermeneutical Responsibilities of Cisgender Allyship
13:00-14:00	Lunch
14:00-15:00	Session 5 10. Evie Willems: "Irrational woman": Trans women, privative slurs, and self-imposed exile from the space of reasons
16:00-16:30	Tea and Coffee Break (optional)
16:30-17:30	Session 5 (continued) N/A
17:30	End of Conference