

## Friday 24<sup>th</sup> February 2017

<b>9.30-10</b>	COFFEE / REGISTRATION
<b>10-10.15</b>	WELCOME
<b>10.15-11.30</b>	KEYNOTE: Sabrina Ebbersmeyer (University of Copenhagen, DK): "Was Eve just curious? Women's voices on female curiosity during the early modern period"
<b>11.30-12.15</b>	Rebecka Sofia Ahvenniemi (NO): "Composing Like a Woman? On Music, Gender, and Democracy"
<b>12.15-13.15</b>	LUNCH
<b>13:15-14.00</b>	Anna Cornelia Ploug (DK): "Mellemlaturens rolle i Anne Conways dynamiske ontologi"
<b>14:00-14.45</b>	Mia Skjold Tvede Henriksen (DK): "Ehrengard og det forførte kvindesyn"
<b>14.45-15:15</b>	COFFEE BREAK
<b>15:15-16:00</b>	Vigdis Kvam (NO): "Borgerlønn – en mulighet for realisering av de tre idealene frihet, likhet og brorskap (freedom, equality and fraternity)"

## Saturday 25<sup>th</sup> February 2017

<b>10-10.30</b>	COFFEE
<b>10.30-11.45</b>	KEYNOTE: Anne-Marie Søndergaard Christensen (University of Southern Denmark, DK): "Illuminating Reality: Iris Murdoch's Second Challenge for Moral Philosophy"
<b>11.45-12:30</b>	Hanna Kinnunen (SE): "Sharing the World through Weilian Attention"
<b>12:30-13:30</b>	LUNCH
<b>13:30 -14.15</b>	Anne Granberg (NO): "The crumbling of common sense; some pessimistic insights from Hannah Arendt in relation to 'post-truth' politics"
<b>14:15-15.00</b>	Sofie Lekve (NO): "The Moral Status of Non-Existent Beings"
<b>15.00-15:30</b>	COFFEE BREAK
<b>15:30 – 16.15</b>	Nathalie Tornéus-Ek (SE): "What is a Woman? – metaphysical fallacies in the name of Simone de Beauvoir"
<b>16.15 – 17.00</b>	Kristina Miklavic (NO): "Shame as a Norm Regulator for Gendered Subjectivities"

# Abstracts

---

**Friday 10:15 – 11:30**

**Sabrina Ebbersmeyer: “Was Eve just curious? Women’s voices on female curiosity during the early modern period”**

The talk focuses on the problem of gender and curiosity during the early modern period. In a time, which is sometimes referred to as the ‘age of curiosity’ and in which curiosity was more and more regarded as a praiseworthy trait, female curiosity remained a doubtful matter, ready to be ridiculed. Thus, it has been suggested that there was hardly any legitimation for women’s curiosity during the early modern period. In my talk I intend to challenge this claim by focusing on texts written by women: How did women argue for their passion for knowledge? What was the women’s voice on female curiosity?

I will briefly sketch the cultural background that gendered curiosity in a specific way and had an impact on how women of the early modern period approached the topic. Thereafter, I am going to illustrate how women encountered and refuted some deeply rooted prejudices, and what arguments and strategies they used in order to claim curiosity for themselves. My argument is based primarily on works written by Christine de Pizan (1364-c. 1429), Arcangela Tarabotti (1604-1652), Marie Le Jars de Gournay (1565-1645), Anna Maria van Schurman (1607-1678), and Margaret Cavendish (1623-1673).

**Friday 11:30 – 12:15**

**Rebecka Sofia Ahvenniemi: “Composing Like a Woman? On Music, Gender, and Democracy”**

The field of musical composition in the Western world seems to repel women. Few young women apply to study composition, and women composers' names are almost non-existent on the concert programs of philharmonic orchestras. The imbalance today is commonly explained by cultural habits and a lack of interest among young women. In this paper I will contemplate on another issue: The musical languages. How is one to compose as a woman? Music, unlike other art forms, hasn't gone through a proper feminist critique in the 20th century. Susan McClary notes that music is still commonly regarded as a universal language, independent of culture, gender, and political issues. I will suggest an approach where these are not extra-musical phenomena, but exist in the work of music. I will discuss “strategic essentialism”, as presented by Luce Irigaray, as a possible solution for making the field more democratic. Further, I will look at the potential of avant-garde music to reflect on gender roles.

**Friday 13:15 – 14:00**

**Anna Cornelia Ploug: "Mellemnaturens rolle i Anne Conways dynamiske ontologi"**

- (1) Mellemnaturens rolle i Anne Conways dynamiske ontologi
- (2) Renæssance/moderne, naturfilosofi, vitalisme
- (3) Hvordan kan vi begrebsliggøre den drivkraft, vi finder i den levende og foranderlige natur?

I sit værk *Principia philosophiae antiquissimae et recentissimae* (Den ældste og nyligste filosofis grundsætninger), udgivet posthumt i Amsterdam i 1690, kritiserer Anne Conway den kartesiske substansdualisme og dens medfølgende mekaniske opfattelse af naturen, og fremsætter i stedet en hierarkisk ånds metafysik hvor Gud og skaberværk udgør hver sin ekstrem.

Oplægget vil undersøge den rolle, Conways begreb om Kristus som 'mellemnatur' (*natura media*) skal udfylde i sin 'kommunikation' af guddommelige attributter til den skabte natur, og hvordan det skabte stræber mod det gode i en trinvis forbedring *ad infinitum*, hvilket resulterer i naturens grundlæggende processuelle karakter.

**Friday 14:00 – 14:45**

**Mia Skjold Tvede Henriksen: "Ehrengard og det forførte kvindesyn"**

Forførerens antagelse i Søren Kierkegaards Forførerens Dagbog (1843) er, at der skal en mand til at realisere en kvindes bevidsthed. I Karen Blixens Ehrengard (1963) er antagelsen umiddelbart den samme, men bliver her gjort til skamme, idet Blixen i sin intertekstuel refererende modhistorie til Kierkegaards værk formulerer kvindens bevidstgørelse på ny. Dette oplæg udspringer som en refleksion over fraværet af det kvindelige synspunkt i udlægninger, der ellers drejer sig om hende. Idet Blixen vender rollerne, undermineres det kvindesyn, der ligger i forførerens tilgang til forførelsesprojektet, og hermed opponerer forfatterinden mod det subjekt/objekt-forhold, der indlejres i den kierkegaardske forførers kvindesyn. Med sammenligningen mellem Kierkegaards og Blixens tekster som grundlag, skal ikke alene forførelsen som begreb, men også blikket på kvinden udlægges, idet de vanlige dikotomier mellem passiv og aktiv, forfører og forført udfordres og nuanceres, for derved at karakterisere den plads kvinden ofte henvises til i filosofien, som "den anden".

**Friday 15:15 – 16:00**

**Vigdis Kvam: "Borgerlønn – en mulighet for realisering av de tre idealene frihet, likhet og brorskap (freedom, equality and fraternity)"**

Guy Standing, en av initiativtakerne til stiftelsen BIEN, Basic Income European (seinere Earth) Network, og forfatter av bl.a. "The Precariat – The New Dangerous Class" er en sterk forkjemper for borgerlønn (basic income) som en grunnleggende rettighet, en rettighet som også må være helt uten betingelser. I dette innlegget vil jeg vise hvordan en samlesning/samtolkning av Standings tanker om borgerlønn og Hannah Arendts tanker, slik de bl.a. fremkommer i hennes verk «The Human Condition», kan vise vei for en konstruktiv måte å realisere frihet, likhet og brorskap/solidaritet – de tre idealene fra den franske revolusjonen. Både frihet og likhet har vært gjenstand for mang en refleksjon innen både filosofi, jus og politisk teori. Det siste av de tre idealene har imidlertid fått mindre oppmerksomhet. Et poeng her vil være at det først er gjennom å gi alle en ubetinget økonomisk basis, en grunnleggende solidaritetstanke, at frihet og likhet kan bli en realitet for alle.

**Saturday 10:30 - 11:45**

**Anne-Marie Søndergaard Christensen: "Illuminating Reality: Iris Murdoch's Second Challenge for Moral Philosophy"**

Two fundamental challenges to moral philosophy emerge from Iris Murdoch's groundbreaking work in moral philosophy in the 1950ies and 60ies. The first is a challenge to understand and acknowledge how moral differences can concern, not just 'differences of choice', but also 'differences of vision' (1956, 40), and ways of responding to this challenge of 'moral vision' can be found for example in certain developments within virtue ethics and particularism. However, Murdoch develops an even more radical challenge by showing that how we, in moral life as in moral philosophy, may come to face a need for new moral visions and new moral concepts enabling us to see and address aspects of moral life that does not come sufficiently into view on our existing moral outlook(s). The challenge is controversial by implying that moral philosophy has a task that is both innovative and thoroughly moral, and it has hitherto received far less attention in moral philosophy in general. The aim of this paper is to explore the implications of this second challenge and give one example of how philosophy can meet this challenge via an engagement with literature, here two works by the Danish writer Maja Lee Langvad.

**Saturday 11:45 – 12:30**

**Hanna Kinnunen: "Sharing the World through Weilian Attention"**

I investigate the notion of attention as it appears in the writings of Simone Weil, providing a suggestion of how to think the conditions for an ethics based on the meeting between two. Reading Weil's concept of attention together with the thought of Luce Irigaray, who stresses the acknowledgement and preservation of difference as the core of a non-appropriating ethics, I show that Weilian attention can be understood in opposition to "the Culture of the Same", acknowledging difference as crucial for ethically meeting the Other. By being conceptualised not only in terms of seeing, but also as listening and touch, Weilian attention breaks with the object oriented "looking- at" permeating the history of western thought, thus creating space for the Other to emerge as a subject. The cultivating of attention challenges the way of relating to others through appropriation, instead providing the basis for a sharing of the world in difference.

**Saturday 13:30 – 14:15**

**Anne Granberg: “The crumbling of common sense; some pessimistic insights from Hannah Arendt in relation to ‘post-truth’ politics”**

Typical of Arendt’s political thinking is that she approaches the political as a specific type of activity and experience which is first and foremost discursive, since action needs speech in order to be understandable, and public speaking is itself a form of action. As a discursive interaction, politics is exchange of views, persuasion, deliberation and discussion about some matter pertaining to the common good, a process that creates and sustains what Arendt calls “common sense” or a “feeling for the world”, which according to Arendt functions as an antidote to totalitarian temptations and political evil. However, common sense is vulnerable not merely to propaganda and direct manipulation, but also to cynicism and a more general confusion between fact and opinion. This paper will explore Arendt’s view on the relationship between truth, lying and common sense in the context of the recent debate about ‘post-factual’ of ‘post-truth’ politics.

**Saturday 14:15 – 15:00**

**Sofie Lekve: “The Moral Status of Non-Existent Beings”**

In my Master thesis I will be researching the moral status of non-existent beings. Primarily I will be focusing on three non-existent beings:

Future generations

Past generations

Artificial Intelligence

In this presentation I would like to shed light on a question that is brought to light as a result from this discussion: do all non-existent beings share the same moral status? Between the three listed non-existent beings, the main factor that separates them is potential. Firstly, I will attempt to shed light on the idea of potential being a determining factor in the field of ethics.

In a historical context women have been considered second to man. In e.g. Aristotle’s Ladder, they are classed in between animals and men. The second question I would like to discuss is how does being a woman affect one moral status if we use potentiality to determine moral status?

**Saturday 15:30 – 16:15**

**Nathalie Tornéus-Ek: “What is a Woman? – metaphysical fallacies in the name of Simone de Beauvoir”**

This essay starts from the metaphysical claims in the feminist philosophy-debate about what a woman is, supposedly initiated by Beauvoir in *The Second Sex*. My thesis is that the nature of Beauvoir’s questions is mistakenly understood as primarily metaphysical, thus leading to what I call metaphysical fallacies about the nature of womanhood and femininity. Her metaphysical devotees are prone to continue this line of thought, thus explicating womanhood and femininity in terms of universal and particular, realism and nominalism, essentialism and constructivism, categories, sets... But, Sara Heinämaa shows that Beauvoir’s work is done within the phenomenological framework, thus radically changing the possibilities of metaphysical claims about sex/gender. By bringing back Beauvoir to phenomenology, I wish to address the discourse that interprets Beauvoir as a metaphysician as being mistaken, showing that this fallacy has its origin in a general problem concerning the naturalisation of the phenomenological living body as addressed by Edmund Husserl.

**Saturday 16:15 – 17:00**

**Kristina Miklavic: “Shame as a Norm Regulator for Gendered Subjectivities”**

My presentation deals with the notion of shame and how it operates as a norm regulator for expressing masculinity and femininity, and, thus, forms constructions of ideal gendered subjectivities. As an individual experience, shame is mostly thought of as a negative emotion that debilitates and contributes to suffering. Building on Taylor and Bartky's notions of shame, Manion's conception of shame as a potential positive notion for the individual and the transformations it can instigate, and Foucault's notion of power, I examine how productive notions of shame can be understood as subjugating, but also potentially transformative for the individual. Further, using the work of Lethinen, I consider how these shame experiences are gendered and, consequently, provide for gendered transformations.

Keywords: shame, gender, subjectivity.