

5th Annual Conference of

The European Philosophical Society for the Study of Emotions

Tallinn University

June 13-15, 2018

Mare building, Uus-Sadama 5, 10120, Tallinn, Estonia



Book of Abstracts



Society Organizing Committee:

Achim Stephan (Osnabrück University)

Alessandra Fussi (University of Pisa)

Damian Cox (Bond University, Queensland)

Imke von Maur (Osnabrück University)

Danilo Manca (University of Pisa)

Local Organizers:

Tõnu Viik (Tallinn University)

Doris-Marii Kondrat (Tallinn University)



TALLINN UNIVERSITY

PROGRAM

Wednesday, June 13, 2018

8 ³⁰	Registration		
9 ³⁰	<p style="text-align: center;">Room M-134 Opening Session Welcome Greetings</p>		
	Room M-133	Room M-135	Room M-340
10 ⁰⁰	<p style="text-align: center;">Erik Wallrup <i>Patheme: Understanding historical change through affectivity</i></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Daniel Musil <i>Structure of affective space</i></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Marta Caravà / Marta Benenti <i>Emotions «out there». Affects and the extended mind hypothesis</i></p>
10 ⁴⁰	<p style="text-align: center;">Luca Dondoni <i>The peculiarity of Angst: Delimitation of the fundamental attunement</i></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Gina Eickers <i>Is emotion recognition scripted? Emotional expressions as social signals</i></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Michiru Nagatsu / Mikko Salmela <i>Interpersonally scaffolded affectivity: The social motivation approach</i></p>
11 ²⁰	COFFEE BREAK		
11 ⁵⁰	<p style="text-align: center;">Danilo Manca <i>Emotions and imagination: A Sartrean perspective</i></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Marguerite La Caze <i>«I can't beat it»: Dimensions of the bad conscience in Manchester by the Sea</i></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Tom Roberts <i>Affordances and aesthetic affectivity</i></p>
12 ³⁰	<p style="text-align: center;">Giorgia Vasari <i>The «nauseating» being. Proximity and shapelessness revealing contingency: The influence of Aurel Kolnai on Jean-Paul Sartre</i></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Lauren Ware <i>Appropriate hate</i></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Jussi Saarinen <i>Painting as solid affective scaffolding</i></p>
13 ¹⁰	LUNCH BREAK		
14 ⁰⁰	<p style="text-align: center;">SYMPOSIUM (14.00-16.00) – Room M-134 Understanding Shame Alessandra Fussi Raffaele Rodogno David Mitchell</p>		
16 ⁰⁰	COFFEE BREAK		
16 ³⁰	<p style="text-align: center;">Alexander Fischer <i>Devilish tongues of angels? On the ethics of manipulation</i></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Bill Wringle <i>Collective regret and collective obligations</i></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Demian Whiting <i>Emotions as categorical bases</i></p>
17 ¹⁰	<p style="text-align: center;">Aaron Ben Ze'ev <i>Is it possible to achieve perfect love with an imperfect person?</i></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Jake Wojtowicz <i>The expression of agent-regret</i></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Bruno Mölder <i>Interpretivism and emotional action</i></p>
17 ⁵⁰	<p style="text-align: center;">Luke Brunning <i>Grief and the breakup of romantic relationships</i></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Zeynep Talay-Turner <i>Emotions and self-deception</i></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">David Bitter <i>Cognitive impenetrability of perception: Suggested hallucination and perceptual affect</i></p>
19 ⁰⁰	WINE RECEPTION		

Thursday, June 14, 2018

9 ⁰⁰	<p>SYMPOSIUM (9.00-11.00) – Room M-134 The Politics of Resentment and Ressentiment</p> <p>Sonja Rinofner-Kreidl Thomas Szanto Mikko Salmela / Christian von Scheve</p>		
11 ⁰⁰	<p>COFFEE BREAK</p>		
	<p>Room M-133</p>	<p>Room M-135</p>	<p>Room M-340</p>
11 ³⁰	<p>Christopher Murphy <i>Philosophy of emotion's founding myth: The misreading of William James</i></p>	<p>Jumana Yahya <i>Fighting fire with fiero: How pride can lead to overcoming temptation</i></p>	<p>Anna Réz <i>Reactive sentiments and fitting attitudes</i></p>
12 ¹⁰	<p>Heleen Pott <i>Pragmatism, phenomenology and the feeling body: James on emotion</i></p>	<p>Sunny Yang <i>Embodied emotion and cultivating embodied virtues</i></p>	<p>Isabel Kaeslin <i>Emotional response as a normative guide</i></p>
12 ⁵⁰	<p>LUNCH BREAK</p>		
14 ⁰⁰	<p>Katherine Rickus <i>Emotional regulation and rationality</i></p>	<p>Michael Hearn <i>Embarrassment: A foundation for an ethics of vulnerability</i></p>	<p>Heidi Maibom <i>The self and other in empathy</i></p>
14 ⁴⁰	<p>Markus Seethaler <i>Narrativity, literature, and moral learning</i></p>	<p>Lasse Bergmann <i>Scaffolding of moral emotions in in-group and out-group disagreements</i></p>	<p>Susanne Schmetkamp <i>What is antipathy?</i></p>
15 ²⁰	<p>Damian Cox <i>Affect mirrors</i></p>	<p>Aiste Seibokaite <i>«One step further» from moral evaluation to moral decision-making</i></p>	<p>Hye Young Kim <i>Agnes Heller's theory of feelings: Empathy</i></p>
16 ⁰⁰	<p>COFFEE BREAK / BUSINESS MEETING – Room M-340</p>		
17 ⁰⁰	<p>Lydia Farina <i>On the phenomenology of artificial emotions</i></p>	<p>Andrew Thomas <i>Being emotional about possibilities</i></p>	<p>Gianluigi Segalerba <i>Whence does Good come? Notes on Plato's moral psychology</i></p>
17 ⁴⁰	<p>Eva Weber-Guskar <i>Can a robot be your friend? Emotions towards artificial intelligence</i></p>	<p>Alison Duncan Kerr <i>The irrationality of anticipatory guilt</i></p>	<p>Pia Campeggiani <i>Aristotle on emotions: Evaluative features and perceptual relevance</i></p>
18 ²⁰	<p>Karel Pajus <i>The morally laden emotions of non-human animals cannot be morally assessed: A reply to Mark Rowlands</i></p>		<p>Chiara Rover <i>Epistemological emotions: Voluptas and dolor as criteria of truth in Lucretius</i></p>
20 ⁰⁰	<p>CONFERENCE DINNER</p>		

Friday, June 15, 2018

9 ⁰⁰	<p style="text-align: center;"> SYMPOSIUM (9.00-11.40) – Room M-134 Dynamics of Sociality in a World in Motion: Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Affective Societies Birgitt Röttger-Rössler Christan von Scheve Rainer Mühlhoff Jonas Bens </p>		
11 ⁴⁰	<p>COFFEE BREAK</p>		
	<p>Room M-133</p>		<p>Room M-340</p>
12 ¹⁰	<p style="text-align: center;"> Miho Kitamura <i>Effects of voice prosody on interpersonal impression formation</i> </p>		<p style="text-align: center;"> Tõnu Viik <i>Re-emergence of affectivity in the democratic politics of the post-truth era</i> </p>
12 ⁵⁰	<p style="text-align: center;"> Ariele Niccoli / Maria Silvia Vaccarezza <i>The dark side of the exceptional: On moral exemplars, character education, and negative emotions</i> </p>		<p style="text-align: center;"> Saad Saheed / Hina Haq <i>Self-stimulatory loops of affectivity and ways of scaffolding in the recruitment of radicalized youth</i> </p>
13 ³⁰	<p>FAREWELL</p>		

LOCATIONS

Tallinn University

Mare Building, Uus-Sadama 5, 10120, Tallinn (Estonia)



Conference Dinner at Wabadus Café and Restaurant

Vabaduse väljak 10, 10146 Tallinn (Estonia)



SYMPOSIA

Wednesday Symposium

Understanding Shame

Organized by

Alessandra Fussi
University of Pisa (Italy)

Self-Disappointment, Deep Self-Disappointment, and Shame

(Alessandra Fussi – University of Pisa, Italy)

I will argue for a distinction between three closely related phenomena: self-disappointment, deep self-disappointment and shame. My thesis is that while self-disappointment is felt in relation to failures that we do not deem relevant for our identity, deep self-disappointment regards failures concerning self-relevant values, without a concern for the views of others. Shame, in turn, is felt only when a failure concerning self-relevant values is viewed in light of our reputation before others we deem important. This point is controversial, because, according to Deonna, Rodogno, Teroni (2012), and contrary to a long philosophical tradition – among others: Aristotle (in the *Nicomachean Ethics* and in the *Rhetoric*), Sartre (1943/1977), Rawls (1971 /2005), Taylor (1985), Williams (1993), Calhoun (2004), Deigh (1983) – a concern for reputation is relevant to shame only when reputation belongs to an individual's self-relevant values. First I will show how the distinction between self-esteem and self-respect – following Harris (1999) – has a bearing on the distinction between self-disappointment and deep self-disappointment. Then I will show how a concern for reputation allows us to distinguish between deep self-disappointment and shame.

Calhoun, C. (2004). An Apology for Moral Shame. *Journal of Political Philosophy* 11, 1–20.

Deigh, J. (1983). Shame and Self-Esteem: A Critique. *Ethics* 93, 225–245.

Deonna, J.A., R. Rodogno, and F. Teroni (2012). In *Defense of Shame: The Faces of an Emotion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Harris, G.W. (1999). *Agent-Centered Morality: An Aristotelian Alternative to Kantian Internalism*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Kennedy, G.A. trans. 1991. *Aristotle: On Rhetoric. A Theory of Civic Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Ostwald, M. trans. 1962. Aristotle: Nicomachean Ethics. Indianapolis-New York: Bobbs-Merrill.
- Rawls, J. (1971/2005). A Theory of Justice. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Sartre, J. P. (1943/1977). Being and Nothingness. An Essay on Phenomenological Ontology. Secaucus: Citadel Press.
- Taylor, G. (1985). Pride, Shame and Guilt. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Williams, B. (1993). Shame and Necessity. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Shame and Heteronomy

(Raffaele Rodogno – Aarhus University, Denmark)

A number of commentators have argued that the heteronomy of shame disqualifies it from having any moral relevance, or makes it relevant only for primitive forms of morality (Adkins 1960, Benedict 1947, Dodds 1951). Their charge is that while (mature) morality is an enterprise based on ideals of autonomy, shame is a radically heteronomous emotion. On views such as these, in shame, we simply succumb to whatever external standards others impose on us by way of the negative judgement they pass on us. Shame should therefore not be considered as of much moral significance. There are two broad strategies for countering this type of charge. One is to deny the autonomous nature of morality (Williams 1993; Calhoun 2004). The other is to deny the heteronomous nature of shame (Deonna, Rodogno, Teroni 2011). While there are things to be said in favour of both strategies, in this paper I wish to tackle this problem more radically by showing that the autonomy/heteronomy dichotomy is a false dichotomy when applied to shame. In short, I argue that if we want to do justice to the moral life of shame, we have to explain (i) why we do not respond with shame but rather with anger, resentment, indignation, disappointment or simply with indifference to at least some of the negative judgements passed on us (heteronomous judgement is not sufficient for shame); while (ii) we do respond with shame to judgements with which we disagree (not all appropriate shame is autonomous). I argue that the connection between shame and attachments and the a-rational nature of the latter explain this riddle.

Anxiety and the body-for-others: Body dysmorphic disorder and the phenomenology of shame

(David Mitchell – University of Johannesburg, South Africa)

This paper explores the relationship between phenomenology and the psychological condition known as body dysmorphic disorder, or BDD. This is, to explain, a disorder in which the sufferer perceives, and is obsessed by, a defect in their appearance which is either non-existent or severely exaggerated. And we will argue that Sartrean phenomenology can shed light on this phenomenon. In particular, drawing on the discussion of the body in *Being and Nothingness*, we suggest that BDD stems from the intensified awareness of a condition of all embodiment. That is to say, BDD arises from an intensified sense of the elusiveness of our own bodies before our attempt to grasp them. For if we cannot ever truly know our bodies directly we look to the perspective of others to help us to do so. And it is this point which holds the key to understanding both BDD, and its status as a social anxiety disorder. For phenomenology then suggests there is a propensity within embodiment itself toward obsession with how one is perceived in the eyes of others. In other words, phenomenology suggests a basic project of the human being regarding the body which is both necessarily pursued and necessarily frustrated. And it is this project then, anxiety producing and obsessional, which allows us to see how a condition like BDD arises. Further, it is this analysis of body dysmorphia which will enable us to gain a deeper understanding of the phenomenon of shame. For this analysis enables us to better grasp the connection between the body-for-others and this type of experience, as well as to see a new direction in which Sartrean phenomenology can be developed.

Thursday Symposium

The Politics of Resentment and Ressentiment

Organized by

Mikko Salmela

University of Helsinki (Finland)

Thomas Szanto

University of Jyväskylä & University of Copenhagen (Denmark)

Presentations:

Thomas Szanto (University of Copenhagen & University of Jyväskylä):
Ressentiment: A Collective Affective Intentionality Account

Mikko Salmela (University of Helsinki) & Christian von Scheve (FU Berlin):
Emotional Dynamics of Right-and Left-Wing Political Populism

Sonja Rinofner-Kreidl (University of Graz): Moral Psychology Goes
Politics: The Dynamics of Tolerance and Ressentiment

Resentment and Ressentiment are political emotions par excellence. There is widespread agreement among social and political scientists that there is an intimate link between Ressentiment and populism, especially on the radical right spectrum of the electorate (Betz 1994; Demertzis 2006; Berezin 2009; Crociani-Windland & Hoggett 2012; Hoggett et al. 2013; Salmela & Scheve 2017; yet critically, Müller 2016).

Ressentiment is a complex antagonistic emotional disposition or sentiment. Since Nietzsche's introduction of the technical term (1887) and Scheler's first systematic elaboration (1912/1919), Ressentiment is usually characterized by an impotence or powerlessness to take reactive or retaliatory action against the perpetrators of alleged harms. It stems from a repression of other negative attitudes, such as distrust, anxiety, envy, malice or hatred, which lie at its source. This results in Ressentiment's protracted and diachronically robust character. Accordingly, characteristic of Ressentiment is an indefinitely prolonged lag between felt injury and redress-oriented reactive expression or behaviour (Meltzer & Musolf 2002).

Ressentiment must be clearly distinguished from resentment. Resentment is an often justified angry reaction towards political or moral injustices and often has a legitimate moral function as a normative marker for social or moral transgressions.

In testifying and reclaiming shared moral standards, loss of self-esteem or equality, it expresses a sense of justice.. Resentment may thus have the power for social or political change (Strawson 1962; Rawls 1971; Solomon 1995; Brudholm 2006; Fassin 2013; Ure 2015; Mihai 2016; cf., critically, MacLachlan 2010). In contrast, Ressentiment though also presupposes the sense of a loss of equal footing, it is an overall destructive attitude. It is not geared at correcting or alleviating wrongdoings, but only at registering and voicing one's felt injuries.

But none of this seems sufficient to explain resentment's role as an emotional gatekeeper for democratic order, equal respect, and critical political public, and Ressentiment's deficiency regarding such role. Moreover, the nature and social-psychological mechanisms underlying these emotions, as well as their relationship are still largely unresolved. For example, a crucial feature of Ressentiment, which has not yet been sufficiently recognized in the literature, but helps explaining its characteristic lack of corrigibility and malleability, is its indeterminate or overgeneralized object and 'blurred' affective focus. Furthermore, it is unclear why exactly, Ressentiment is usually associated with right-wing, whereas resentment with left-wing populist rhetorics and politics.

In the face of these research desiderata, the proposed symposium shall provide novel explanations of these two sentiments by drawing on intra- and interdisciplinary resources from sociology, the political sciences, moral psychology, classical phenomenology and contemporary philosophy of emotions.

Specifically, the three presentations will address the collective affective intentional structure, the according socio-psychological habitualization mechanisms and the specific normative nature and appropriateness conditions of Ressentiment (Szanto); the roles of Ressentiment and resentment in partially dissimilar emotional mechanisms behind support for right- and left-wing populist parties and movements (Salmela & von Scheve); the dialectical opposition of resentment, with its inherent tendency towards exclusion, nonrecognition and depreciation of other person's or group's beliefs and forms of living, and tolerance as a civic virtue enabling people to cope with social conflict and disagreement in an open-minded, calm and non-aggressive manner (Rinofner-Kreidl).

Friday Symposium

Dynamics of Sociality in a World in Motion: Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Affective Societies

Organized by Birgitt Röttger-Rössler
FU Berlin (Germany)

Affect and emotion are crucial to human existence and sociality. As much as they integrate people into social and cultural environments and create communal bonds, they may also cause intense frictions that manifest demarcation, conflict and exclusion. 21st century societies are characterized by multiple mobilities; not only do people travel ever more quickly but so do ideas, objects, practices and information. Cultural and national boundaries are being crossed and blurred, thus transforming and reconfiguring established orders of meaning and feeling.

The contributions to this panel address the dynamics of sociality in a world of motion from the perspectives of philosophy, social anthropology, sociology and legal studies. They focus on the affective dimensions of parent-child relations in transnational family constellations (Röttger-Rössler, social anthropology), on the construction of collective emotions in current debates on the recognition of religious minorities (Christian von Scheve, sociology), on the interplay of affect and power in contemporary political and governmental formations (Rainer Mühlhoff, philosophy) and on the affective-emotional dynamics in proceedings before the International Criminal Court in The Hague (Jonas Bens, legal anthropology).

All contributors belong to the CRC “Affective Societies”, Freie Universität Berlin, which aims at establishing a new understanding of societies as *affective societies*, in which the fundamental meaning of emotionality and affectivity for communal life is taken into account, along with the manifold challenges of the mobile, interconnected and mediatized environments of the 21st century.

The affective dimensions of parent-child relations in transnational families

(Birgitt Röttger-Rössler – FU Berlin, Germany)

The contribution addresses the formation of parent-child relationships within the context of migration from the perspective of emotion theory. What does it mean to raise children in transnational social fields and how do children experience their uprising in such settings? What does it mean to be the child of immigrants; that is, to

be brought up by parents who are influenced by practices, objects, values and people in a distant “homeland”, which often differ considerably from ways people act and think in the country of immigration?

Based on empirical data raised in an ethnographic study about children of former Vietnamese contract laborers working in the erstwhile German Democratic Republic, the paper describes the conflicts which impair the relations between parents and children and depicts their entanglement with socio-cultural aspects. The main aim of the paper is to reflect the affective dynamics associated with this particular migration regime in order to gain a better understanding of the reconfigurations of family relations and attachment formations in the context of migration.

Emotion and the discursive construction of social collectives:
The case of religious minorities and the secular public sphere

(Christian von Scheve – FU Berlin, Germany)

Debates about the status and recognition of religious minorities in contemporary Western societies frequently evoke notions of „religious emotions“, for instance insult, harm, offence, and indignation. Focusing on public discourse in Germany, these debates are commonly centered on (immigrant) Muslims and their religious practices as well as on the status and reach of secular institutions, in particular the freedom of expression. In this contribution, I offer an understanding of these debates that capitalizes on concepts of affect and emotion and the discursive formation of social collectives. Based on empirical case studies, I show, first, that the linguistic coupling of emotions with specific social categories contributes to the emergence of collective and group-based emotions as well as to the formation of actual social collectives. Emotions as discursive categories are predominantly (self-)attributed to religious subjects as being (unduly) affected. In contrast, the secular subject is portrayed as rational, deliberate, and affectively neutral. These ascriptions not only become hallmarks of subjectivation, but also constitute secular and religious collectivities along the antagonisms of native–immigrant and rational–emotional. Second, and on a more speculative account, I argue that the language of this discourse itself bears a range of *affective* qualities that contribute to this collectivization beyond the attribution of specific emotions. In particular, the relational and material aspects of language render the religious and the secular, the rational and the emotional, “us” and “them” in antagonizing affective registers in this discourse.

Affect, Power, and Politics. A Spinozan Approach

(Rainer Mühlhoff – FU Berlin, Germany)

In the “turn to affect” of the 1990s and 2000s, “affect” was heralded as a way out of the impasse of post-structuralist theories of the subject. “Affect” was seen as an aggregate of de-subjectivation and social change. One decade later, in times of post-truth politics and populist uprisings, hardly anyone shares this optimistic attitude towards affect anymore.

In this talk, I will start from a dynamic interpretation of Spinoza’s ontology of affect to point out that the relation of affect and power is ambivalent. By introducing the concept of ‘affective resonance’, I will show how relational patterns of affecting and being affected dynamically stabilize micro-social structures. Affect can be understood as a register of social power that operates through the reciprocal *modulation* of individuals (as opposed to repression) in the synchronicity of situations. By introducing the concept of an ‘affective disposition’, which is related to the concept of a ‘dispositif’, I will argue that the specific affective capacity of an individual (*potentia*) is product of his/her biographical past. As the totality of affective traces of past relations, events and encounters, this disposition acts in the presence as potentials to affect and be affected and thus to perpetuate affective patterns and structures.

Putting this together, it turns out that affect is, in fact, a register of relational and productive power with striking parallels to a concept of power after Foucault and Butler. Affective resonance dynamics can lead to a stabilization and perpetuation of dominant forms of social relationality (such as gender roles) that are deeply rooted in affective dispositions of individuals. Theories of affective ontogenesis can thus be linked with theories of subjectivation. This also offers an affect-theoretical approach to new forms of ‘political culture’. In particular I will outline how studies of populism can be informed by conceptual tools such as affective resonance and affective dispositions.

On the Courtroom Atmosphere: Legal Objectivity as an Affective Register

(Jonas Bens – FU Berlin, Germany)

There is a common assumption that court proceedings are designed to cast aside affect and emotion in order to ensure a rational procedure with a just outcome. This paper takes the opposite approach and describes the courtroom as an apparatus to produce specific affective and emotional dynamics, a courtroom atmosphere. By presenting material based on several months of courtroom ethnography in the International Criminal Court in The Hague, the argument is made that courtroom proceedings are about mobilizing affect and emotion in order to produce objectivity.

Deploying the lens of affect theory, the courtroom is conceptualized as an affective arrangement in which human and non-human bodies interrelate. Describing the courtroom as an affective arrangement implies that affective and emotional dynamics are always present there, and some atmosphere is always enfolding. Instead of casting aside affect and emotion, the courtroom is set up to produce specific courtroom atmosphere. What differentiates the courtroom atmosphere from others is that it is characterized by objectivity. The theoretical claim that underlies this paper is that legal objectivity is in itself an affective register among others, not a mode of meaning-making that was somehow free of affect and emotion. Based on history of science research on objectivity, this paper highlights the connection between the idea of objectivity and the idea of the object. Objectivity as an affective register enfolds as a dynamic between those kinds of bodies which can be characterized as objects. To produce objectivity, bodies in the courtroom have to be objectified, which—as its flipside—entails the attempt of stripping their subjectivity.

Attempts to suppress certain emotional displays (clapping, cheering, booing, outbursts of anger etc.) are then not merely a strategy to dissolve all affective dynamics, but only one strategy among many to strip bodies of their subjectivity. The introduction of non-human objects as evidence (images, video-tapes, forensic evidence etc.), quoting out of files and investigation reports rather than introducing human witnesses giving testimony in their own voice — acts that are not directly related to enforcing ‘feeling rules’ (Hochschild) — are other visible strategies to produce an affective dynamic of objectivity.

Actors in the courtroom therefore either aim to maintain or to disrupt the atmosphere of objectivity in certain respects. While judges might see themselves in the role of maintaining the courtroom atmosphere all the time, the parties might be striving to disrupt the atmosphere to the disadvantage of the adversary. All participants, however, must rely at some point on evoking objectivity to have their version of reality believed over another. In this perspective the process of truth finding before court is deeply embedded in the participants’ attempt to produce specific affective and emotional dynamics rather than casting aside affect and emotion altogether.

ABSTRACTS

Are Immoral Jokes Amusing?

An Empirical Test of the Wrong Kinds of Reasons Problem

Dong An
Texas A&M University (USA)

According to the Fitting Attitude (FA) theory, something has certain evaluative property if and only if it is fitting to feel a certain way. The most prominent notion of “fitting” is there being a reason to have that response. One outstanding problem for FA theories is the wrong kind of reason (WKR) problem: one can have different kinds of reasons for a certain feeling, but not all are relevant for the fittingness of the attitude. Suppose one judges a morally offensive joke unfunny based on moral considerations. According to FA theories, since there is a reason not to feel amused, the joke is not funny. However, some people argue that a morally offensive joke can still be funny and that moral reasons are irrelevant for determining the fittingness of amusement. They argue that unless FA theorists spell out how to distinguish the relevant from the irrelevant reasons, FA analysis fails.

We argue that the WKR problem is not as strong as some scholars think. Two models have been distinguished. In the competing model, one can have different kinds of reasons for the response. For example, one can have a “fitting” reason to feel amused and a moral reason not to. If the moral reason outweighs the fitting reason, one will decide the joke unfunny. This model indeed faces the WKR problem. In the silencing model, moral features do not act as reasons that compete with other kinds of reasons but act as conditions that silence candidate reasons one might have otherwise for feeling amused. Our hypothesis is that moral features are sometimes inhibiting the funniness of a joke as the silencing model suggests.

To test this hypothesis, we asked 43 college students to participate in an experiment where they read some neutral and offensive jokes. They were first asked to rate how funny and how offensive these jokes are. They rated again after we asked them to put away any social pressure. The first result is that among the samples who rated the jokes offensive, a substantial sample rated the jokes not funny. This indicates that moral features influence the evaluation of funniness. The second result is that among the samples who rated the jokes offensive, a substantial amount rated the jokes not funny and their ratings remain unchanged after they put aside pressure. This indicates that they saw the moral features but that they rated the jokes unfunny not because they do not want to look bad or want to show moral disapproval. If they were motivated in such a way, their rating after putting aside pressure should have increased.

However, only a very small fraction of the sample did that. The best explanation of this result is that most people used the silencing model. The existence of these cases implies that the proponents of the WKR problem owe us an explanation why these people commit the fallacy of citing irrelevant reasons in their evaluation. Thus, our work urges people to reassess the force of the damaging WKR problem.

Is it possible to achieve perfect love with an imperfect person?

Aaron Ben Ze'ev

University of Haifa (Israel)

I examine the dream of having a perfect person with whom to establish an enduring perfect romantic relationship, by distinguishing between two senses of “perfect”: flawless and most suitable. In discussing romantic love, while criticizing the use of the first sense, I consider the second one to be valuable. Alongside this distinction, I make two other distinctions concerning the beloved’s properties. One distinction refers to whether they are discovered or bestowed; the second concerns whether these properties are non-relational or relational.

In light of these distinctions, we can differentiate between the comparative and uniqueness approaches to the nature of the beloved. In the comparative approach, the perfect beloved is flawless, her most relevant properties are discovered, and her major cherished properties are non-relational. In the uniqueness approach, the perfect beloved is the most suitable partner, and her most significant romantic properties are mainly relational and bestowed.

Both approaches are common and valuable in choosing a romantic partner. The decision of whether to give preference to one of these approaches is usually not straightforward; typically, it involves many considerations, each of which carries different weight. Such a decision takes place on a continuum between the two senses of perfect: flawless and most suitable. Most cases fall between the two extremes; the precise location on the continuum is determined by personal and contextual factors. Being aware of these differences is crucial for building a perfect (in the sense of most suitable) relationship with a nonperfect partner (in the sense of someone who is not flawless).

Scaffolding of Moral Emotions in In-Group and Out-Group Disagreements

Lasse T. Bergmann

Osnabrück University (Germany)

Moral sentimentalists and rationalists have been debating for a long time whether emotions pick up on morally relevant information. A recent contribution to the debate (Greene 2014) applies the distinction of in-group and out-group situations to moral problems. In-group problems are emanating from the social disagreements within a group, and out-group problems are disagreements of different groups or members of different groups. Differences in cognitive, emotional and neurobiological functions have been studied in these situations, thus the disagreement

between sentimentalists and rationalists could be settled depending on which situation an agent is in.

Greene uses this distinction for his rationalistic agenda, asserting emotions to be heuristics that are unable to accurately deal with unfamiliar out-group situations—but this view has many problems. A view which presents a much more plausible explanation for the differing usefulness of moral emotions in in-group versus out-group disagreements, is implied by the position of Colombetti and Krueger (2014). They argue that emotions are socially scaffolded phenomena, i.e. they rely on resources in the world to become available by integrating them into a cognitive environment. Through this attunement to resources in the world affective processes are amplified.

A case in point is someone unintentionally breaking a norm, e.g. sitting on a chair in an exhibition, which unbeknownst to them is a piece of art. In most cases the person will not need an explicit verbal cue to realize that they have broken a norm. The immediate reactions of the surrounding people will make this abundantly clear—making sitting on the artwork very uncomfortable. The person implicitly picks up on relevant information through their affective experience as the people around her are part of her affective environment. The unavailability of these kinds of socially mediate scaffolds in out-group disagreements accounts for the shortcomings of emotions therein. The emotions and reactions of the out-group are not something to be open or sensitive to. They are considered untrustworthy, maybe dangerous or dehumanized—thus the information they provide is not integrated into decision making.

However, humans engineer their own affective environment, thus it stands to reason that they can change whether their engagement with the world resembles an out-group engagement. Sentimentalist can argue that humans should engage with the world such that scaffolds are available and thus emotions pick up on morally relevant information.

References:

- Colombetti, G., & Torrance, S. (2009). Emotion and ethics: an inter-(en) active approach. *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences*, 8(4), 505.
- Colombetti, G., & Krueger, J. (2015). Scaffoldings of the affective mind. *Philosophical Psychology*, 28(8), 1157-1176.
- Greene, J. D. (2014). *Moral tribes: Emotion, reason, and the gap between us and them*. Penguin.
- Greene, J. D. (2017). The rat-a-gorical imperative: Moral intuition and the limits of affective learning. *Cognition*.
- Evans, J. S. B. T. (2012). Dual process theories of deductive reasoning: facts and fallacies. *The Oxford handbook of thinking and reasoning*, 115-133.

Cognitive Impenetrability of Perception: Suggested Hallucination and Perceptual Affect

David Bitter
CEU Budapest (Hungary)

Is the way we perceive the world influenced by what we believe or desire the world to be? The converse is surely true: we often come to believe and desire what we do on the basis of what we see, hear, touch, taste, and smell. Might perception be informed by cognition in a similarly specific and direct manner? If the answer is yes, then perception is cognitively penetrable. Purportedly, this would have interesting consequences for theories of mental architecture, the justificatory role of perception, and the theory-ladenness of scientific observation.

A trending view in philosophy and psychology to the contrary notwithstanding, this talk argues that there is in fact little reason to assume that perceptual experience of low-level features such as color or lightness is cognitively penetrable. Yet it is granted that not all candidates of cognitive penetration can be sufficiently explained away by intra-perceptual (e.g., shape-color associations) or cognitive factors (e.g., misplaced perceptual judgments). Rather, some phenomena are arguably more plausibly explained by alterations in perceptual affect.

A most powerful example comes from the phenomenon of hypnotically suggested hallucination. In hypnosis, typically, one person (the subject) is guided by another (the hypnotist) to respond to suggestions for changes in subjective experience involving alterations in perception, thought, emotion, or behavior. Despite much prior skepticism, the effect is not a sham. Yet it doesn't follow that subjects experience genuine perceptual hallucination or even cognitive delusion. More plausibly, just as suggested analgesia may involve a dissociation between the sensory and affective components of pain, it only feels to subjects as if the suggested state of affairs really pertained.

If an affective analysis of suggested hallucination is correct, then the likelihood of finding convincing examples of cognitive penetration of perception cannot be very far from zero. But irrespective of epistemic likelihoods and the empirical fact of the matter, the proposed account also has important implications for the general structure of the cognitive-penetrability debate.

For example, it is widely taken for granted that cognitive penetration may involve a penetration either of perception or perceptual belief. Many defenses of cognitive penetrability of perception accordingly negatively argue against explaining away candidate phenomena by appeal to distorted perceptual belief. A crucial implication of the present account is that such argumentation does not establish cognitive penetrability of perception.

Another apparent common assumption is that if some experience in addition to or as opposed to low-level perceptual experience is cognitively penetrable, then

either high-level perceptual phenomenology or cognitive phenomenology or both exist. The present proposal underscores that even if both the antecedent and the consequent of this conditional are true, the conditional as such is still false. For at least in some relevant cases, it is plausibly affective rather than perceptual or cognitive phenomenology that is relevantly penetrated.

Grief and the Breakup of Romantic Relationships

Luke Brunning
University of Oxford (UK)

My talk explores the distinct character of grief following the unilateral breakup of a romantic relationship. Grief is a process, involving many emotions, which is linked closely to, but not constituted by, narration. Bereavements and breakups have shared features. Some of these include: the telic collapse of shared goals and practices; the loss of intimate emotional support; the destruction of a co-authored idiolect; and jarring confrontations with the limits of personal agency.

Breakups have a unique character, however, and strike distinctly at the heart of one's identity. In understanding this, we can understand the character of grief more generally. When a relationship ends, one's agency is implicated. One must navigate implicit or explicit blame, implied criticism of one's relationship or character, and grapple to maintain self-esteem. This process is complicated by the prospect, however remote, of confronting the continued life of one's ex-partner. Breakups generate complex narrative turbulence. Grief often makes one unable to narrate. The cessation of shared projects, and the upheaval of life, shapes one's moods and existential feelings, which can impede one's narrative capacities. Despite this, one's narrative voice typically returns as one grapples with the event of death.

In breakups, with a living ex-partner, and one grapples with a process, which is uncertain, ambivalent, or openly conflicted, due to the structure of contemporary romantic culture. Modern romantic life is internally ambivalent, and engages the whole self. Perceived failings in romantic life can destabilize the whole self: one's personality is at fault. In addition, breakups animate many stakeholders. Family, friends, new partners, and ex-partners have their own narratives, and can contest one's own narration. Finally, these narrative arcs are often the schematic 'found-objects' of romantic culture. The partner as not-good-enough monster, for example, or the relationship as doomed. Stakeholders in a breakup jostle to reinforce or resist these narratives.

As such, recovery of narrative grip in a breakup is often fragile, which contributes to the pain of a breakup. This fragility can tempt one towards narrative acquiescence: the desire to grasp an explanatory or justificatory readymade. To do so, however, is to succumb to a particular kind of Bovarysme, in which one's relation to

a valued person and relationship, and one's social context, is seen through the lens of a distorting narrative. The unique narrative turbulence after a breakup is not only painful, therefore, but generates ethical risks because narrative order is all too often restored at the cost of insensitivity.

Aristotle on emotions: evaluative features and perceptual relevance.

Pia Campeggiani

Swedish Collegium for Advanced Study, Uppsala (Sweden)

In the *De Anima* Aristotle defines emotions as 'enmattered accounts', making it clear that emotions are not purely intellectual responses, but are embodied and based on physical processes as well (DA 403a16-25). They are always accompanied by pleasure or pain or both (e.g. EN 1105b 21-23, EE 1120b12-14, Rhet. 1378a21-22) and these hedonic states consist in bodily alterations (EE 1220b14, Rhet. 1382a21, 1383b14, 1386b18-19, 23-24). Emotions thus amount to affective phenomena involving some kind of appraisal, but this is a form of appraisal that is neither abstractable nor separable in existence from bodily states (DA 403a19-24). Therefore, a proper definition of emotion must involve reference to both its formal and material components.

Accordingly, in this paper, I will explore Aristotle's view on emotions by anchoring it in the broader framework of his hylomorphic theory of the soul. Specifically, I will argue that, according to Aristotle: (i) our physical states can shape the way we select, perceive, and evaluate external stimuli: therefore, the beliefs and appraisals that feature in our emotional reactions also depend on the body. Bodily feelings guide our value orientation by lowering or raising our thresholds for emotional reactions, so that we accentuate or downplay the salience of eliciting conditions on the basis of our own internal states. (ii) Emotions, once aroused, involve the body in the same way, so that they influence perceptions and evaluations of all sorts, lead us to emphasize certain features of the percepts we select, and may even affect the hypotheses which precede the perceptual recognition of external stimuli themselves. By keeping a dual focus on the evaluative features of emotions and their perceptual relevance, I will claim that Aristotle's psychology provides us with an account of affectivity that characterizes it as an essential dimension of cognition.

Emotions "out there". Affects and the Extended Mind Hypothesis

Marta Caravà
University of Bologna (Italy)

Marta Benenti
FINO Consortium (Italy)

The "Extended Mind Hypothesis" (EMH) challenges the idea that cognitive phenomena are bounded to humans' skulls and brains (Clark, Chalmers 1998; Clark 2008). To argue against this internalist account of the mind, it appeals to externalism of vehicles (Hurley 2010). This one holds that in some cases contents of dispositional mental states are enabled by environmental props and artefacts: objects such as notebooks and laptops embody information that draws the agent who performs a cognitive task to act in a certain way. Given this crucial functional role of objects in cognitive processes, the EMH claims that the mind can be partially constituted by objects of the environment.

Although we are sympathetic with the EMH we claim that it entails two problems. First, it does not explain those experiences that do not involve content, because it is committed to the view that mind extends into the world only as long as objects are content-carriers (Hutto, Myin 2013).

Second, it fails to account for the very agency of objects because it takes them to be cognitively relevant only because they store information. We suggest that, in order to actually extend the mind, the theory should focus on what objects actually do in cognitive processes.

We claim that affective experience is crucial to discuss these two points. Indeed, i) some affective experiences (e.g. moods) do not entail intentional contents and ii) objects are often ascribed affective characters in virtue of their material, perceptual and phenomenological properties, rather than in virtue of their capacity to store information. Therefore, assessing the emotional features of objects can help to understand objects' agency better. This would provide a deeper and more successful account of extended cognitive experiences than the EMH's one.

To develop our proposal, we look at the ongoing debate about expressiveness artworks and natural objects. In particular, we endorse those views that consider the experience of expressive qualities of things as being perceptual in character (e.g. Wollheim 1993; Davies 1994; 2005; Noordhof 2008). After drawing the distinction between the capacity of objects to move us and the possibility that we ascribe them expressive characters, we insist that such attributions are first of all made possible by the material constitution of objects.

Thus, acknowledged that several variables (e.g. beliefs, felt emotions, contextual features, projections and affective reactions) can influence our perception, we focus on the perceptual recognition of objects which is affectively permeated at a

level that does not require any particular background knowledge nor cognitive abilities.

The sad, threatening, agitated, lively look of objects can channel our actions and reactions in a mostly unreflective fashion. Therefore, an extended approach should consider them not only as “intellectual anchors” but also as “emotional anchors” (Malafouris 2013; Gosden 2005).

We believe that our proposal might i) extend the EMH to emotional features (in the vein of Colombetti, Roberts 2014), explaining how the material structure of objects shapes their “emotional agency”; ii) help think of extended experiences without contents.

Affect Mirrors

Damian Cox

Bond University, Queensland (Australia)

In this paper I explore the concept of an affect mirror. By “affect mirror”, I mean the process by which one comes to understand one’s own affective states by observing oneself in the eyes of another, by seeing one’s own affective states mirrored in an encounter with another. I use two films to explore affect mirrors: *Call me by your name* (Guadagnino, 2017) and *La Promesse* (Jean-Pierre and Luc Dardenne, 1996). People sometimes fail to accurately track their own affective states; they sometimes fail to notice the precise nature of their feelings or they hide the nature of their feelings from themselves under a cover-story of one sort or another. In such cases we can occasionally rely on others to make up the deficit. An obvious way of coming to understand affective states that are obscure to us is to infer them from the way others react to our actions. Fear in the eyes of another may demonstrate an otherwise unnoticed hostility or aggression; pity or overt concern may demonstrate an emotional fragility one is disguising from oneself. This is, in many ways, an unremarkable phenomenon. My interest lies in another path to affective self-knowledge. Is it possible to learn how one feels by seeing one’s feelings mirrored by another? I think it is both possible and common.

My task is to give an account of this phenomenon – the phenomenon of the affect mirror. I wish to set out the conditions in which we are likely to encounter it and what makes it possible. I argue that it is a form of recognition, rather than inference. I argue that it is crucial in many relationships, especially intercultural relationships, where it enables mutual understanding across cultural difference. I develop the argument in terms of the two films. *Call me by your name* explores the relationship between a teenage boy and an adult man. *La Promesse* explores a burgeoning ethical encounter between a teenage boy and a woman from Burkina Faso. The two films portray contrasting forms of affect mirrors and put them to

aesthetic work in different ways. In *Call me by your name* affect mirrors accomplish the erotic work of the film; in *La Promesse* they accomplish the ethical work of the film. In intercultural encounters, such as portrayed in *La Promesse*, much cognitive work is done by exploring difference. The boy is attentive to the myriad differences that mark out the woman from Burkina Faso from himself. But this, I argue, is not sufficient to explain the boy's ethical transformation in the film. For this we need to understand the work done by affect mirrors. The lovers in *Call me by your name* play an erotic game, one which informs the film's title. The erotic force of this game is explained by affect mirrors.

The Peculiarity of Angst. Delimitation of the Fundamental Attunement.

Luca Dondoni
University of Pavia (Italy)

Our research arises within the framework of Heidegger's *Dasein-analytik*, with the aim of determining and delimitating the controversial concept of Angst. We will endeavour to detect and investigate the relevant features that set Angst apart from the other affects – Fear and Boredom, above all – in the theoretical project unveiled by *Being and Time*. This comparative work will enable us to grasp the crucial role played by Angst in the dynamic of disclosure of the fundamental constitution of *Dasein* as Temporality.

The opening section of our paper will serve as historical and theoretical introduction to the main guidelines of Heidegger's enquiry on the ontological constitution of the *Dasein* and on its substantial nexus to affects – this concise foreword will be useful to highlight the actual relevance granted by Heidegger to the affects for his metaphysical project.

The second section is devoted to the comparison between Angst and *Furcht* – Fear. We will address the relationship between these two affects, whose contours are prone to fade ones into the others. While the presence of *Furcht* denotes an adverse prediction about a concrete and imminent danger, Angst is not direct to any determined, present or anticipated event: Angst seems to be not immediately motivated. The *prima facie* insight about the non-directness of Angst will lead our further analysis. From our comparison with Fear, Angst, as a particular way to be-into-the-world, will emerge as the fundamental phenomenal way to experience the *Nichts*, and so to grasp the primordial Being-towards-Death of the *Dasein*.

In the third part of our research we will tackle the analogy between Angst and *Langeweile* – Boredom. While the analyses conducted by Freud and by Heidegger somehow managed to delimit the concept of Angst from the one of Fear, the relationship between Angst and Boredom remains problematic. There cannot be found a consistent and exhaustive discussion about the role of Boredom in the context of *Being and Time*, and we believe that this may be due to a deliberate

theoretical decision – that we will properly discuss. Boredom will return on stage with two subsequent works, both dated 1929, namely one proslusion – What is Metaphysics? – and one lecture course – The Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics: World, Finitude, Solitude. We will notice how the account of Boredom drawn by Heidegger in these pieces closely traces back the one of Angst that he had put forth in Being and Time. Only via the analytic comparison between Angst and Boredom we will be allowed to draw some further consideration about the close relationship that binds together Angst and Time, Dasein and the World, affects and the primordial constitution of Being-towards-Death.

The last section will serve as summary in which we will recall the premises of our work and the purposes it moved from, and compare them to the achievements we have gained through our research. We will also draw some considerations about the initial detected confusion about the nature of Angst and its phenomenology, highlighting how this issue is still far from being settled.

The Irrationality of Anticipatory Guilt

Alison Duncan Kerr

University of St. Andrews (UK)

When is it rational to feel guilt in anticipation of doing some action? Consider a person faced with a choice situation between two different options, A and B. The person very much wants choice A, but realizes that she will feel great guilt over doing A—as she contemplates this choice situation, she feels this anticipatory guilt. Empirical evidence suggests that implicit bias is frequent with anticipatory emotions. When one anticipates how one will feel about a future event, one tends to imagine that one will feel far more happy than one ends up feeling, or one imagines that one will feel far more sadness than one ends up feeling. What explains these phenomena? One thought is that emotion regulation plays a role in the result that one does not end up feeling as strongly as one might have anticipated. In other words, when one anticipates feeling sad about a choice one has made, the result is that one doesn't feel as sad merely because one regulates one's sadness in anticipation of the event. If a person is faced with the choice situation, and anticipates feeling great guilt over doing option A, perhaps she might not feel as much guilt as is appropriate in light of the situation. In these regards, anticipatory guilt sometimes does one a disservice. In developing this account, I motivate the distinction between the fittingness conditions for anticipatory guilt as they differ from the fittingness conditions for guilt. And, finally, the account is careful to distinguish between between anticipatory emotions and metaemotions.

Is emotion recognition scripted? Emotional expressions as social signals

Gina Eickers

Berlin School of Mind and Brain / FU Berlin (Germany)

Emotion recognition was long presumed to happen automatically, fast, and reliably. However, there is an emerging line of resistance to this received view, according to which emotion recognition is highly sensitive to context, and thus requires active and adaptive forms of information processing.

In this paper, I defend the context-dependent view of emotion recognition and postulate underlying psychological mechanisms. I point to different aspects of context that have an influence on emotions occurring in specific situations and on how these emotions can be recognized. Based on these arguments, I conclude that recognition often depends on the use of scripts.

First, I take a closer look at classic emotion theories. Ekman, for example, claims that there is a biologically fixed set of basic emotions (Ekman, 1969, 1971, 1999). Thus, emotional expressions, Ekman argues, are distinctive universal signals: there is not only an emotion-specific physiology but also emotion-specific expressions. Ekman's claims seem to entail that people, independent of culture and context, have a universal capacity to recognize specific facial muscle movements as emotional expressions (Gendron & Feldman Barrett, 2017).

Not only Ekman, but also accounts of folk psychology assume that emotions can be reliably recognized from facial expressions (cf. Goldman, 2006, Gallese, 2001, 2007). It seems that standard accounts of folk psychology agree with Ekman's claims that emotion recognition happens automatically, reliably, and does not need more information than the expression provided in a face.

But claiming that emotion recognition is independent of context is highly problematic. Studies on emotional expressions show that social context has a lasting effect on how emotional expressions are interpreted (Hess, 2009, Crozier & de Jong, 2012, Gendron & Feldman Barrett, 2017) and thus assert the hypothesis that social context plays a crucial role for emotion recognition. Emotional transaction theory argues in a similar fashion, stating that emotions are designed to function in social contexts and arguing that there is a reciprocal relationship between context and emotion (Fridlund, 1994, Griffiths & Scarantino, 2005).

Another proponent of a context-dependent account of emotions is Russell. He formulates his account in terms of scripts (Russell, 1991, 2003). Following Lakoff, he considers emotions to have different components and to be scripts in the sense of being a sequence of subevents (Russell, 2003, Lakoff, 1987).

My proposal here is to extend Russell's approach, and more generally the stance emotional transaction theory takes -- emotions being scripted and active actions rather than passive events -- to emotion recognition. That is, in this paper I argue that emotion recognition works via scripts as well. For example, if someone

displays anger (or any other emotional expression), responses will depend on the contextual structures given in that situation, e.g., gender, social status, occupation, situation. If knowing the meaning of an emotion term is to know a script for that emotion (Russell, 1991, 2003) and if emotional expression is a feature of an emotion script (Russell, 2003), then it is plausible to argue that emotion recognition works via scripts.

On the Phenomenology of Artificial Emotions

Lydia Farina

University of Exeter (UK)

This paper examines the phenomenology of artificial emotions viewed as emotions of artificial systems such as robots. The dominant view in the literature on artificial intelligence is that artificial systems, although capable of recognising and simulating emotional behaviour, they are not capable of experiencing emotions; the phenomenology aspect of artificial emotions is non-existent (Picard 2003; Moss 2016). Other philosophers claim that as we are currently unable to reductively explain phenomenal states, we are not in a position to rule out the possibility that artificial systems might be able to experience emotions (Stephan 2009). I approach this question by discussing Heidegger's 'attunement to the world', an openness to the world viewed as a necessary requirement for experiencing emotions (Heidegger 1927; Smith 2016). Welton describes this 'openness' as affectivity, an ability to care about what is given to us in experience (Welton 2012). This 'openness to the world' entails the possibility of emotional experience where the external object is experienced in a certain attitude. This phenomenological aspect, what Kriegel calls the 'representational attitude or mode' of a phenomenal state is irreducible to neurobiological states and it individuates emotional states from other mental states and from each other (Kriegel forthcoming). In this paper I argue that, for artificial systems to be able to experience emotions, they must be attuned to the world in the Heideggerian sense of 'things mattering to them' (Heidegger 1927) such that they are capable of affectivity; that they are able to represent what is given to them in experience in a certain evaluative attitude. I argue that being attuned to the world just means 'being in a state which determines the significance of one's surroundings' regardless of how this state is physically realised. If artificial systems are capable of affectivity in this sense, one cannot reject a priori that they are not capable of experiencing emotionality.

A common objection against the view that artificial systems are capable of experiencing emotional phenomenology is that they do not possess human-like biological bodies (Moss 2016); they cannot undergo the bodily transformation which, according to some accounts, constitutes or causes the emotional experience (James 1884). I argue that views which reject the claim that artificial systems can be attuned

to the world in the Heideggerian sense, because they lack human-like organic bodies, are based on the mistaken beliefs that affectivity and emotionality are necessarily bound to an organic human body or that phenomenal states are reducible to neurobiological states. If my argument is successful and artificial systems are capable of affectivity, our focus should move from the metaphysical question of whether a phenomenology of artificial emotions can exist to the epistemological question of whether we would be in a position to know what that specific phenomenology would be like, as well as the normative question of whether we have to ensure that, as artificial systems are increasingly situated in social spaces, they must develop and experience emotions.

References

- Heidegger, M. 1927. *Being and Time*. Translated by Joan Stambaugh. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2010.
- James, W. 1884. What is an emotion? *Mind* 9: 188-205.
- Kriegel, U. forthcoming. Reductive Representationalism and Emotional Phenomenology. *Midwest Studies in Philosophy*.
- Moss, 2016. Genes, Affect, and Reason: Why Autonomous Robot Intelligence Will Be Nothing Like Human Intelligence. *Techné: Research in Philosophy and Technology* 20 (1):1-15.
- Picard, R. W. 2003. *Affective Computing: Challenges*. MIT Press.
- Smith, J. 2016. *Experiencing Phenomenology; An Introduction*. Routledge. Taylor and Francis.
- Stephan, A. 2009. On the Nature of Artificial Feelings. In B. Roettger – Roessler and H.J. Markowitsch. *Emotions as Bio-cultural Processes*. Springer.
- Welton, D. 2012. Bodily Intentionality, Affectivity, and Basic Affects. In Dan Zahavi (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Contemporary Phenomenology*. Oxford: UK. Oxford University Press.

Devilish tongues of angels? On the Ethics of Manipulation

Alexander Fischer
Basel University (Switzerland)

When we think of Manipulation, we often think of evil manipulators like Shakespeare's Iago. He manipulates Othello, who is unaware of this, powerless, loses himself and becomes furiously jealous, killing Desdemona during the process. But while Manipulation can surely be used for devilish ends, in a deceptive manner and maybe even with a certain intensity that makes it impossible for agents to act otherwise, it doesn't have to be like this. In fact, there are no good reasons to define Manipulation in this negative normative manner. So, in this talk I (1) want to put forward, that the moral status of Manipulation is much more complex than the Iago-

Othello-example suggests; just think of how a young love is not based on rationally convincing the other person of us being worthy as a partner, but how we speak with tongues of angels, enter a kind of game, dancing around each other – manipulating back and forth. This obviously is not the same as what Iago does. Now, if we (2) try to look at Manipulation in a neutral way, we can define it as follows: Manipulation is the power to make it more likely, that a manipulated agent chooses some end (action, belief, etc.) by actively changing the emotional attraction of certain ends or their realization – but the agent remains ultimately free to choose or not to choose this end. The transformation of emotional bonds just makes some options more appealing (or unappealing) to the manipulated and thus more likely to be chosen (or not). Starting with this definition, which fits the Shakespeare-example as well as the young love-example, we can (3) get a clearer look on the normative issues that Manipulation imposes on us. Mainly it is the concerted use of our affective levels that raises suspicion (especially in classical ethical theories) as we cherish our rational agency, which presupposes our autonomy – thus Manipulation, e.g. speaking with the tongues of angels, seems to be devilish. But then again, this evaluation might at times also be counterintuitive. It is the weight that moral philosophers give to autonomy when evaluating Manipulation, that I want to challenge in this talk. I will offer an alternative account of an Ethics of Manipulation, which is able to include our affinity of autonomy, but places emphasis on the affection of our character development, psychic ecology, the possibility of acting freely and the use of positive ends. Thus, a more flexible ethical perspective on the manifold ways of how Manipulation occurs in our everyday life opens up, making it possible to respect a grave premise, that we always have to keep in mind when thinking about how humans act and how we need to think about how humans ought to act: that we are all rational, but nonetheless bounded rational agents.

Embarrassment: A Foundation for an Ethics of Vulnerability

Michael Hearn

The University of Queensland (Australia)

The intuition underpinning this paper is that embarrassment possesses the potential to influence a consideration of an ethics of vulnerability. Embarrassment, in concert with the blush, I will argue, provides something like the normative and prescriptive force necessary if such an ethics is to be considered seriously. Accordingly, I hope to give an account of ethics that will itself account not just for the human animal but all animals, mindful of Jacques Derrida's 'accusation' against Emmanuel Levinas that his ethics failed in this regard.

I will proceed on the understanding that embarrassment evolved as a way of preventing social exclusion, allowing those who displayed "inclusive fitness" to

adapt more successfully to group living.¹ In order to avoid “social ostracism”, surely the ‘death’ of the human subject constructed within alterity, “embarrassment likely developed (1) as an appeasement gesture, (2) to deter social transgression, and (3) to motivate amends and reparations for the social wrong.”² Alongside this criteria, when we consider that the subject blushing from embarrassment is signalling “submission and apology”, while at the same time scanning “their emotional surroundings [...] as they attempt to repair their social transgressions”, we get a compelling picture of an ethical animal, if such be defined as that which occurs prior to being named human.³

Behaviour associated with displays of embarrassment is described in the scientific literature as “prosociality [...] defined as caring about others’ welfare and avoiding behaviours that may damage another’s welfare.”⁴ The blush also elicits from the other “emotions and behaviours” that serve to “remedy social transgressions.”⁵ In short, the subject blushing from embarrassment is more likely to be forgiven than a subject who displays no such appeasement signal.⁶ The evolutionary origins of *the blush* correspond with those of embarrassment, leading us to think it “reasonable to conclude that, along with the singular physiological response of blushing that might be its hallmark, embarrassment has desirable functions in social life.”⁷

I hope to demonstrate how embarrassment and the blush lend themselves to a consideration of ethics. By relying on scientific research, combined with a reading of Levinas, I trust it will become evident, even to Derrida, that an ethics with *the blush of embarrassment* at its core can account for all.

¹ Ryan S. Darby & Christine R. Harris, “A biosocial perspective on embarrassment,” in *The Psychological Significance of the Blush*, eds., W. Ray Crozier & Peter J. de Jong (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 122.

² *Ibid.*, 122.

³ *Ibid.*, 123.

⁴ Matthew Feinberg, Robb Willer, and Dacher Keltner, “Flustered and Faithful: Embarrassment as a Signal of Prosociality,” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 102 (2012), 81; authors’ emphasis.

⁵ Dacher Keltner & Cameron Anderson, “Saving Face for Darwin: The Functions and Uses of Embarrassment,” *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 9 (2000), 187-190.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 190.

⁷ Roland S. Miller, “The interactive origins and outcomes of embarrassment,” in *The Psychological Significance of the Blush*, eds., W. Ray Crozier & Peter J. de Jong (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 199.

Emotional Response as a Normative Guide

Isabel Kaeslin

Columbia University (USA)

Recently, philosophers have started to pay more attention to the study of the emotions. On the one hand, they investigate their role in action explanation¹ and in expression of meaning², and on the other, the question has been raised what role the emotions play in moral decisions. I will be concerned with the latter question. I will argue that there is a non-cognitive kind of emotional response that is best understood as an expression of value, which needs to be taken seriously by the subject experiencing it when making moral decisions. I will be claiming that in this way, the emotions play a much more independent role in moral decisions than has been attributed to them before, even in the most emotion-sympathetic literature.³

For that purpose I will first disambiguate between different notions of emotion, in order to specify the kind of emotional response that interests me, and of which I want to suggest that it has been underestimated in its role in normatively guiding our actions. Once we have this specific notion of emotional response at hand, I will then ask how such emotional responses can guide our actions in a way that cognitive or rational mental processes cannot. The main task will be to avoid the threat to conceive of the emotional response as 'habituated reason'⁴, that is, to conceive of the emotional response merely as a trained or conditioned way to respond exactly in the way rational deliberation would. For this is what I think has led previous authors to end up with a too rationalist conception of moral decisions, even when they attempted to give the emotions a robust role.

What is an Emotional Response - Disambiguation

Often when the question of the relationship between morality and emotions is posed, one immediately thinks of paradigmatic so-called 'moral emotions', such as anger, courage, perhaps love, jealousy, and so on. These are complex entities⁵ of which it is important to ask what roles they play in moral decisions. I will not be concerned with such sophisticated emotions, as I call them. I'm interested in a more primitive form of emotional response, namely, in what I call spontaneous dislike and spontaneous attraction. In other words, I focus on basic emotional expressions of value. How are they different from the so-called moral emotions? We can ask the same questions about them as have been asked about the sophisticated emotions: Are they mere feelings,⁶ are they intentional,⁷ that is, have an object, and ultimately, do they show us anything about how good or bad the relevant action or situation is? To illustrate, here is an example of a Spontaneous Dislike and a Spontaneous Attraction.

Emotional Response as Spontaneous Dislike or Attraction

Imagine that you've always enjoyed eating meat, so much so that you indulge yourself in eating a substantial amount of meat every day. Suddenly, today, when you're about to bite into your steak again, it just doesn't feel right. You cannot tell what would be wrong about it (no cognitive dislike), but you feel a dislike about having another bite of your steak: you're experiencing a spontaneous dislike. It's an emotional response that doesn't have any cognitive aspect - it's non-rational or non-intellectual - and it appears suddenly. This emotional response will give you (prima facie) cause to reflect on your usual pattern of acting, which until this moment was taken for granted. Hence, even such a primitive emotional response makes you question a previously unquestioned pattern of acting. The moral significance of this disruption of old patterns of acting will concern us in the second half of the paper. For now, note that the same reflective attitude can be caused by a spontaneous attraction: Let's imagine that you've been a confident vegetarian for the last ten years of your life. Today, just when you're about to bite into your vegetarian sandwich, you experience a sudden desire for some meat in it: you experience a spontaneous attraction. Again, you cannot tell what you like about the idea (no cognitive attraction), but you feel the attraction of doing so. Again, this emotional response will give you (prima facie) cause to reflect on your usual pattern of acting, which for many years was taken for granted. So, again, even such a primitive emotional response can disrupt longstanding patterns of acting.

I will argue that emotional responses of this kind can disrupt patterns of action in a distinctive fashion, thereby playing a role in motivation that rational or cognitive mental processes do not. This is not to say that a new rational consideration could not give the agent pause, thereby prompting her to reflect anew on patterns of action. It is to say, however, that it would not achieve the same kind of disruption as an emotional response of this form does.

I will argue that such emotional responses are not mere feelings, that we can think of them as intentional (as having an object) even though they are not cognitive, and that they can normatively guide us in our actions in a distinctive way, namely by giving us negative reasons against our usual patterns of acting. That is, they can only play a negative role in guiding our actions, by 'telling' us what not to do. These disruptive negative reasons against usual patterns of acting are the independent contribution of the emotional responses in normative guidance.

¹ Betzler, Monika (2007): "Making Sense of Actions Expressing Emotions." In: *Dialectica* 61(3): 447-466. Betzler, Monika (2009): "Expressive Actions." In: *Inquiry* 52(3): 272-292.

² Green, Mitchell (2016): "Expressing, Showing, and Representing" In: C. Abell and J. Smith (eds.) *Emotional Expression. Philosophical, Psychological, and Legal Perspectives*.

³ For example, Martha Nussbaum (in *Upheavals of Thought. The Intelligence of Emotions* (2001)) takes the emotions to be cognitive and belief-like, and for that reason they play a significant role in moral decisions according to her. As a contrast, I want to argue for an independent role of the emotions in moral decisions, one that does not rely on them being belief-like.

⁴ Or, using Brady's language, the threat of thinking of emotional responses as "proxy reason". (Brady, Michael (2013): *Emotional Insight. The Epistemic Role of Emotional Experience*, p. 118)

⁵ in Aaron Ben-Ze'ev's sense: *The Subtlety of Emotions* (2001).

⁶ Damien Whiting (2011): "The Feeling Theory of Emotion and the Object-Directed Emotions." In: *European Journal of Philosophy* 19(2): 281-303.

⁷ R. S. Peters and C. A. Mace

Agnes Heller's Theory of Feelings: Empathy

Hye Young Kim

Ecole Normale Supérieure, Paris (France)

In "Über die Verschiedenheit der Ästhetischen, Reflektierten und Ethischen Empathie" (Heller 2016), Agnes Heller analyzes the differences between three types of empathy: aesthetic, reflective, and ethical, and shows how empathy works in our life and what we can do with it. In this paper, I would like to articulate her analysis of empathy along with her theory of feelings based on *A Theory of Feelings* (Heller 2009) and discuss what we can understand by empathy or 'feeling with' and which meaning, or significance we can find from this discourse in the present day where we observe the revival of the history of fascism

Effects of voice prosody on interpersonal impression formation.

Miho Kitamura

Waseda University, Tokyo (Japan)

People form the personal impression of a speaker based on the content that he is talking. On hearing a voice, people also form a personal impression of that speaker. Vocal prosody differs from types of emotion, and would modulate personal impressions. Present study examined how the emotional prosody modulates interpersonal impressions using a voice transformation tool (DAVID; Da Amazing Voice Inflection Device (Ancourier, et al., 2017)). We prepared 81 voice descriptions those are implying different personality traits (for example, positive personality: "He promised not to smoke in his apartment since his roommate was trying to quit").

These sentences are pretested for valence and arousal (n=39). Based on these scores, we selected 54 descriptions, and those were divided into the three valence categories (positive, neutral, and negative). There are no significant differences of arousal scores between the three categories. We recorded these descriptions spoken in a neutral tone by a young female native Japanese speaker. Using the voice transformation tool (DAVID), those neutral voices are modulated toward happy or sad emotional voices by changing the prosody of them. Twenty-three participants listened to those emotional voices and answered what kind of impressions they have by a 7-point Likert-scale (from 1;negative to 7;positive). Results showed that there is a significant difference of the person impressions between the happy and sad voices, suggesting that the types of voice emotion modulated the person impressions. Interestingly, the effect of voice emotion is stronger for the positive and negative emotional descriptions than that for the neutral ones. That means that emotions of voices and descriptions would strongly interact with each other during the impression formation.

I can't beat it': Dimensions of the bad conscience in Manchester by the Sea.

Marguerite La Caze

The University of Queensland (Australia)

In this paper, I interpret Vladimir Jankélévitch's work on the bad conscience (2015) and on forgiveness (2005) in relation to the film *Manchester by the Sea* (Kenneth Lonergan, 2016). This film is a striking meditation on remorse and the difficulty of self-forgiveness for Lee Chandler, a man who lives a monastic life as a janitor in Boston after the tragic death of his three children in a house fire. Many discussions of the film so far have primarily focused on its depictions of the emotions of despair and grief (with brief references to guilt), aspects of it that are certainly important. (Lane, 2016; Scott, 2016; Fleming, 2017) However, a focus on grief neglects the ethical dimensions of the film that Jankélévitch's intense articulations of the solitary character of remorse and what a genuine offering of forgiveness really concerns can illuminate and engage with. His accounts demonstrate the immense complexity of remorse, self-forgiveness, and the difficult of accepting the generous forgiveness of others, even in situations where the calamity that has occurred is not a result of a deliberate, intentional action. In his elucidation, Jankélévitch identifies remorse and the bad conscience, which is not a response to an external law: 'It is the crime itself that is our torture.' (2015, 37) *Manchester by the Sea* allows us to understand what that experience might mean for a human life, and how sometimes we can neither

give up remorse and forgive ourselves nor accept the forgiveness of others. For Jankélévitch, forgiveness must be an event, a gift of love, and a personal relation to the other, rather than forgetting, excusing, or putting aside. While the film shows us the power of such forgiveness when it is offered by Lee's former partner and mother of their three children, Randi, it also shows us its limits. The problem is that Lee's apparent obsessive remorse dwells in the irreversibility of time and the irrevocability of our acts that Jankélévitch explains, and goes further in being a remorse that cannot be overcome. The film also enables us to question features of Jankélévitch's view: that we can undo the consequences of our act or deed, in contrast to the action, and that self-forgiveness is a conceptual impossibility, because forgiveness must be a relation to another, rather than sometimes an existential one. I consider how *Manchester by the Sea* examines the bad conscience through the experience of one person's incapacity to overcome or 'beat' his remorse despite the forgiveness of others.

The Self and Other in Empathy

Heidi Maibom

University of Cincinnati (USA)

Empathy is often described as feeling an emotion that is more appropriate to another person's situation than to our own. This suggests that the closer we get to replicating exactly what another person feels, the better our empathizing is. Our job is to transform ourselves, imaginatively, into the other and experience what she does in her situation. I shall argue that this is not the right way to think about empathy. Were we simply to take on another's experience as another, it would be foreign to us. Our own emotions appear as deeply embedded in our lives to the extent that they bear an intricate relationship to our experiences, our current situation, and the persons that we are. The significance of, say, sadness may be rather unique to us. We should expect the same to be true of the target we are empathizing with.

To the extent that experiencing an emotion is more of a holistic and extended event than a discreet and relatively contained one, we should not expect to be able to feel what another feels exactly. Even if it were possible we could not use this emotion because it would fail to be integrated into our mental economy. It would not have the significance to us as it does to the target. And so we must always experience a version of what another experiences that is personalized. Harriett Beecher Stowe claims that what really aroused her empathy for slaves was the death of her favorite child. She wrote "at his dying bed and grave I learned what a poor slave mother must feel when a child is torn away from her." (Stowe 1852/2009) She learned this lesson not intellectually, but affectively by feeling that she shared in the

slave mother's grief. At the same time there is no denying that her grief at her favorite child dying of cholera is quite dissimilar from the grief or pain of a particular slave at having her child sold. It would be a mistake, however, to see this as a problem with empathy. On the contrary, our own experiences, felt personally in our bodies and minds, are the elements out of which empathy for others blossom.

I go on to explore in more detail how empathy really aims at replicating the significance of the emotional experience to the other more than the particular emotion the other happens to experience. To truly empathize, the emotion we experience as sharing with the other must make sense to us. This does not mean that we simply project what we feel in response to another's situation on to them, however. The point of empathy is to feel something consonant with what another person feels, but in our own person, that makes some sense to us, yet is not a mere projection of our own emotions.

Emotions and Imagination. A Sartrean Perspective

Danilo Manca
University of Pisa (Italy)

In this talk, I would like to explore the controversial interaction between emotions and imagination. In the first part of the talk, I will sketch a phenomenological account of some emotions such as anger, hatred and fear, by referring to Aristotle's analyses. The aim is to show the ambivalent role imagination plays in the arousal of an emotion. On one hand, imagination is able to arouse, to extend in time and to renew an emotion, on the other it is able to satisfy the pleasure arising out of an emotion as well as to neutralize its pain.

In the second part of my talk, I will compare Sartre's sketch for a theory of emotions with his account of the imaginary. I will discuss the idea that both emotions and imagination can be seen as a sort of break with the ordinary instrumental lifeworld because they throw consciousness in the horizon Sartre calls "the Magic". Nonetheless, whereas emotions entail beliefs, imagination is the source of the neutralization of all mundane horizons characterizing the phenomenological approach. Accordingly, I will ask whether this implies that the activity of imagination is a necessary condition to educate our emotional life as well as to make it the object of a phenomenological investigation.

Interpretivism and emotional action

Bruno Mölder

University of Tartu (Estonia)

The paper focuses on the (putative) trouble that emotions raise for the interpretivist position, the view that interpretation plays the constitutive role in the possession of the mind.

In „Passionate Engines: What Emotions Reveal about Mind and Artificial Intelligence“ Craig DeLancey (Oxford UP 2002) has claimed that interpretivism is not an adequate approach to the mind, because it fails to accommodate basic emotions. In particular, he argues that interpretivists cannot predict certain kinds of emotional actions, that is, actions, which are explained in the light of the occurrence of basic emotions. As interpretivism tends to make sense of actions in terms of beliefs and desires, this approach gets into trouble when the actions cannot be predicted or made intelligible by reference to beliefs and desires. According to DeLancey, the trouble is especially serious in the case of B-D postfunctional emotional actions, when the action continues even after it is no longer functional with regard to one's beliefs and desires.

In my presentation I defend interpretivism against DeLancey's arguments. Interpretivism is not necessarily committed to cognitivism about emotions. I show that the interpretation of emotional action need not proceed from the narrow base of beliefs and desires. In addition, I elaborate how we could make sense of the idea that emotions cause actions on the interpretivist picture.

Philosophy of Emotion's Founding Myth: The Misreading of William James

Christopher Murphy

Keele University (UK)

One could say that philosophy of emotion from the twentieth-century onwards is a series of footnotes to William James. Reactions for or against his theory of the nature of emotion, first outlined in his 1884 paper 'What is an Emotion?', have structured the range of positions in this entire sub-field in philosophy. The influence of his writing on emotion cannot be overstated but I wonder whether it wouldn't be more accurate to say that misinterpretations of his work have been more influential than what James actually believed.

In this paper, I argue that James's theory has been widely misunderstood as it has been taken out of the context of his overall psychological and philosophical theories. I first describe what I call the standard range of interpretations of James's

theory, which have been embraced by a wide range of philosophers, psychologists, and other scholars. I argue that they make three interpretative mistakes in their readings. First, they treat the 1884 paper as a stand-alone piece instead of as a part of *The Principles of Psychology* published early. Second, they do not include James's views on the problem of consciousness, as expressed in *The Principles*. This book aimed to get around traditional distinctions, and ignoring it leads to a misunderstanding of James' conceptual framework by using terms like 'feeling', 'perception', 'cognition' in a way James would have rejected. Third, they ignore the history of ideas that informed and led up to his writing of *The Principles*.

While there have been a few attempts to look again at James's theory, in whole or in part, such as Ellsworth (1994), Redding (1999/2011), Ratcliffe (2005), Hatfield (2007), and Southworth (2014) and that while these have been positive contributions, I argue that some of the pertinent details have been missed or not elaborated on enough by their various accounts.

I argue that what James meant with his usage of key terms can be uncovered by looking in depth at *The Principles of Psychology* and some of his papers from around this period in his career, such as 'On the function of cognition' (1885). From this, I develop an interpretation of his theory at that time which I believe to be more accurate than the other accounts mentioned. I then discuss how replacing the standard account with a more accurate one may show that the traditional debates between cognitivism, non-cognitivism, and perceptualism in philosophy of emotion are based on certain questionable presuppositions about the mind and cognitions and this may, hopefully, lead some of them to being dissolved and making space for newer approaches.

References:

- Ellsworth, P.C. (1994) 'William James and Emotion: Is a Century of Fame Worth a Century of Misunderstanding?' in *Psychological Review* 101 (2):222-229
- Hatfield, G. (2007) 'Did Descartes Have a Jamesian Theory of the Emotions?' in *Philosophical Psychology* 20 (4): 413-440
- James, W. (1884) 'What is an Emotion?' in *Mind* 9 (34):188-205
- (1885) 'On the function of Cognition', *Mind* 10 (37):27-44
- (1890) *The Principles of Psychology* New York: Dover Publications
- Ratcliffe, M. (2005) 'William James on emotion and intentionality' in *International Journal of Philosophical Studies* 13 (2):179-202
- Redding, P. (1999) *The Logic of Affect* New York: Cornell University Press - (2011) 'Feeling, Thought and Orientation: William James and the Idealist Anti-Cartesian Tradition' *Parrhesia* 13: 41-51
- Southworth, J. (2014) *William James' Theory of Emotion* University of Western Ontario: Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository. 2315. <https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/etd/2315>

Structure of Affective Space

Daniel Musil

University of Hradec Kralove (Czech Republic)

It is widely accepted that affective phenomena can last from very short episodes to long-lasting moods or even lifelong sentiments. On the one hand, These emotions can co-occur and exist without any relationship between them. On the other hand, they can be combined or melted into each other in many different ways. Moreover, there is broad consensus that these actual emotions can be very distinct in their nature and that they can even be differently valenced. As a result, we can experience them in many modes, for instance as distinct, combined, synchronized etc.

Even though There has been a lot of philosophical work devoted to investigations of question where we can draw a boundaries of emotion in terms of spatial extension or spatial location, almost no reflection has been dedicated to the questions about temporal boundaries of emotions and about relationship between various affective phenomena which take place at the same time. Are emotions mutually exclusive? Where are the start and the end of affect? Are emotions discrete or do they blend together? What kind of relationship is between mixed emotions and feelings? In my paper, I will try to sketch possible answers to these questions by introducing the structure of affective space which enables to explain the arrangement of emotions and relations between them.

Building on interdisciplinary research from variety of disciplines like neuroscience, philosophy of mind and psychology, I will argue that affective space is structured as multidimensional framework where affective phenomena with different temporal scope and various character and intensity are blended, mixed, fused or coexist together according to our own construction of these emotions and their relationships. That means, there is only one stream of affective experience, but this space is heterogeneous in its essence. In particular, I will claim that three stages constitute this space: First, we construct our emotion as an intentional mental state or process which can have a different duration (in fact, number of these constructions can be unlimited). It is necessary to point out, that some affective states are always present in this space. It is because of the fact that our mind is inherently affective, i.e. affectivity does not function as on/off matter. Secondly, relationships between concurrent emotions are constructed depending on the evaluation of past experience, relevance and context or situation. Thirdly, according to the attention we pay to these relations we can experience the actual state in many different forms (for instance Rafaeli et al. (2007) distinguish three different tendencies - synchrony, a-synchrony, de-synchrony).

Interpersonally scaffolded affectivity: the social motivation approach

Michiru Nagatsu

University of Helsinki (Finland)

Mikko Salmela

University of Helsinki (Finland)

An influential approach in recent theorizing on collective and shared emotions analyses them within the Extended Mind framework as Extended Emotions (e.g. Krueger 2014, Krueger & Szanto 2016; Colombetti & Krueger 2015; Colombetti & Roberts 2015; León, Szanto & Zahavi 2017). The main idea is that, analogous to our use of tools for thinking, we construct affective niches with artefacts and other agents for regulating our feelings and emotions. A salient example is the handbag and its contents a woman carries (Colombetti & Krueger 2015). Slaby (2016) rightly criticizes the tendency of this approach to identify the individual as the autonomous ‘user’ of external environments as her affective ‘resource’, without questioning how individual affective and mental states are constituted and constrained by environmental scaffolding, both social and physical. We use Slaby’s critique as our starting point, but add two novel contributions. First, we argue that to make progress in this debate we need explicit analysis of the function and mechanisms of interpersonally scaffolded affectivity because the important affective scaffolding (including material one) often involves other agents or anticipation of their reactions (Griffiths & Scarantino 2009). Second, we provide such analysis, drawing on the social motivation hypothesis (Anonymized 2014). The social motivation is a particular psychological disposition whose main role is to orient humans toward affiliative stimuli, which yield social reward and enable the formation of social bonds. The function and mechanism of social motivation, we argue, are the key not only to understanding how interpersonally scaffolded affectivity works but to evaluating whether or not a particular affective niche promotes individual and collective well-being. In particular, we suggest that our orientation toward affiliative stimuli is so basic that it is not amenable to individuals’ self-oriented instrumental regulation but rather susceptible to systematic manipulation resulting in reduced sense of individual well-being. The social motivation hypothesis provides a framework for studying such problematic niches, e.g. Slaby’s example of emails as the “mind invasion” or the “corporate life hack”, as well as niches that are genuinely conducive to personal and collective well-being. Using this framework, we briefly review several empirical studies on face-to-face vs. online social interactions and discuss their general design implications for interpersonal affective niche construction.

References

- Colombetti, G. & Krueger, J. (2015) Scaffoldings of the affective mind, *Philosophical Psychology*, 28, 1157-1176.

- Colombetti, G. & Roberts, T. (2015) Extending the extended mind: the case for extended affectivity. *Philosophical Studies* , 172, 1243–1263.
- Griffiths, P. E. & Scarantino, A. (2009). Emotions in the wild: The situated perspective on emotion. In P. Robbins & M. Aydede (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Situated Cognition* (pp. 437–453). Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Krueger, J. (2014) Varieties of extended emotions. *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences* , 13, 533–555.
- Krueger, J. & Szanto, T. (2016) Extended emotions. *Philosophy Compass* , 11, 863-878. León, F., Szanto, T. & Zahavi, D. (2017). Emotional sharing and the extended mind . *Synthese* . DOI 10.1007/s11229-017-1351-x.
- Slaby J. (2016). Mind invasion: Situated affectivity and the corporate life hack. *Frontiers in Psychology* 7:266.doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00266

The dark side of the exceptional. On moral exemplars, character education, and negative emotions

Ariele Niccoli

University of Florence (Italy)

Maria Silvia Vaccarezza

University of Genoa (Italy)

Largely due to Linda T. Zagzebski's seminal works on Exemplarist Moral Theory (2010, 2015, 2017), recent literature has seen a renewed interest in analyzing the role morally exceptional individuals play in our everyday moral lives, as well as the way they ground our moral judgements on virtues, values, and right actions. This new wave has also contributed to favor a retrieval of philosophical studies on positive moral emotions targeting moral exemplarity (see, e.g., Kristjansson 2017), and particularly admiration (Irwin 2015; Zagzebski 2015). From a character educational perspective, research on such emotions is proving particularly fruitful, in that it concerns the question of how they can be canalized so as to foster virtue acquisition (see, e.g., Sundari 2015; Croce and Vaccarezza 2017).

The purpose of this paper is that of walking a different path, and focusing on the negative exemplarity-related emotions (NERE), and on their educational implications. If it is true that exemplars can inspire gratitude, moral awe, and admiration or elevation, it is also undeniable that confronting with one's moral exceptionality may in some cases elicit negative emotions, such as jealousy, envy, embarrassment and shame. How, then, should educators deal with these reactions? Against Zagzebski (2017: 58-9), who sometimes takes NERE as obstacles to one's moral growth, and therefore thinks educators should do their best to prevent them¹, we claim they can be considered as significant dimensions of one's moral growth, as

well as viable paths to virtue acquisition, which should be included in an educational process, rather than eradicated.

In this paper, we will first provide an instrumental defense of negative emotions broadly conceived; secondly, we will elaborate two arguments in support of their intrinsic positive role; then, we will illustrate both kinds of role by analyzing three paradigmatic NERE: guilt, shame, and envy. Finally, we will conclude by elaborating a proposal to integrate NERE in a character-educational strategy.

¹Actually, Zagzebski's analysis of envy is subtler than this. In particular, she distinguishes between benign envy for moral traits, which is morally valuable, and malign envy, which is taken to be a vice as it "prevents the acquisition of virtue [...] because it makes emulation [...] impossible" (Zagzebski 2017: 55). All in all, she seems nonetheless quite skeptical about the positive value of negative exemplarity-related emotions, most of which she doesn't even take into account: "I do not think that the exemplars I have chosen as exhibits in the next chapter are likely to produce hostile feelings or are controversial in other ways, but it would be interesting to find out which exemplars do produce such feelings, and how we ought to respond to that in social interactions and in education" (Zagzebski 2017: 59).

The Morally Laden Emotions of Non-Human Animals Cannot Be Morally Assessed: a Reply to Mark Rowlands

Karel Pajus

University of Tartu (Estonia)

Mark Rowlands defends in his book *Can Animals Be Moral?* (2012) the view that non-human animals can act morally because they can be motivated to perform actions for moral reasons. The moral reasons of animals take the form of morally laden emotions. Morally laden emotions are other-regarding emotions (e.g. compassion) with 'identifiable moral content' (e.g. "x's suffering is unwarranted"). Animals who act for a moral reason are motivated by the evaluative and moral content of their other-regarding emotions. The affective part of the emotion provides the animal with a reliable 'sensitivity' to morally salient features of situations. Rowlands further insists that for animals to be moral agents in the proper sense of the term, their morally laden emotions have to be subject to moral assessment. This means that the emotions of animals are morally good or bad. Furthermore, if the emotions of animals are morally good or bad, then animals ought to act on their morally good emotions and ought not to act on their morally bad ones. I will criticize the view that the morally laden emotions of animals can exert this kind of normative pressure on animals by defending the, so called, Kantian control argument. According to this argument, metacognitive abilities engender control over emotions

and metacognitive control, in turn, is necessary for an emotion to exert normative pressure on its bearer. Since animals do not have metacognition, it follows that their emotions do not exert normative pressure on them. Thus, animals are not moral agents in the proper sense of the term. I will defend the Kantian control argument by showing that criticism of it is wrong. According to one objection, presented by Rowlands himself, animals do not require advanced metacognitive abilities to control their emotions because metacognitive abilities cannot engender control over emotions in the first place. For metacognitive capacities to confer control over emotions, metacognition would have to be itself under the agent's control. Metacognition is, however, not under the agent's control because it is subject to the same emotional influence. I will respond to this criticism by arguing, first, that control over emotions by exercising metacognition is possible even if metacognition is subject to emotional influence. I will further argue that even if perfect control over metacognition is absent, then control over emotion can still exist. Human beings are able to act continently, which as a type of imperfect metacognitive control. Animals lack continence and they do not therefore possess morally good or bad emotions that exert normative pressure on them.

Pragmatism, phenomenology and the feeling body: James on emotion

Heleen Pott

Erasmus University Rotterdam (Netherlands)

Without the body there would be no emotion, according to William James (1884) - emotions are 'feelings of bodily changes'. This definition is commonly seen as the starting point of all modern theories of emotion. But what actually did he mean by 'feelings' and how precisely is the body involved in experiencing emotions? Despite more than a hundred years of extensive debate there is no consensus on this issue. In the 20th century, James's view was widely seen as compatible with a reductive version of scientific naturalism. He was criticized by philosophers (among them Wittgenstein and Sartre) for conceptualizing emotion as a non-intentional bodily sensation; psychologists argued that his theory could not account for the evaluative nature of emotions. In the 21st century, James's view was defended and rehabilitated again by a wave of neo-Jamesian theories, among these Prinz (2004) and Robinson (2005), who praise James for his evolutionary grounded psychological theory of emotion as a non-cognitive 'gut feeling'. From a quite different perspective, drawing on James's later work, Ratcliffe (2008) argues that James's view on emotion shows interesting similarities with ideas of Heidegger and Merleau-Ponty, and that we should understand 'feelings of bodily changes' as 'existential feelings'.

In my paper I undertake an attempt to unify these two seemingly contrasting accounts of James's 'emotion': on the one hand as a state of bodily arousal that leads

to conscious feelings, on the other as a structure through which the world is experienced. I will argue that the significance of James's definition of emotion depends on his philosophical ideas, and that his phenomenological approach to feelings and emotions nicely fits with his naturalistic focus on physiological changes. Rereading James's work in the context of his philosophical pragmatism can help clarify how his psychology anticipates an action-oriented understanding of emotion (Frijda 1986, 2007, and how his philosophy of mind is based on a view of consciousness as fundamentally affective, and an interpretation of the mind as radically embodied.

Bibliography

- Colombetti, G. (2014). *The Feeling Body. Affective Science meets the Enactive Mind.* Cambridge Mass.: MIT Press
- Frijda, N.H. (1986) *The Emotions.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Frijda, N.H. (2007). *The Laws of Emotion.* New York: Erlbaum
- James, W. (1884). What is an Emotion? *Mind* 9: 188-205
- James, W. (1902). *The Varieties of Religious Experience.* New York: Longmans, Green and Co.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (1945/1962). *Phenomenology of Perception.* London: Routledge
- Prinz, J. (2004). *Gut Reactions.* Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press
- Ratcliffe, M. (2008). *Feelings of Being. Phenomenology, Psychiatry and the Sense of Reality.* Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Robinson, J. (2005). *Deeper than Reason.* Oxford: Oxford University Press

Reactive Sentiments and Fitting Attitudes

Anna Réz

Eötvös Loránd University (Hungary)

Peter Strawson's seminal paper "Freedom and Resentment" has been subject to constant reinterpretations since its first publication in 1962. One of its major innovations was first pointed out by Gary Watson, who argued that the most original part of Strawson's account concerns the "order of explanation" with regard to being and holding responsible: "Whereas traditional views have taken these attitudes (i.e., reactive attitudes such as guilt or gratitude) to be secondary to seeing others as responsible, to be practical corollaries or emotional side effects of some independently comprehensible belief in responsibility, Strawson's radical claim is that these "reactive attitudes" (...) are constitutive of moral responsibility (Watson 1987, pp. 259)" In a similar vein, R. J. Wallace has argued (1995), elaborating on Strawson's theory, that there are no prior and independent facts about being morally responsible. Facts about responsibility come about by determining the conditions under which it is morally appropriate to hold someone morally responsible.

Recently, Patrick Todd (2016) and David Shoemaker (2017) advanced a different understanding of the Strawsonian approach. While Shoemaker offers a response-dependent account of moral responsibility, and Todd is highly skeptical about that very project, they both agree that the adequate interpretation of the Strawsonian “reversal” should be conceived analogously to response-dependent accounts of evaluative properties (such as e.g. funny).

In my talk I first argue that we should distinguish the methodological-conceptual claim put forward by Wallace (and presumably Watson) from the metaphysical thesis of Shoemaker and Todd. Wallace’s account is a general meta-schema to understand the concept of responsibility and the theoretical debates surrounding it. The response-dependent account proposed by Shoemaker, by contrast, is a theory of moral responsibility itself.

Second, by recognizing these differences in method and content we can shed a new light on Strawson’s original paper. Although the text itself is notoriously reticent in spelling out the relationship between reactive attitudes, moral demands and moral responsibility, it seems safe to assume that the response-dependent account proposed by Shoemaker is a useful amendment of the Strawsonian approach. Its major advantage is that it helps interpreting and illuminating Strawson’s much discussed and debated claim, i.e., that the practice of interpersonal expectations cannot and should not be “externally” justified. If the normative standards regulating the fittingness of our responsibility-attributing practices are internal to the practice itself, then it makes no sense to refer to more general metaphysical or normative principles to justify them.

However, for the very same reason it is open to further discussion whether Wallace’s normative interpretation would or should be endorsed by a coherent Strawsonian account. Although strictly speaking the normative interpretation does not commit us to a non-naturalistic approach to moral responsibility, its main motivation runs afoul of naturalism. According to Wallace’s proposal, at the end of the day our moral norms will determine the conditions under which it is appropriate to hold someone responsible – and we have no reason to suppose that our norms regulating the fairness of responsibility attribution will pick out a naturally or metaphysically uniform set of properties. Thus, Wallace’s account leads to a conclusion contrary to Strawson’s original discussion: the final justification of our responsibility-attributing practices comes from an “external” source – from general moral norms and principles.

References

- Shoemaker, D. 2017. Response-Dependent Responsibility; or, A Funny Thing Happened on the Way to Blame. *Philosophical Review*, Vol. 126, pp. 481–527.
- Strawson, P. F. 1962. Freedom and Resentment. *Proceedings of the British Academy* 1962, pp. 1–25.

- Todd, P. 2016. Strawson, Moral Responsibility, and the “Order of Explanation”: An Intervention. *Ethics* 127, pp. 208–240.
- Wallace, R. J. 1995. *Responsibility and the Moral Sentiments*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Watson, G. 1987. Responsibility and the Limits of Evil: Variations on a Strawsonian Theme. In: Schoeman, F. (ed.), *Responsibility, Character, and the Emotions: New Essays in Moral Psychology*, pp. 256–286. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Emotional regulation and rationality

Katherine Rickus

Marquette University, Milwaukee (USA)

Emotions are often evaluated on the basis of their perceived rationality, or their apparent lack of it. The relations that pertain between reason and emotion have a long history of discussion in philosophical inquiry and have, on the whole, been characterized as comprising some sort of conflict between the cognitive and the affective. This is variously characterized as an antagonistic relationship between the domains of reason(s) and feeling(s), thoughts and sensations, heads and hearts, the intellect and the gut, which ends up amounting to some likely conflict between “the thoughtful” and “the thoughtless”, and, consequently, between the “rational” and the “irrational” respectively. I will refer to this putative antagonism as the “cognitive-affective tension”, and hold its assumption responsible for greatly (and erroneously) influencing the evaluative attitudes we take towards emotions and emotional subjects, particularly rationality.

In the course of this discussion, I hope to undermine the assumptions of the antagonistic relation, and in doing so to question the use of rationality in particular ways as an evaluative attitude applied to emotions and emotional subjects. I reach the following conclusion with respect to rationality: that emotions as the episodic affects described by philosophers are not the proper objects of assessment of rationality – rather, if we care to evaluate states and agents for rationality episodically we should assess our beliefs or our active responses to emotions as rational or not (on whatever model of rationality we take to be the most plausible or salient). Better still, we should evaluate emotions not as episodes, but as processual narratives, by evaluating the psychological causal history of an individual which leads to affect. This can lead to rationality having less force as an evaluative attitude about emotions, but as I indicated, if assessments of rationality remain desirable, there are other non-affective states more suited to this dimension of evaluation. This conclusion is derived from what I take to be one of the principal rational roles of emotion in the life of emotional subjects, that is the systematic autoregulation of emotion to aim at some tolerable affective ambience.

Affordances and Aesthetic Affectivity

Tom Roberts
University of Exeter (UK)

According to ecological theories of perception, there are essential links between the contents of a subject's sensory experience and her capacities for embodied action. Visual experience, for example, picks out affordances: possibilities for behavioural engagement that depend upon how a subject's environment is structured and populated, and upon her own skills, dispositions, and physiology.

One popular way to understand the perception of affordances is to treat it as a fundamentally affective phenomenon. The world perceptually invites or solicits certain forms of practical interaction, and repels others, according to the agent's needs and concerns – a door handle solicits grasping; an outstretched hand invites shaking; a deadly snake deters touching; and so forth.

In this paper, I argue that the affective dimension of the perception of affordances is not limited to the solicitation of practical modes of behavioural engagement - that is, to actions carried out for the sake of some further goal of the agent. Sometimes, parts of the world call out to be engaged with for their own sake, or for the sake of their purely sensory and aesthetic properties. Objects and surfaces solicit haptic contact for the sake of their felt qualities, for example, while foods and drinks invite consumption for the sake of their taste.

Moreover, there are everyday aesthetic qualities that are best understood, I suggest, in terms of an object's perceptually soliciting actions of these kinds. A space is messy just in case it solicits tidying-up; a mark on a surface is a visual blemish just when it invites wiping-off; for a wine to be quaffable is for it to solicit continued consumption, and so forth. Embodied, concerned perceivers, then, are immersed in a world that affords not only complex varieties of practical engagement, but also rich forms of aesthetic and sensory appreciation.

Epistemological Emotions. Voluptas and dolor as Criteria of Truth in Lucretius

Chiara Rover
Sapienza Università di Roma (Italy)

As keys to access the ethical dimension, the two basic feelings or affections (*pathe*), namely pleasure (*hedone*) and pain (*algedon*), constitute the third criterion of truth envisioned by Epicurean canonics (DL X 31, 34). They are involved in the discrimination (*krinesthai*) of choices (*haireseis*) and rejections (*phygai*) (31), and therefore fall within those which Sextus Empiricus defines as “practical” criteria, as

opposed to “epistemological” ones (M VII 29). In order to function as “practical” truth criteria, however, *pathe* clearly require the contribution of *logismos*, which is crucial for the evaluation of pleasure and pain (Menec. 132).

The present contribution argues that *pathe* deserve the title of criteria of truth even when they are considered in themselves, as something self-evident (*enarges*) and a-rational (*alogos*). At this “zero grade”, pleasure and pain constitute a sort of counterpart to sense-perceptions: in the Epicurean tradition, *aisthesis* never presents itself in a “neutral” form, but always with a sort of more or less pleasurable or painful undertone, depending on how well the porous structure of our sensory organs reacts to the impact caused by *eidola*. So even as more or less “automatic” consequences of *aistheseis*, *pathe* provide some information on reality, thereby operating as genuine epistemological criteria. They inform us about the degree of conformity and harmony an external object displays vis-à-vis our own atomic structure, even before we can assert anything at all about the identity of this object through the use of *prolepsis*, and hence *logismos*.

Lucretius' position proves particularly crucial and revealing. If we examine all the various occurrences of the terms *voluptas* and *dolor* in *De rerum natura*, we will find some that appear to confirm the intrinsic epistemological value of the two affections or emotions. Pain is produced «where bodies of matter, by some force stirred up, / Through vitals and through joints, within their seats / Quiver and quake inside, but soft delight, / When they remove unto their place again» (DRN II, 963-966).

Even before any rational operation, these basic emotions – Lucretius' *voluptas* and *dolor*, and Epicurus' *pathe* – may rightfully be described as criteria of truth: a truth which is also at “zero grade” and which pertains to things rather than judgements, but which nonetheless possesses indisputable epistemological value.

Painting as solid affective scaffolding

Jussi Saarinen

University of Jyväskylä (Finland)

We humans continuously reshape the environment to alter, enhance, and sustain our affective lives. This two-way modification has been discussed in recent philosophy of mind as affective scaffolding, wherein ‘scaffolding’ quite literally means that our affective states are enabled and supported by environmental resources such as material objects, other people, and physical spaces (see e.g. Griffiths & Scarantino 2009; Colombetti & Krueger 2015; Maiese 2016). In this paper, I will argue that under certain conditions the process of painting amounts to a noteworthy case of affective scaffolding. To expound this idea, I will begin with a theoretical overview of

affective niche construction and affective scaffolding. Then, based on the criteria of robustness, concreteness, and dependability, I will specify a solid form of affective scaffolding and propound painting as a cogent case of such. In support of my argument, I will highlight two feelings typical to painterly creativity: the feeling of aesthetic resonance and the feeling of fusion. To conclude, I will discuss the overall contributions and limitations of my account.

My examination is motivated by a shortage of research on an important affective aspect of artistic creativity. While there has been much discussion about the ways in which artistic practice and its products may express or give form to artists' feelings and emotions, considerably less has been said about artists' active pursuit and attainment of certain affective states by way of the creative process. For many painters the activity of painting is not only about producing art or about giving form to experience, but also about setting up a niche in which certain affective states are enabled, realized, and valued. By examining painting from this point of view, I will illuminate the process of artistic creativity in a novel way, and at the same time, add nuance to our understanding of the nature of affective experiencing.

Self-Stimulatory Loops of Affectivity and Ways of Scaffolding in the Recruitment of Radicalized Youth: A Comparative Study among different Radicalized Organizations

Saad Saheed

Osnabrück University (Germany)

Hina Haq

Osnabrück University (Germany)

In the last few decades, the number of people who have been radicalized and joining the extremist organization has increased, particularly, the youth from all around the world are joining these organizations on an alarming rate. Affective bonding to these organizations is one of the most prominent aspects of the recruit's personality. To better understand how the affective bonding during the recruitment of youth for radicalization works, it seems very promising to adopt new insights and developments from the field of situated cognition and affectivity, particularly the concepts of Affective Scaffolding and Self-Stimulatory Loops of Affectivity (SSLA). The two notions highlight both the intended structuring of the affective bonding by the recruiting organizations and the immersive influence these settings have on the individuals. The focus of affective bonding in this study would be on two main aspects, i.e. one on a personal level and second on an organizational level.

On a personal level of this affective bonding, the person who joins the organization develops an “affective self-stimulating loop” with it. The more they listen to the ideas the more they start relating to the words of their leader and their emotions develop with it. The same is with the training rituals and different other activities, which give a boost to the affective loop. This loop keeps the person in a specific affective state which leads them towards a deeper involvement in the organization or for the cause of the organization. The focus is to identify affective loops in the cases of the youth who have joined the radicalized organization. How do these loops get formed? Are there some common affective patterns for these loops?

The second aspect is on the organizational level. Extremist organizations design themselves in a way that they provide niches for the young mind to scaffold with their ideas. The framework of Scaffolded Mind was introduced by Sterelny (2010). This concept of ‘Affective’ scaffoldings, helps to study in more detail the structure of radicalized organizations and what kind of niches they construct which act as scaffolding phenomenon for the young minds who join these organizations. The study investigates the affective structuring of the extremist organizations and how these organizations ‘affectively’ keep the concerned emotions elevated and cultivate them step by step, creating environmental niches which facilitate young people to emotionally scaffold to them.

This study applies the theoretical structure of Affective Scaffolding and SSLAs to philosophical and empirical research and theories from different parts of the world. Especially, it covers Arabic, Hebrew, German, English and Spanish, literature to see whether the various radicalized organizations use more or less the same tools for Affective Scaffolding new recruits or whether they differ in important respects. The aim is to provide a broad theoretical perspective and to compare Eastern with Western philosophies of Radicalization and Affectivity.

What is antipathy?

Susanne Schmetkamp
University of Basel (Switzerland)

Whereas a lot has been written on empathy and sympathy, antipathy has been widely ignored in philosophy of mind, philosophy of emotion, and moral philosophy. Empathy is broadly understood as the sharing and understanding of mental states, especially emotions, of other beings in order to better understand what others feel and how it is like to feel that way from a certain perspective (for an overview Batson 2009; Coplan/Goldie 2011; Maibom 2017). Except for some more or less serious controversies concerning the process and outcome of empathy, there is

at least a broad agreement that empathy differs from sympathy and that the latter is a genuine moral emotion (Darwall 1998; De Sousa 2001). In sympathy – or compassion – we judge morally that another being is in an unfortunate or fortunate situation (and deservedly so) and we are motivated to promote the wellbeing of the other for the sake of the other (Ben Ze`ev 2000). Some argue that an adequate form of moral sympathy or compassion presupposes empathy. However, it is not at all clear whether this is a necessary condition and whether empathy might not also lead to an opposite emotion or emotional attitude, namely antipathy. Following everyday language antipathy seems to be a mere spontaneous reaction of disliking another person (or fictional character). In this case it is elicited by criteria of attraction, partly as signs of character traits. However, when we watch a fictional movie we experience that we not only sympathize with a fictional hero (and want her success) but that we at the same time feel antipathy for antiheroes and that this antipathy is not only based on dislike but on informed moral judgments. In case of ambiguous characters we might even feel both sympathy and antipathy for one and the same character. Moreover, according to the paradox of tragedy principle we take pleasure in antipathy (Plantinga 2009). We are not only interested in „good“ characters but also in bad ones; we cannot not only empathize and sympathize with them (the so called sympathy for the devil) but we will also side against them and this is part of the aesthetic game. Obviously antipathy is more than a spontaneous reaction. Is it the antonym of sympathy? Is it based on empathy? Given that sympathy is a complex way of caring of other`s wellbeing which leads us to feel morally motivated: Could we, in turn, understand antipathy as a complex way of concern towards the uneasiness of others? I will answer this question positively and argue that antipathy is not only a spontaneous affect but also an attitude based on empathetic understanding and on moral judgements and that these judgments lead to the conclusion that the other should not get our compassion.

Narrativity, Literature, and Moral Learning

Markus Seethaler

Graz University (Austria)

The argument in my paper is twofold. First, I claim that narrativity plays a significant role in our self-understanding, although narratives do not play the role to unify our self or provide personal identity. Where narratives come into play is if we want to understand ourselves as persons. Second, I argue that one way to shape our personality is moral learning through literature. To do so, we need to emotionally engage in literary texts.

Narratives are important in our everyday life. For example, we often present memories in terms of first-person narratives, we engage in fictional narratives by reading literature or watching movies, and we are able to depict our life in the form of an autobiography. This has led to the theoretical claim that human beings always experience or should experience themselves as the authors of their own life and that we can only make sense of our self if we think of it in a narrative (for example Schechtman 2007). While it seems promising to argue, that narrativity and self-understanding are connected, the exact formulation is crucial. If we expect narrativity to provide the unity for our self and personal identity, we run the risk of excluding many persons with a more episodic approach to their lives (see Strawson 2004) or ignoring the fact that most life-narratives are fragments at best and far away from complete and unifying stories (see Lamarque 2004). I argue that instead we should follow the phenomenological tradition in differentiating the self and the person where the self is not something that can be separated from consciousness and first-personal givenness (see Zahavi 2007). In this framework, before we can even make sense of narratives we need to presuppose the self. Where the narrative in fact comes into play is if we want to make sense of us as persons, that can be shaped over time through our convictions, decisions and experiences.

One way to shape our personalities through experience is to engage in literature. If the argument in the first section is correct and we do need some narrative account to understand ourselves as persons, it seems natural to consider literary texts. As well as my self-understanding as a person also literature has a narrative structure. Although, just to recognize a similarity in structure does not activate a process of moral learning. What we need as well is an emotional bonding to literary characters that enables us to fully understand their struggles and to relive their development. My point is that if we achieve this emotional bonding, we are in fact in a position to shape or redefine our own personality. The structural similarity enables us to explain our ability to achieve such an emotional engagement in the first place.

References

- Lamarque, Peter (2004). "On Not Expecting Too Much from Narrative", in: *Mind & Language* 19 (4), 393-408.
- Schechtman, Marya (2007). "Stories, Lives, and Basic Survival: A Refinement and Defense of the Narrative View", in: Hutto, D. (ed.), *Narrative and Understanding Persons*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 155-178.
- Strawson, Galen (2004). "Against Narrativity", in: *Ratio* XVII (4), 428-452.
- Zahavi, Dan (2007). "Self and Other: The Limits of Narrative Understanding", in: Hutto, D. (ed.), *Narrative and Understanding Persons*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 179-202.

“Whence does Good come? - Notes on Plato’s moral psychology”

Gianluigi Segalerba
Universität Wien (Austria)

My contribution will be dedicated to the analysis of some aspects of Evil in Plato. The presence of an evil factor in men's soul is attested, for instance, in Republic IX, 571b3-572b9, and in Republic 588b1-589b7. Plato asserts, among other things, that a component of our soul, at least while sleeping, does not omit any act of folly or shamelessness: human beings are capable of every crime. This predisposition is not accidental: on the contrary, it belongs to the very nature of men, since a terrible, savage, and lawless form of desires is present in every person, even in the seemingly most measured persons. This soul component appears to be a kind of “antireason”. Thus, men have in themselves emotions being able to destroy everybody and everything.

On the basis of the description of the structure of the soul in Republic IX (and, to a certain extent, of Republic IV too), it does not seem, therefore, particularly difficult to explain the presence of Evil in the human dimension. It seems, on the contrary, rather difficult to explain the possibility of Good in the human dimension, since a good disposition of the soul does not seem so easy to be arrived at.

Basing on different passages of Plato’s Republic, I would like to analyse in my contribution the following subjects:

- the presence of good and evil desires and pleasures in the soul;
- the contrast between the rational part and the appetitive part together with the contrast between desires of the rational part and desires of the appetitive part;
- the presence of Evil in each person, which is located in the appetitive part of the soul, the dangers that this part represents both for the individual and for every society, and the strategies proposed by Plato to put Evil in us under control;
- the process of degeneration of a state and the causes of the death of a state in relation to the prevalence in a society and in the individual of the evil components;
- the processes of individuals’ internalization of the bad conditions of a society and of individuals’ externalization of the bad conditions of the souls into a society;
- the presence of Evil in the human history as a meta-historical presence rooted in the very structure of the men, independently of the particular historical age (we are the Evil, therefore the Evil will be always present in the human history).

My thesis as regards the possible solutions offered by Plato in order to reach a liberation from the Evil will consist in interpreting the whole process of knowledge

described by Plato as a kind of indispensable therapy against the evil component present in each of us. I will mainly base my interpretation on passages of the Republic (especially from book IV, V, VI, VII and IX of the Republic); references to other works of Plato like Gorgias, Phaedo, Phaedrus, Timaeus and the Laws will, however, be present in my analysis. A comparison with some passages of Thucydides (for instance, Melian dialogue and the pathology of war) will belong to my exposition. Likewise, I will analyse the similarities between Plato's tripartition of the soul and Freud's analysis of the structure of the soul with particular attention for Freud's Todestrieb in the Es.

In my presentation, I will first expose some arguments in favour of the existence of a strong tripartition of the soul (a point contested by some scholars, who say there actually is no tripartition of soul in Plato). I will then analyse Plato's description of the evil component as a factor capable of committing every kind of delict and crime. I will then proceed to the analysis of the desires/emotions that are connected by Plato, respectively, to the appetitive part and to the rational part of the soul. Plato assigns different pleasures, desires and ruling principles to the three parts of the soul. Emotions and desires belong not only to the appetitive part; a kind of desires does belong to reason too: contrast between reason and appetitive part also means and implies, therefore, a kind of contrast between desires belonging to reason and desires belonging to the appetitive part.

My thesis regarding the structure of the human soul will be that, if we usually ask ourselves how Evil is possible, we, basing ourselves on the descriptions offered by Plato, had better ask whether and how the Good is possible. The description of the soul in Republic IX is anything but encouraging, since the evil component does not need a particular training in order to be active, whereas reason and emotions/desires belonging to reasons appear to need a long education. Moreover, Plato tells us that only a few men does manage to eliminate the evil component: the evil component apparently remains alive in the majority of people. The structure of the individual soul has immediate effects and immediate impacts for every state and every society, as we can see through the description of the degeneration and the decadence of the constitutions in the books VIII and IX of the Republic. Therefore, an analysis of the individual soul immediately represents, for Plato, an analysis of the strategies to be applied in order to guarantee the stability of every state.

Only the long process of knowledge can free some individuals from the evil component that every individual has in himself. The knowledge of the realm of being opens up and makes accessible to the individual a new reality dimension: only this dimension can develop the potentialities of the rational part and can strengthen the desires of the rational part. Only this kind of development enables the individual to effectively contrast desires and passions of the appetitive part: Either philosophy or degeneration; either philosophy or victory of Evil.

Accordingly, as regards the structure of every society, only a class of individuals having had access to the alternative reality dimension is able to safeguard the structure of the state against the presence, in the majority of people, of an evil factor.

In spite of every process of education, however, Plato does not seem to consider the Evil in us as a factor that can be totally defeated: Evil is, at least in the human dimension, not eliminable; men (the majority of men) are constitutively (also) evil. Every political constitution, every society will be, therefore, always exposed to the menace of a degeneration; Evil will always appear in human history (this independently of the particular historical moment), since Evil is rooted in the very structure of the men.

‘One step further’ from moral evaluation to moral decision-making: A conceptual inference from the empirical evidence

Aiste Seibokaite

Eberhard Karls University Tübingen (Germany)

A growing body of literature on psychological and neuroscientific studies has been investigating two kinds of moral judgments: moral evaluation and moral decision-making. In philosophical terms, moral evaluation corresponds to moral appropriateness judgment from an observer’s perspective. Moral decision-making corresponds to deciding upon a course of action in a (usually) asymmetric sacrificial Trolley-type moral dilemma from an agent’s perspective. The psychological mechanisms involved in both evaluation and decision-making include (but are not limited to) value and outcome computation, cognitive reappraisal, emotional processing, attribution of mental states to others, empathy and harm aversion.

This inquiry into the psychological and neurobiological mechanisms has served as input to cognitive theories on the role of affect and reason in moral judgment. However, conceptual consideration of the process of moral judgment itself is scarce in the cognitive science literature, yet a common question in meta-ethics. What steps do we take to reach a moral appropriateness judgment? How do we come to a decision in a dilemma situation?

In this article, I argue that moral decision-making is only ‘one step further’ from moral evaluation. In my view, moral evaluation consists of the following steps: 1. Witnessing an action that might belong to the moral domain, 2. Accessing personal moral knowledge (either on moral norms or beliefs about morally significant outcomes), 3. Assessing the degree of moral significance of the action in question, 4. Ascribing moral appropriateness. Moral decision-making in a dilemma situation is conducted in the following steps: 1. Encountering a choice that might

belong to the moral domain, 2. Evaluating one horn of dilemma (going through the steps of moral evaluation process), 3. Evaluating the other horn of dilemma (going through the steps of moral evaluation process again), 4. Using moral imagination to decide upon the course of action.

I develop my argument for 'one step further' difference by considering empirical evidence from neuroimaging studies on moral judgment. A recent meta-analysis showed that moral evaluation and moral decision-making differ only by the additional activation of one brain region during decision-making tasks: the temporoparietal junction (TPJ) (Garrigan et al., 2016). Together with activation in ventromedial prefrontal cortex (vmPFC) it constitutes the core of the mentalizing network. Involvement of these two regions may suggest the underlying neuronal correlate of the 'one step further' regarding a moral decision, as well as different involvement of vmPFC in moral evaluation and moral decision-making.

In neuroimaging studies, the mentalizing network is assumed to be responsible for considering social cues of complex social situations. Within this network, the TPJ integrates temporary beliefs and intentions (goals), while vmPFC infers from long-term stable character traits (Amodio and Frith, 2006; Van Overwalle, 2009; Lombardo et al., 2011; Bzdok et al., 2012; Denny et al., 2012). Given the ascribed roles of these two regions we may assume that the 'one step further' is expressed as a process of moral imagination. Mavis Biss' radical moral imagination account, which considers imagination as a creative re-thinking of social expectations on moral behaviour and personal character traits, fits best, considering the current empirical evidence on the role of affect and cognitive reasoning in moral judgment.

Finally, I conclude my article with an overview on how my account on moral evaluation and moral decision-making benefits other cognitive theories by identifying the conceptual steps of the processes, in which interaction between affective and cognitive reasoning could result in behavioural differences.

Emotions and Self-deception

Zeynep Talay-Turner

Istanbul Bilgi University (Turkey)

'Human beings are rational creatures, but we also have emotions.' Saying 'but' already implies that rationality excludes emotions. Robert Solomon calls this 'the old prejudice' according to which emotions belong to the irrational part of our psyche, and are disruptive. In his tripartite structure of the psyche Plato, for instance, claims that in order to live a virtuous life our reason should rule over our passions and desires. Stoics go even further claiming that passions need to be avoided at all cost, however, saying this they do not suggest a division between rationality and irrationality: there is an intrinsic relationship between emotions and cognition and

this is what the following Stoic saying is about: ‘behind all your emotions, there is a judgment, albeit a false one’ (Chrysippus). According to this, we may change our judgment about a particular issue and thus be liberated from an unwanted emotion, be it jealousy, envy, fear and so on. This Stoic theory of the passions, has attracted many contemporary philosophers of emotions, and given rise to the so-called evaluative tradition (C.D. Broad, Errol Bedford, Anthony Kenny, Lazarus, Robert Solomon, Nussbaum).

In the first part of my paper I investigate the relationship between emotions and cognition and show how emotions are constituted by and/or are dependent on evaluative judgments. Here I mostly focus on compassion, and claim that since evaluative judgments cannot be separated from social values, compassion itself is a socially constructed emotion, or at least has a socially constructed dimension in it. Then, I claim that if emotions are constituted or structured by judgments, then any suspension of judgment (Arendt on Eichmann) can lead to a state of indifference, or an emotion-free state. And here I am interested in the ethical consequences of such a state, namely that with the suspension of judgment and accordingly of emotions, it is much easier for someone to avoid any moral action, and accordingly any sense of accountability. One dimension of this problem is self-deception. I examine this via a particular literary genre, namely, auto-biography, or as recent studies claim, auto-fiction. In this final section I look at Albert Speer’s memoirs and claim that his self-deception was a result of a suspension of judgment.

Being Emotional About Possibilities

Andres Thomas
Durham University (UK)

It is common for us to say things like “I am worried about my exam tomorrow”, “it makes me sad to think about the death of my close friend (who is still alive)”, or “I pity Anna Karenina”. Expression of emotions towards the future, counterfactual situations, and fictional characters are troubling cases for theories of emotion which require our emotional attitudes to have an aspect of intentionality, that is to say, they require our emotions to be about something. The future is yet to come, counterfactual situations have not actually happened, and fictional characters are not real people. So, in these cases what are our emotions about, and how can we satisfy the intentionality condition? These concerns have led some philosophers down a Meinongian route, arguing that it is possible for us to express emotions and other intentional attitudes toward non-existent entities. However, other philosophers argue that the metaphysics that accompanies a Meinongian theory are deeply unattractive.

In this presentation, I will argue for a middle way. I will argue that these situations should be thought of as cases of emotions about possibilities rather than cases of emotions about non-existent events or people. This method I think will ease some of the Meinongian concerns about emotions and non-existence, but it also comes without the worrying metaphysics that anti-Meinongians find hard to swallow. To achieve this, I will argue along lines inspired by David Lewis (1986). I advocate the view that possibilities are fleshed out possible worlds not dissimilar to our own. The events of these worlds are the objects of our emotions and the subjects of utterances concerning the future, counterfactuals, and fictional characters.

However, I will also point out that in order to reap the functional benefits of my proposal we do not necessarily need to succumb to the ontological commitments of Lewisian possible worlds. I will suggest that at the very least we can solve this puzzle with a fictionalist view of possible worlds. I will conclude that we can lift some of the pressure of these cases about emotions towards non-existence and provide a partial solution to the Meinongian question about how we can have emotions towards non-existent objects without committing to an unpopular ontology. We can enter into “imaginative-games” set against a background of Lewisian possibility in order to account for our emotional reactions to the future, counterfactuals, and fictional characters.

References

Lewis, David K. (1986). *On the Plurality of Worlds*. Blackwell.

The «nauseating» Being. Proximity and Shapelessness Revealing Contingency: The Influence of Aurel Kolnai on Jean-Paul Sartre

Giorgia Vasari
Sapienza University of Rome (Italy)

The objective of this paper is to consider the potential impact of Aurel Kolnai’s essay *Der Ekel* (1929) on Jean-Paul Sartre’s thought, with emphasis on Sartre’s description of the contingency of existence, revealing itself in the emotional experience of «nausea» (1938-1943). In fact, critics tend to support the idea of Sartre being a reader of Kolnai’s work and, therefore, the hypothesis of an influence of Kolnai on some parts of Sartre’s philosophy. In this perspective, I argue that shapelessness and proximity to the shapeless object – considered by Kolnai as basic features of the disgusting object and disgust – are the most important characteristics of the contingency of Being in Sartre.

According to Kolnai, proximity is «a concept that acquires a central position for the problem of disgust» because it's «not merely an occasion» but «also a concurrent object of the disgust»¹. Indeed, being disgusted is a matter of intimate contact with an object deprived of its shape, therefore an aggressively «sticky» object. Moreover, disgusting substances are often «viscous» and «soft»; sweet taste «can most easily become disgusting, since it is just the moment of sweetness that forms the basic tonality of what one might call a self-consistent, undemarcated and formless, insipidly agreeable taste»; disgusting animals are «vermin-like», «lithe» and characterized by «their crawling stickiness». From an intentional point of view, the disgusting object adheres to the subject wrapping it and leaving it no escape.

But, through this aggression the subject doesn't fear death, as death itself resides in this «surplus of life», in this «macabre debauchery of matter». Therefore, the matter lack of structure and order reveals a lack of sense in life, which leads to disgust.

The main question of Sartre's early philosophy is the contingency of existence, its lack of essence. The nonsense reveals itself to consciousness and consciousness – which is contingent too – builds itself on the surface of Being-in-itself, adhering to it. However, because of its freedom, consciousness has the power to free itself through creation, and its goal is to found the «value»²: a meaningful reality. But the contingency of Being-in-itself can turn into «antivalue», «absorbing» consciousness in «indifference»: this is the «slimy», the «stickly-sweet revenge» of Being-in-itself.

The «slimy» dissolves consciousness, haunting it but not making it fear death. These contents of *L'être et le néant* (1943) represent the core of *La nausée* (1938). In this novel, the hero suffers from frequent nausea until he becomes «Nausea»³ himself, facing the aggressive contingency of a frightening existence in its «obscene nudity»¹⁴. This revelation (in the public park) is characterized by the semantic field of fullness, softness, shapelessness and proximity, as well as the presence of disgusting animals like the snake and the larva: «the diversity of things, their individuality» reveals itself as mere «appearance» melting like «vener» and leaving only «soft, monstrous masses, all in disorder», in a «flaunting abundance». The essential «pure and rigid lines» (like in «the circle») don't exist in this world, in which there only exists a «fundamental absurdity»: «that ignoble marmalade». Therefore, «the essential thing is contingency».

Notes

¹A. Kolnai, *On 1 Disgust*, Open Court, Chicago and La Salle 2004, p. 40.

²J.-P. Sartre, *L'être et le néant*, Gallimard, Paris 1987, p. 131.

³J.-P. Sartre, *La nausée*, Gallimard, Paris 2015, p. 181.

Re-emergence of affectivity in the democratic politics of the post-truth era

Tõnu Viik
Tallinn University (Estonia)

I will claim that the political era that we sometimes call “post-truth” phase of democracy is best described as a change in the (discursive) rules of contemporary democratic practices. New ways of making politics started to involve both archaic and new forms of collective affectivity. By collective affectivity I mean communally shared, or social, emotions. Collectively shared emotions are intersubjective feelings that are validated and brought to existence by either an imaginative or real presence of other subjects. Quite often common moods are experienced as joint states of mind that unite the subjects who feel the same way into a group with its specific communal identity. The paper attempts a phenomenological description and explanation of shared emotions, as they are in play of the post-truth politics. I will argue that the new populism provokes successfully a type of enjoyment that is similar to the Lacanian notion of *jouissance*. Even if a particular populist agenda fails to solve a particular problem it addresses, it still brings about a communal feeling that currently prevailing ways of policy-making are not dealing with the problems in the way “we” desire. What “we” desire is a non-alienated, authentic way of politics that proceeds from the heart of the *Volksgeist*, is carried out by uncorrupted and unstained father-figures, and would produce a uniform agreement and a warm sense of support between each member of the political community.

Patheme: understanding historical change through affectivity

Erik Wallrup
Stockholm University (Sweden)

A change of emotional behaviour or within an emotional culture is often seen as a consequence of overarching transformations of the social order, so for instance by Norbert Elias. This paper suggests instead that an affective shift (to use a both broader and more far-reaching term than ‘changes in emotional behaviour’) within society is always related to a new world disclosure. ‘World’ is here understood in general terms as the interrelations through which meaning is created, as a cultural configuration, or, in the special case of the work of art, an aesthetic configuration that may interact with the cultural configuration. Both Martin Heidegger’s conceptions of ‘world’ (especially those in *Being and Time* and ‘The Origin of the Work of Art’) and Nikolas Kompridi’s socially related reformulation of ‘world disclosure’ are vital here.

With his point of departure in the concept of 'episteme', Michel Foucault has shed light upon the conditions of possibility of knowledge during particular epochs such as the Renaissance, the Classical Age and the modern period. As shown by Michael Schwartz, Foucault's notion of different epistemological epochs is intimately related to Heidegger's History of Being (Seinsgeschichte) in which Being is given but also refused in different ways through history. Something in Heidegger that, however, is absent in Foucault's historiography is the affective element. Through introducing the concept of 'patheme', an affective parallel to Michel Foucault's 'episteme', I intend to open up a new perspective on historical change where affective traits are not held to be caused by political, social or epistemological circumstances. Whereas the 'episteme' defines the condition of possibility of knowledge, the 'patheme' is the affective condition of any historically given worldhood.

Accordingly, the 'patheme' is decisive for how man relates to the surrounding world, it conditions human reflection and action, and it makes itself known in art in an eminent way. The 'patheme' can therefore not be reduced to theories of affectivity (such as Descartes's theory of passions), but stands in a reciprocal or even determinative relationship to such theories. To give an example, already discussed by William M. Reddy in terms of an 'emotional regime', the French Revolution did not have an affective shift as one of its consequences; instead, the affective shift that got it fullest description in the writings of Rousseau (both the political and literary ones) preceded and conditioned the revolutionary upheaval and outcome. Another example: the free-flowing affectivity of today cannot be explained by social media, but should be understood from the perspective of an affective shift lying as far back as the 1960s. 'Patheme' is key to such an approach.

Appropriate Hate

Lauren Ware

University of Kent (UK)

This paper has two aims. The first is to provide an argument for a new account of hate as an affect distinct from anger, disgust, and contempt. The second is to provide an argument as to how hate is, in certain cases, the appropriate and justified response to an object.

Hate, we will argue, is an attitude characterised by a desire to eliminate its object. This can take a variety of forms depending on the kind of object. For created objects such as art, architecture, or technology, hate is characterised by the desire either that these objects had never been made in the first place, or that these objects would be destroyed. For groups of people, hate is characterised by a desire to dissolve or disestablish the object group. For individuals, hate is to desire either that the

person was never born, or would cease to exist, or that their identity should be erased.

Demonstrating how hate, on our account, is neither equivalent to—nor a form of—anger, disgust, or contempt, we make three sub-arguments for this account. The first is that when making a hate claim, there is always an eliminative connotation. For example, if one were to say, ‘I hate brutalist architecture’, this claim can be reasonably interpreted as a claim about that person’s desire to see all brutalist architecture removed, or that they wish it had never been built in the first place.

The second argument rests on the methodology of hate groups and/or hate ideologies. Misogyny, xenophobia, racism, homophobia, and transphobia are manifested through silencing, exclusion, and historical, experiential, and cultural erasure, as well as bodily violence directed at individual members of these groups. The eliminative character of hate manifested in these cases not only includes the attempt to destroy individual members of the group, but also to destroy their ability to function as a group.

Thirdly, we look at examples where one attempts to correct the hate claim of another. For example, one might sincerely claim, ‘I hate it when it rains!’. We might well imagine that someone else might try to correct that person, by demonstrating that rain is valuable, and that the speaker would miss it (for life and death reasons) if it were to disappear. Given that these correctives appeal to the value of the existence of the object of the hate claim, this suggests that a genuine hate claim is one about the lack of perceived value in the existence of the object.

We will then go on to argue that despite the deeply problematic cases of hate, and claims that hate is always inappropriate, there are cases where hate is the appropriate thing to feel, justified either morally, politically, aesthetically, epistemically, or by the context’s given normative domain. Such examples will be any case where the object, group, ideas, or even individuals should justifiably cease to exist, or at least, be justifiably desired never to have come to be in the first place. That is, despite some misgivings about hate, it can be, and has been, a motivator for good, and therefore should not be something to be avoided at all costs.

Can a Robot be Your Friend? Emotions towards Artificial Intelligence

Eva Weber-Guskar

Georg-August-Universität Göttingen (Germany)

What happens if intelligent machines rather than other humans become partners in our interactions – as it is already increasingly the case? Examples of this begin with intelligent personal assistants like Siri and extend to autonomous cars and the robotic seal “Paro” who is used for people with dementia. The rise of these new “actors” challenges our understanding of emotions. We can distinguish at least three

questions: Can we have real emotions towards them or only pseudo-emotions? Is it not appropriate to have such emotions even if we can? And if we can have real and appropriate emotions in such cases, are these perhaps new types of emotions?

This paper concentrates on the second question and on one type of emotions: the emotion of sympathy (a positive, pleasant attitude towards someone that is bound up with the motivation to spend time with that someone etc.; to be distinguished from empathy and from the way David Hume and Adam Smith would use the word). Neuronal networks as self-learning systems based on powerful processors and a huge amount of data can interact in a rather "autonomous", flexible and individually personalized way. Furthermore, they recognize emotions and imitate their expression with the consequence that a kind of emotional exchange is possible in the interaction with them. The question put more precisely is: Is it necessary that both sides feel emotions (that is "have emotions") in order for the involved emotions to be appropriate? Is it, therefore, for example, not appropriate to have sympathy towards Jibo, the new language assistant and table robot that not only turns light and music on and off and orders your groceries but that also talks to you and cheers you up with a joke if you are in a bad mood?

I want to argue that there are at least some reasons to deny this question. First: Whereas pity (that has been discussed for this question so far) indeed presupposes the existence of emotions at the other side because it is an emotion that is by definition directed at an emotion (or at least feelings), namely some sort of pain or negative emotion, sympathy does not so. Second: In interactions with humans we do not find it necessarily inappropriate to have sympathy towards someone who does not have any emotions towards us. We might develop this emotion just by observing someone interacting with other people. Third: While emotions as thankfulness or resentment are bound up with the belief that the object of the emotion is responsible for its actions sympathy is not so. We hold sympathy towards babies, who cannot act responsibly, to be completely appropriate. This is way the fact that artificial intelligence is not in the strict sense autonomous is not relevant for the question of the appropriateness of sympathy. To sum up: While there are obvious reasons for the belief that other emotions concerning artificial intelligence are not appropriate, it is rather hard to find those reasons for the emotion of sympathy.

Bryson, Joanna: „Artificial Intelligence and Pro-Social Behaviour“. In: Misselhorn, Catrin. *Collective Agency and Cooperation in Natural and Artificial Systems: Explanation, Implementation and Simulation*. Cham et al.: Springer, 2015: 281 – 306.

Duffy, Brian R. „Anthropomorphism and the social robot“. *Robotics and autonomous systems* 42, 3 (2003): 177-90.

Misselhorn, Catrin; Pompe, Ulrike und Stapleton, Mog. „Ethical Considerations Regarding the Use of Social Robots in the Fourth Age“. *GeroPsych: The Journal of Gerontopsychology and Geriatric Psychiatry* 26, 2 (2013): 121-33.

Emotions as Categorical Bases

Demian Whiting
University of Hull (UK)

A standard view in metaphysics has it that dispositional properties of objects have categorical or causal bases, properties of objects that ground or explain the way objects are disposed to behave when certain circumstances obtain (see e.g. D. Chalmers 2010). But if this is true of objects in general, then the same must be true of people specifically. So the question arises: what in the case of ourselves might play the role of a categorical basis for our behavioral dispositions?

I will argue that emotion is the best candidate – indeed it turns out to be the only viable candidate – for the categorical basis for our behavioral dispositions. In other words, I will argue that we are disposed to behave in the ways we do in virtue of the emotions we undergo. I argue that desires and beliefs are not suitable candidates, desires because they are behavioral dispositions and therefore not suited to act as categorical bases, and beliefs because they are the stimulus or triggering conditions for our behavioral dispositions. I then outline a number of reasons for why emotions seem very well suited to play the role of categorical bases. In particular, I show how emotions' phenomenal qualities – the edgy quality that is distinctive of fear, or the irritable or hot-headed quality distinctive of anger say – can explain how we are disposed to behave when encountering the world and its objects. A striking upshot of the argument is that the widely-held view that beliefs and desires alone explain everything there is to explain about behavior – the so-called folk-psychological model of human behavior – turns out to be false. For emotion in addition to desire and belief has an essential and distinctive role to play in the explanation of human behavior.

Chalmers, D. 2010. *Consciousness and its Place in Nature*. Oxford University Press.

The expression of agent-regret

Jake Wojtowicz
Kings College London (UK)

I aim to develop our understanding of agent-regret and its expression by looking at the relation between agent-regret and reasons for action. Drawing on some forthcoming work by John Gardner, R Jay Wallace's recent work on regret, but mostly on Bernard Williams's characterisation of the emotion, I bring out how the expression of agent-regret differs from the expression of ordinary regret.

I begin by sketching a basic picture of agent-regret, contrasting it with ordinary regret. Roughly, agent-regret involves lamenting what I have done, whereas regret involves lamenting what happened.

I then introduce Bernard Williams's claim that someone who feels agent-regret would not be satisfied by an insurance pay-out to the victim, whereas such a pay-out would satisfy someone who felt ordinary regret. Hence, agent-regret's particular expression.

I argue that we can understand this lack of satisfaction if we see that regret gives us a reason to make things better, whereas agent-regret gives us a reason to make up for what we have done. This reason is present because if we see something as lamentable we tend to have a reason to fix it. When it comes to regret we lament what happened, whereas when we feel agent-regret we regret what we have done; thus agent-regret involves a reason to fix what we have done: to make amends.

I illustrate this with the following case. Margot breaks Christina's vase, knocking it over as she walks down a corridor. She feels agent-regret. Alice, a bystander with no involvement in the breakage, regrets that the vase smashed. Still, Alice has reason to act: "The vase smashed" is a fact, and it counts in favour of buying Christina a new vase. I further expand on the relation between regretting a lamentable occurrence and the awareness of reasons to fix it.

But Alice does not have reason to do anything more than repair the damage done to Christina's vase, and the smashed vase does not speak in favour of Alice-in-particular fixing it. She has no reason to help Christina if an insurance company has already paid out and replaced the vase because what she laments has been repaired.

How might Margot make up for what she has done? In the simplest case, she might fix the vase herself. Both Alice and Margot might try to fix the vase, and in doing so conform to their reasons to act; but the reason why they act differs – Alice wants to make things better, Margot wants to make up for what she has done. To properly understand this expression, we need to understand the reasons in play, rather than just the actions performed. Margot feels the need to do something even if someone else has repaired the vase, because she has not conformed to her reason to make amends. I argue Margot can make amends by instantiating the values damaged by what she regrets doing. So, she might buy Christina flowers for the vase, enhance the beauty in her life, and partly make amends.

Collective Regret and Collective Obligations

Bill Wringe
Bilkent University (Turkey)

In his 1985 book *Ethics and the Limits of Philosophy*, Bernard Williams invoked the possibility of 'a way of doing moral philosophy that started from the ways in which we experience our ethical life. Such a philosophy would reflect on what we believe; feel; take for granted; the ways in which we confront obligations and recognize guilt and responsibility; the sentiments of guilt and shame. It would involve a phenomenology of ethical life.' Williams observes that such a philosophy 'could be a good philosophy'; but the subjunctive mood governing his remark suggests that he regards the possibility as non-actual. In this paper, I aim to try to bring the counterfactual closer to actuality by investigating some of the ways in which a kind of ethical phenomenology might have a bearing on considerations about collective obligation.

Williams mentions, as examples of experiences on which his 'phenomenology of ethical life' might take as material for reflection, certain kinds of moral emotion – in particular, 'the sentiments of guilt and shame.' Here, I shall focus on a particular variety of a different, but closely related emotion – that of moral regret. I shall be discussing what we might call 'collective moral regret', and in particular a form of collective moral regret related to omissions.

I shall argue that in order to understand some instances of collective moral regret we must take ourselves to be committed to the possibility of there being collective obligations which fall on groups which are not agents. This conclusion runs counter to much recent work on the nature of collective obligations. However it is of interest for a number of reasons. Most prominent among them is that it opens up the possibility of obligations which fall on one particular non-agent collective: what one might call the 'global collective', consisting of the world's population as a whole.

I shall argue as follows: first, I shall describe some situations which I take to call for collective moral regret. I shall then investigate this response in more detail, arguing for three claims: first, there is a *prima facie* case for thinking this response is a rational and appropriate – but not obligatory - response to the situations described; secondly, that the rationality of the response presupposes the existence of certain kinds of collective obligation; and thirdly, that the rationality of the response does not presuppose the existence of a collective agent on whom those obligations fall. Finally, I shall consider whether the idea of collective obligations which fall on non-agents is simply incoherent and whether I have placed more argumentative weight on the deliverances of phenomenology than they can bear.

Fighting Fire with Fiero: How Pride Can Lead to Overcoming Temptation

Jumana Yahya
Osnabrück University (Germany)

The self-control literature rarely treats emotions as a phenomenon that is useful for sticking with one's commitments and better judgments. Most self-control theorists categorize an emotion as a compelling force, which, at worst, must be avoided at all costs, and, at best, can be utilized only by the clever. For those compelling emotions, which can potentially be repurposed to serve self-control, only the positive emotions seem to be discussed. Moreover, only low-arousal emotions are typically accepted as useful for successful self-control. In light of a recent trend to conceive self-control as a situated phenomenon (Heath & Anderson, 2010; Hung & Labroo, 2011), the time has come to reconsider the role that emotions can (and do) play in self-control. Empathy, for example, has been associated with the ability to delay gratification (Soutschek et al., 2016).

The aim of this paper is to argue that emotions deserve to be bona-fide members of the self-control system. More specifically, this paper will suggest a candidate for a self-controlling emotion, namely, fiero. Fiero – a term coined by the psychologist Isabella Poggi – refers to a version of pride, which is experienced when an agent triumphs over a great challenge. Aristotle treats pride as a very important emotion, and claims that “a person is proud if he both is and thinks himself to be worthy of great things”. The intuition that this paper develops, following Aristotle, is that pride can lead to great things, which are, in this context, sticking to one's better judgments.

The interesting thing about fiero, or pride in general, is that the expression of this emotion is innate (Tracy & Matsumoto, 2008), and that this emotion motivates the desire to overcome additional challenges. Furthermore, if something like the facial feedback hypothesis is true, which states that mimicking a facial expression can induce the relevant emotion in an agent, then fiero can potentially be induced by mimicking the behavioral markers of this emotion (i.e., clenched fists, raised arms, fierce face, etc.). Taken together, these suggestions indicate that inducing a feeling of fiero might be sufficient to motivate an agent to overcome strong temptation and be successfully self-controlled.

Embodied Emotion and Cultivating Embodied Virtues

Sunny Yang

Hankuk University, Seoul (South Korea)

In this paper, I show that cognition and bodily feeling are not distinct in emotion. I argue that the pure cognitive theory of emotion, which identifies emotion with evaluative judgment or belief, is inadequate. The main objection to standard pure cognitive theory is that it cannot explain the non-cognitive aspects of emotion. I argue that if we have to take an adequate account of what is essential to being an emotion, we must resist the false choice between pure cognitive theories and pure somatic, bodily feeling theories. In order to do this, I suggest that we should take an account of “how emotions can be sophisticated cognitive states and, at the same time, have bodily feelings as a major component” (Ratcliffe 2008, 17).

I first of all consider Prinz’s ‘embodied appraisal theory’. The theory, on the one hand, agrees with pure somatic, bodily feeling theory in the sense that emotions are embodied, and disagrees with the feeling theory in the sense that judgments are needed for emotion elicitation (Prinz 2003:81). According to Prinz, emotions are “structurally simple embodied states, but they carry the kind of information that full-blown cognitions can carry.” (Prinz 2003: 82)

However I raise an objection to this embodied appraisal theory. I argue that Prinz cannot explain cultivating embodied virtues: how we might educate our emotions and cultivate virtues. Prinz explains how and where emotions can get in on the act by utilizing notion of ‘valence markers’, which are reward and punishment markers. It is an unconscious mechanism that exerts influence on behaviour. The advantage of taking this model is that it could be tested by seeking biological evidence that emotional valence is systematically related to brain systems associated with reinforcement and punishment, which have been independently investigated.

Finally, I present an alternative account of Prinz’s embodied appraisal theory in order to explain educating our emotions and cultivating virtues. D. Hutto is actively developing an alternative, enactive understanding of emotions that conceives of emotional responsiveness as non-representational and embodied in ways that go beyond the head (see Colombetti 2013; Hutto, Kirchhoff & Myin 2014). His radically enactive account of emotions conceives of them in terms of dynamically unfolding interactions with, rather than representations of, the world (Hutto 2008; Hutto 2012; Hutto & Myin 2013). Following Hutto’s lead, I attempt to apply this conception of the emotions to explain how we might educate our emotions and cultivate virtues (Hutto & Sánchez-García 2015).

I suggest taking a holistic stance where skills, cognition, and emotion are not decoupled and isolatable but rather, fully embodied processes meant to work together. I argue that a holistic integration is something to be accomplished within the context of a social practice.