



**University of
Roehampton
London**

All events are
funded by

***The Royal
Institute of
Philosophy***

The University of Roehampton
***An Evening with a
Philosopher Event Series***

**SPRING TERM
(2021)**

EVENT LIST

All welcome!

Events held **online**
from **6:00 - 8:00**
pm

To join **Zoom**
meeting:

Meeting ID:

322 019 7156

Passcode:

011932

27TH OF JANUARY: 'An Evening
on ... Defending Animals', with
Angie Pepper (Roehampton)
and Rich Healey (Roehampton)

24TH OF FEBRUARY: 'An Evening on ... Freedom
of Musical Expression' with Robert Simpson (UCL)

14TH OF APRIL: 'An Evening on ... the Politics of Shame'
with Luna Dolezal (Exeter)

12TH OF MAY: 'An Evening on ... Insulating Humanity' with Joe
Saunders (Durham)

The University of Roehampton: *An Evening with a Philosopher* Event Series (Spring Term, 2021)

Funded by the *Royal Institute of Philosophy*

This term, the University of Roehampton will be hosting its first annual *An Evening with a Philosopher* event series, generously funded by the *Royal Institute of Philosophy*. The events are free, and open to everyone.

The *An Evening with a Philosopher* events are not a lecture series in the traditional sense. Instead, speakers are invited to present a piece of ‘work in progress’ which is of general public interest. In this way, the events will foster an informal and conversational atmosphere, in which ideas are exchanged and discussed, rather than simply disseminated. The overall aim of the *An Evening with a Philosopher* event series is to: a) allow professional philosophers to present their ideas to an interested public before they are complete, and b) to allow an interested public to meaningfully contribute to ongoing research by offering comments, questions, and feedback which can genuinely shape the final piece of work.

This term’s events (abstracts below):

- **27th of January:** ‘An Evening on ... Defending Animals’, with Angie Pepper (Roehampton) and Rich Healey (Roehampton)
- **24th of February:** ‘An Evening on ... Freedom of Musical Expression’ with Robert Simpson (UCL)
- **14th of April:** ‘An Evening on ... the Politics of Shame’ with Luna Dolezal (Exeter)
- **12th of May:** ‘An Evening on ... Insulating Humanity’ with Joe Saunders (Durham)

In the spring term (2021) these events will be held **online**, from **6:00 pm – 8:00 pm** (GMT). To join the events, follow the below zoom link:

- <https://roehampton-ac-uk.zoom.us/j/3220197156?pwd=WlJQcktwMXpueU1YSW9qWjlVdEU4dz09>
- Meeting ID: 322 019 7156
- Passcode: 011932

For more details, please message Neil Williams (neil.williams@roehampton.ac.uk)

Event Details (Spring Term, 2021)

27th Jan, 6:00 – 8:00pm: *An Evening on ... Defending Animals* with Angie Pepper (Roehampton) and Rich Healey (Roehampton)

Imagine that you are walking down the street and you see one person physically attacking another. It is evident that the victim poses no threat to their attacker, and that the attacker's capacities for moral agency are not compromised. What are you permitted to do in such a case? Most philosophers believe that it would be morally permissible, and perhaps even obligatory, for you to intervene to defend the victim. Moreover, many believe that it would be permissible for you to harm the attacker if harming them is the only way to stop the threat that they pose.

Now consider the claim that nonhuman animals have rights. Specifically, animal rights theorists have argued that nonhuman animals have rights against being killed, and rights against being made to suffer. These are important rights that are reflected, albeit inconsistently, in animal welfare legislation that is designed to protect animals against abuse and cruelty. If animals have rights of these kinds, then it would seem, assuming third-party defence is justified, that it would be permissible for you to harm another human if doing so was necessary to stop them from violating the rights of a nonhuman animal.

While this seems relatively straightforward, few have been prepared to embrace the conclusion that a commitment to animal rights entails that it is sometimes permissible to harm humans in defence of animals. Indeed, most defenders of animal rights explicitly denounce the use of violence in defence of animals, advocate animal rights pacificism, and deny that it could ever be permissible to harm humans in defence of animals. In this workshop, we will interrogate this orthodox position and explore the question of whether it is ever permissible to harm humans in defence of other animals.

24th Feb, 6:00 – 8:00pm: *An Evening on ... Freedom of Musical Expression* with Robert Simpson (UCL)

Most of us believe that speaking and writing should be socially privileged activities. We believe that society should be extra-tolerant towards speech, even when it results in offense, discord, false beliefs, and other bad consequences. Why think this way? An important part of the answer is that speaking and writing are the best means we have for giving articulate expression to our thoughts and feelings. If we don't have freedom of speech, then it becomes exceedingly difficult to share thoughts and feelings with others, and to have other people's thoughts and feelings shared with us in turn. And a life where we can't do these things seems terribly grim and lonely. But if that is why we privilege speech -- because of its ability to give articulate expression to our thoughts -- then why do most of us also believe that musical expression should be socially privileged, alongside speaking and writing? After all, music is a strikingly *inarticulate* way of expressing what's in our minds and hearts. This session will discuss a series of questions that follow from these observations. Could it be that music is a more articulate mode of expression than it initially seems? What is the real value of articulacy in expression, anyway? And is there some distinctive value to be found in inarticulate modes of expression?

14th April, 6:00 – 8:00pm: *An Evening on ... the Politics of Shame*, with Luna Dolezal (Exeter)

Shame is a negative self-conscious emotion that is commonly understood to arise when we are concerned with how we are seen and judged by ourselves and/or others. Above and beyond other emotions, shame is theorized to be a foundational part of human life; it has been described by some social theorists as the 'master emotion'. The aim of this lecture is to give an introduction to the politics of shame, looking at how shame plays a role in experience, health, social relations and political inclusion and exclusion. In particular, my focus will be on experiences of what is commonly called 'chronic shame' (Pattison 2000, Nathanson 1992, Dolezal 2015), where shame is recurrent, persistent or enduring in experience. To use the feminist phenomenologist Sandra Lee Bartky's formulation, shame is not always an acute event, but can become a "pervasive affective attunement" (Bartky 1990, 85). Instead of experiencing shame as a discrete event with a finite duration, it is experienced as a persistent, and perhaps, permanent possibility in daily life. In chronic shame, the anticipation of shame (whether explicit or implicit) comes to be a defining feature of one's lived experience and, in addition, has important socio-political consequences. Thus far, chronic shame has eluded simple phenomenological analysis, largely because chronic shame often does not have a clear experiential profile: it is frequently characterised by the absence rather than the presence of shame. My aim in this paper is to begin a phenomenology of chronic shame, drawing from Husserl's formulation of the 'horizon' as a means to discuss structural aspects of chronic shame experiences, in particular how chronic shame is characterised by structures of absence, anticipation and intersubjectivity, while playing a role in the formation of the character of one's socio-political experience.

12th of May, 6:00 – 8:00pm: *An Evening on ... Insulating Humanity*, with Joe Saunders

The world can be a dark, cold, difficult place. One role that ideas, ideals, beliefs and theories can serve is as *insulation* against the harsher aspects of the world. In this session, philosopher Joe Saunders explores whether love, morality and freedom might serve as insulation for us. He also considers whether we need insulation, and the dangers of too much insulation.