

better count on for the end of this epidemic (Ortega y Gasset, 1999).

All our analysis will not result in a macabre chronicle of dark times belonging to a silent and discreetly distressing apocalypse. They are symptoms of an era that is being forged and in it there is room for the prodigy, for the restoration of the human, for the rediscovery of the tiny sparks of light that await us in the hands of strangers who reach out to us with tenderness. We will end with a phenomenological approach to tenderness and love as the crux of human reality.

#### **Reference list:**

- Anders, G. (2011), *La obsolescencia del hombre. Sobre el alma en la época de la segunda revolución industrial*. Pre-Textos.
- Han, B-C. (2017), *La sociedad del cansancio*. Herder.
- Han, B-C. (2021), *La sociedad paliativa*. Herder.
- Negro, D. (2009), *El mito del hombre nuevo*. Encuentro
- Ortega y Gasset, J. (1999), *La rebelión de las masas*. Espasa.
- Syrstova, E. (1979), *El mundo imaginario*. Akal.
- Lewin, K. (1935), *Teoría de campo. Una dinámica teoría de personalidad*. McGraw Hill.

## **Haslanger and The Racialized Subject**

*Larissa Koliás*

University of Calgary (Calgary)

Sally Haslanger (2019) Social/Political Theory of Race (SPR) defines race as a hierarchal, systemic position of subordination or privilege. She argues that ‘race’ is reducible to only this hierarchy, and that any value which may have come from racialization, such as affirmative racial identities, artistic traditions, cultural norms, etc., are not attributable to race but something she calls pan-ethnicity. Borrowing from Yen Le Espiritu (1992), Haslanger explains that during the process of racialization, multiple ethnic groups may be grouped together within a single race, resulting in pan-ethnicities. Although it is an offshoot of racialization, Haslanger defines pan-

ethnicity as distinct from race.

I argue that Haslanger's SPR perpetuates systemic racial oppression and privilege by utilizing the same logic inherent to systems of oppression in the West. My argument appeals to Maria Lugones's (2003) theory of the logic of purity and split-separation of subjects within Western systems of oppression. Utilizing the works of anthropologist Mary Douglas (1966) and critically examining the influence of Enlightenment thought, Lugones argues that systems of Western oppression are a function of cultural purity and aim to safeguard the perceived rationality of the West. According to Lugones, Western cultures uphold the purity of rationality by creating a binary conceptualization of subjectivity. There are two types of subjects within this framework – the 'unified (white) subject' and the 'fragmented (non-white) subject'. I maintain that by separating pan-ethnicity from race, Haslanger's SPR fails to offer an account of race that is not a function of the logic of purity; the SPR is thus an offshoot of systemic oppression, operating within the conceptual bounds of racism.

Further, not only does the SPR reproduce the logic of purity, but I also claim that it further reinforces this logic. Kristie Dotson's (2011) argues that pernicious ignorance is fundamental to systemic oppression, where pernicious ignorance is the result of predictable and harmful epistemic gaps in cognitive resources. I further claim that by situating itself within the white framework, Haslanger's SPR advances the pernicious conceptual deficits of racism. To demonstrate this, I look at Karen-Arnold Frost's (2014) analysis of the performative art piece "The Couple in a Cage: Two Amerindians Visit the West" by Coco Fusco and Guillermo Gomez-Penaz (Fusco, 1995). Frost's analysis demonstrates that ignorance is not defeated by merely making the ignorant aware of their gaps in cognitive resources; rather, its defeat occurs when those gaps are filled with a new understanding. Applying Frost's analysis to Haslanger, I show that the SPR not only fails to offer a new understanding of race, but it reinforces these cognitive gaps by presenting the hierarchal, binary view as the only framework for understanding race. The SPR is, therefore, not only insufficient for racial justice, but is actively pernicious by reinforcing the logic inherent to racism in the West. I conclude that we need an account

of race which utilizes a different logic, one which can perceive the cohesive multiplicity of the racialized subject by moving away from binary conceptual frameworks.

### Reference list:

Douglas, M. (1966) *Purity and danger: an analysis of concepts of pollution and taboo*. Praeger.

Dotson, K. (2011). Tracking epistemic violence, tracking practices of silencing. *Hypatia*, 26(2), 236–57.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1527-2001.2011.01177.x>

Le Espiritu, Y. L. (1992). *Asian American panethnicity: bridging institutions and identities*. Temple University Press.  
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1bwljcp>

Frost, K. (2014). Imposters, tricksters, and trustworthiness as an epistemic virtue. *Hypatia*, 29(4), 790–807.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/hypa.12107>

Fusco, C. (1995). *English is broken here: notes on the cultural fusion in the Americas*. The New Press.

Haslanger, S. (2019). Tracing the sociopolitical reality of race. In G. Joshua, S. Haslanger, C. Jeffers & Spencer Quayshawn, (Eds.) *What is race?: four philosophical views* (pp. 3–37). Oxford University Press.

Lugones, M. (2003). Purity, impurity, separation. In H. L. Nelson & S. Ruddick (Eds.), *Pilgrimages/peregrinajes: theorizing coalition against multiple oppressions* (pp. 99–119). Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

### Analytic argument against solipsism

*Alex Marchan*

KU Leuven (Leuven)

Solipsism is an ethically harmful doctrine that spreads intolerance and tends to form strong illusions that prevent people from reasonable judgement. In this paper, I am arguing against solipsism as a fallacy that leads either to the creation of an illusory world or to