

“Leave this Europe where they are never done talking of Man, yet murder men everywhere they find them, at the corner of every one of their own streets, in all the corners of the globe. [...] where they never stopped proclaiming that they were only anxious for the welfare of Man: today we know with what sufferings humanity has paid for every one of their triumphs of the mind. [...]. Let us decide not to imitate Europe; let us combine our muscles and our brains in a new direction. Let us try to create the whole man, whom Europe has been incapable of bringing to triumphant birth”.
(Frantz Fanon 1961: *The Wretched of the Earth*)

Colonialism presented itself as a triumph of the civilized, moral, rational, superior human that altruistically carried the burden of bringing the fruits of reason, modernity, liberty, equality, emancipation, technology, progress, rule of law from Europe to other parts of the world. European colonizers arrogated to themselves the role of protectors and enforcers of the norms of ‘human’, ‘humane’ and ‘humanity’, while justifying slavery and genocide on the grounds that “primitive” populations, who were defined to be at inferior stages of humanity, threatened the moral sanctity of European civilization. It was argued that if the natives wanted to qualify as ‘human’, they must adopt European practices, values, norms, and institutions. The normative violence that historically informed Eurocentric and androcentric definitions of ‘human’ and ‘humanity’ endures in the postcolonial world. My talk will interrogate how contemporary discourses of cosmopolitan humanitarianism and human rights are inflected by neo-colonial impulses and argue that a reconfiguration of our normative understandings of ‘being human’ is imperative in order to envision non-dominant futures. ◇

Luciano Floridi ◊ Infraethics – What it is and why it matters

In this talk, I analyse what infraethics is and why it is important. The idea may be quickly introduced by comparing it to a phenomenon well known to economists and political scientists. When one speaks of a ‘failed state’, one refers not only to the failure of a *state-as-a-structure* to fulfil its basic roles, such as exercising control over its borders, collecting taxes, administering justice, providing schooling, and so forth. One also refers to the collapse of a *state-as-an-infrastructure* or environment, which makes possible and fosters the right sort of social interactions; that is, one may be referring to the collapse of a substratum of default expectations about economic, political and social conditions, such as the rule of law, respect for civil rights, a sense of political community, civilised dialogue among differently-minded people, ways to reach peaceful resolutions of ethnic, religious, linguistic, or cultural tensions, and so forth. All these expectations, attitudes, practices, in short such an implicit ‘socio-political infrastructure’, which one may take for granted, provides a vital ingredient for the success of any complex society. It plays a crucial role in human interactions, comparable to the one that we are now accustomed to attributing to physical infrastructures in economics. By analogy, it seems time to acknowledge that the morally good behaviour of a whole population of agents is *also* a matter of ‘ethical infrastructure’ or *infraethics*, to be understood not as a kind of second-order normative discourse or metaethics, but as a first-order framework of implicit expectations, attitudes, and practices that *can* facilitate and promote morally good decisions and actions. Examples include freedom of expression, privacy, reliability, respect, sustainability, transparency, trust, openness, fair competition, and so forth. In this talk, I shall argue that building and maintaining the right sort of infraethics and maintaining it is one of the crucial challenges faced by governance today, because an infraethics is not morally good in itself, but it is what is most likely to yield moral goodness if properly designed and combined with the right moral values. ◊

Rahel Jaeggi ◊ N.N.

N.N. ◊

Julian Nida-Rümelin ◇ Plädoyer für eine normative (humanistische) Anthropologie

Die traditionelle philosophische Anthropologie hat zwei für sie zentrale Herausforderungen nicht angemessen bewältigt und dies mit einer zunehmenden Marginalisierung bezahlen müssen: Die erste Problematik kann man unter die Überschrift „Naturalismus“ stellen. Die traditionelle philosophische Anthropologie hat keine Antwort auf die Naturalismus-Kritik spätestens seit George Edward Moores *Principia Ethica* gefunden. Die zweite Herausforderung ist die der Krypto-Normativität anthropologischer Theorien. Im Gewande der Bestimmung des Wesens des Menschen werden impliziter inhaltliche normative Positionen eingenommen, deren Begründung sich dann unter Verweis auf die unwandelbare Menschennatur zu erübrigen scheint. Beide Herausforderungen kann man als zwei Aspekte desselben Phänomens interpretieren. Im Vortrag soll zum einen für die Unverzichtbarkeit philosophischer Anthropologie argumentiert werden, zum anderen aber gezeigt werden, dass eine explizit normative, humanistisch geprägte Anthropologie beide Herausforderungen bewältigen kann. Die Form dieser Bewältigung ist realistisch und kohärentistisch. ◇