



UNIVERSITÉ
DE GENÈVE

FACULTÉ DES SCIENCES
DE LA SOCIÉTÉ

GECOPOL

THE GENEVA COLLOQUIUM IN POLITICAL THEORY

PRINTEMPS / SPRING 2021

Abstracts

Jeudi 4 mars | Axel Gosseries (Université catholique de Louvain)

Age-adjusted Voting Weight

Should old-age votes be granted less weight? In this paper, I discuss whether we should adjust voting weights to age, focusing on advanced age. I begin with rebutting two objections. I then present the idea of lifetime egalitarianism, before engaging in more detail with two possible justifications for granting lesser weight to the votes of elderly citizens: the future residence time and the differential longevity arguments. I conclude on whether these two pro-tanto arguments suffice.

Mardi 23 mars | Jérôme Grand (Université de Genève / IEP Paris)

De la juste valeur de la liberté d'association

Ce projet de recherche se focalise sur le concept d'association sociale comme un exemple paradigmatique d'association permettant de questionner, dans une perspective rawlsienne, la valeur de la liberté d'association pour le respect de soi-même et son traitement dans les théories constitutionnelles et dans les théories contemporaines de la justice.

Mercredi 24 mars | Francesco Laruffa (Université de Genève)

Towards a post-neoliberal social citizenship?

Drawing from the literature on social citizenship in normative political theory and that on neoliberalism in political economy, this paper argues that for building a post-neoliberal social citizenship it is not enough to increase social policy generosity – as it is often assumed in the welfare state literature. In particular, the presence of democratization processes aimed at revitalizing the political-democratic dimension of social citizenship and at redistributing political power in society is what distinguishes alternatives to neoliberalism from its social-inclusive versions.

Lundi 12 avril | Lisa Herzog (Rijksuniversiteit Groningen)

Democratic Institutionalism

In this lecture, I discuss “democratic institutionalism” as an approach to political theorizing that turns from principles to institutions. At its core, it asks which institutions are needed, in complex, modern societies, to uphold citizens’ equal freedom and the institutional structures that let democratic life flourish. I argue that truthful communication is a key dimension of democratic institutionalism, thereby drawing a connection to questions of political epistemology. In a nutshell: we cannot theorize about democracy without theorizing about democratic knowledge.

Lundi 19 avril | Valeria Ottonelli (Università di Genova)

Justice in Emigration

In this paper, I argue that a fundamental issue of domestic justice in liberal democratic states concerns the conditions in which emigration takes place. I claim that emigrants suffer an injustice from their state when they have to choose between the enjoyment of their right to stay in their home country and socio-economic opportunities they are entitled to. More specifically, sending states are wronging those emigrants whose range of opportunities at home is below the domestic standard of equality of opportunity.

Mardi 27 avril | Yoann Della Croce, Matteo Gianni & Valeria Marino (Université de Genève)

Citizenship and Mental Illness

Mardi 4 mai | Yoann Della Croce (Université de Genève)

Medical Institutions, Assisted Suicide, and the Limits of Self-Governance

Justifications of refusal to provide physician-assisted suicide have recently gone beyond the traditional objection of conscience, instead basing refusal on a right of non-participation grounded in institutional self-governance. As such institutions, qua institutions, should be left to decide what medical procedures they offer. I draw some limits to this position through the adoption of a Rawlsian perspective. Doing so allows to both nuance the radical self-governing view while simultaneously tackle the difficult question of the obligations of private medical institutions.

Mardi 18 mai | Edward Hall (University of Sheffield)

Political Compromise and Dirty Hands

In this paper, I offer an original account of why compromising in politics is likely to involve the kind of politically necessary but morally problematic behaviour at the heart of the dirty hands thesis. On the view I defend, compromising politicians do not dirty their hands simply because they choose to negotiate on matters of principle. Rather, I contend that when forging a political compromise, negotiators can either comply with the requirements of ethical compromise-making or abide by the special obligations they have to their representees, but they cannot do both simultaneously. As a result, reasonable resentments about how a political compromise was negotiated will almost inevitably emerge and compromise-makers will not be able to explain their conduct in a way that can cancel all these grievances. This explains why political compromises can be classed as dirty, even if choosing to compromise on a particular issue is, all things considered, the politically responsible thing to do.

Mardi 25 mai | Federico Zuolo (Università di Genova)

Animals and Politics: A Liberal Theory

Although starting from disagreement has been the hallmark of many politically liberal theories, none have been devoted to the treatment of animals, and conversely, most theories in animal ethics do not take the disagreement on this issue seriously. But to tackle the pervasive conflicts that characterize our societies, we should begin from this disagreement. To honor the liberal principle of legitimacy, we need a framework of public justification suitable to the disagreement about the treatment of animals.