

RCJP Distinguished Lecture 2014 – Sally Haslanger

Canadian Journal of Philosophy Distinguished Lecture 2014 by Professor Sally Haslanger: Social Structure, Narrative and Explanation

I'd like to introduce our speaker in the Canadian and philosophy distinguished lecture series, this is our second lectures. Today we have Professor Sally Hassinger who is a foreign Professor of philosophy women's and gender studies at MIT, judging from the standing room only crowd I don't think Professor Hassinger needs further introduction so let me just welcome her.

It's a really great honour to be here and thank you for coming, there are some seats available so for the people who are sitting in the aisles if you'd prefer to get a seat I completely take a second to let you get through to have seats. Also there is a handout, those of you who are unable to get a paper copy if you have a device you can go to sallyhaslanger.weebly.com/research.html and you look down a little bit and there is a link to the handout okay? W-E-E-B-L-Y weebly.com. If you just click sallyhaslanger.weebly.com it comes up with the research tab, if you go to the research tab and scrolled down in progress like this, I will show you there.

Okay so the way I do talk is I use a very elaborate hand out and I read some of it and then I add a little bit, I think this is important for those having trouble processing auditory for whatever reason, or maybe first time in English so I hope this helps you. If you have trouble hearing me at any point raise your hand and I can also sum it up. Okay so let's get going; introduction. Recent work when implicit, why that seems to require a key ingredient in the explanation of persistence in equality in societies where all of those substantial prospects have been achieved there is still far to go.

People in societies are much greater for instance being put towards social justice remain unjust. While I argue that one of you wrongs that have been in 21st centuries cannot be achieve overnight, the arc of the modern universe is long injustice can still be distance even if we're making progress. Even so, it is illuminating to see that injustice persists in the face of good intentions and increase the protections and it is important to determine why it persists, and I hope I don't have to hear some kind of a pump about all the various injustices that tend to exist, they are pretty devastating.

So this is where a study that puts in advice, seems to offer insight, not all discrimination is explicit. Our cooperative systems are constructed in such a way that our primary school recent intentions are just the tip of the iceberg, our reception followed in action are also substantially influenced by positive structures that are not normally evident to us. Even those who are complicity converted to equality and justice may not have the blessed act to ways that are problematically discriminatory, for explicit deliberation enters the process of deciding how to act quite late or only in strenuous circumstances, if at all. Perhaps learning how to manage implicit bias seems more effective than when the arcs of justice can be sooner achieved.

How many people here have not heard of this advice? Yes, we're making progress on this okay so implicit bias; it is this research in service psychology had shown that even if your highly commitment to equality in your conscious beliefs that especially under conditions where you have to make quick judgements and the awful standard of evidence that this is shooter experiments, where you have a button that you have to push and you get lots of pictures flashed in front of you and you have to decide whether the individual in the picture has a gun and if they do you have to push

the button to shoot and yes we all assume that if it's a black male it's a gun and not a cell phone and we shoot right? Even if we're committed to social justice, and it's hard if you want to gain the system because if you pause and don't shoot that also is an indicator that you're bias because of the how the system is, because you had to think and that's why. It's a very complicated kind of research, it's very

RCJP Distinguished Lecture 2014 – Sally Haslanger

complicated in how it works and how it's trying to test our implicit processing but it is very very robust data that says that we do have these implicit biases.

Although I'm convinced that implicit bias plays a role and perpetuating injustice argue that an advocate of how implicit bias functions must be situated in a broader area of social structures and structural justice when changing structures is often a preconditioned for changing patterns of 'inaudible' in action, and it certainly required for a further change.

Now some of you are going to say well duh but I check with people of those who are going to say yeah duh, well I'm hoping that what I say may be illuminating about why the duh. So for those of who are less familiar with some of the work on social justice has been dying, critical race theory, genders theory for the past several decades here is a little primer on structural injustice. So there is a tradition that the only social justice that argues it's sustains on the focus and the actions and attitudes on individuals as the primary source of injustice for racism, sexism and other forms of oppression are structural. There are some chairs down here if you at the back want to come and sit down? Don't worry about interrupting its fine, just make your way. Very roughly 1) racism, sexism in the life of the analysed in the primary sense in terms of unjust and interlocking social structures, not in terms of the actions and attitudes of individuals, although individuals can add racist perceptive attitudes, these are entirely necessary or sufficient for race or sex oppression. A normative core of what's wrong with racism and sexism when it's not in a bad attitude to individuals but in the asymmetrical 'inaudible' and benefits in regarding to relationships that fits societies and toes on such groups. Now one person who disagrees with this is Jorge Garcia who thinks that racism is in the heart and that you have a will in some way or you have to participate in an institutional, it was created out of ill will. So he's an example of someone who disagrees with the structural repel, but there are a lot of people who are concerned with justice who don't care about the will of the people who gave institution; it's about eponyms or it's about procedures or something like that.

So 2) correcting the wrongs of racism and sexism in the life is not best achieved on focusing on the bad attitudes of individuals because partial injustices persist even when the attitudes change and people like normal are resentful when their brain cause problems much bigger than themselves, and resentful people are resistance to change. So against this backdrop it's unclear how to situate recent work on bits of bias, first isn't this bias introduced into the debate as part of normative analysis that belongs to racism and sexism? Or simply as a fact as possible explanation of persistent inequality, and you'll find that there's quite a bit of philosophical literature these days on whether we are morally responsible for our implicit racist ideas etc, implicit sexist ideas and how that might be part of an analysis of what racism is and such like that. So that's one possibility but it could be that it's not, that it's not a part of the normative analysis. And second if the best explanation of social stratification is structural then it puts it bias seams at best to be gentle to what's new to achieve justice. My recent emphasis on implicit bias as a solution, my concern in the discussion will be on the explanatory rather than the normative role of implicit bias; so I'm looking at what are the courses of social stratification. Normative work as many people know I leave to others, I don't really RCJP do normative work, but I do really but I pretend I don't because I don't want to be held to it because I'm not really into it.

Okay so part of the picture that I want to make here is that philosophers are a real buddy buddy with psychologists and convenience psychologists and social psychologists, but you know what? They're not the experts on social stratifications; it's the sociologists who are the experts on social stratification so why do we run off to the psychologists all the time to sort of see what their stories are? Because they're god damn good at this. But if we really wanted to draw on a rich empirical tradition and discipline in understanding social stratification we really ought to look at the social sciences more broadly, and not that's what we'll be doing with this talk.

RCJP Distinguished Lecture 2014 – Sally Haslanger

Even if oppression is structural phenomenon recognition implicit bias is of a more significant advance than an argument just offered acknowledging. Like I was trying to say look its all structural s why are we worrying about this advice? So here is attempt at a response but I'm going to 'inaudible' for it now. So regarding 1A and 2A although racism and sexism can curve without explicit racist and sexist attitudes, injustice is always going to involve problematic behaviour on parted individuals and that behaviour is possibly a result of implicit racists and sexist attitudes. So yeah, you can't just say it's all the structure and not me I didn't have anything to do with it, because we are participating in these structures all the time. And implicit bias may be part of the normative story but as far as we can change our implicit attitude we are plausibly responsible for it, so there's something's to beat out there. And although the charge of implicit bias is personal it avoids blaming individuals obligatory, more culprits collected, we all suffer from implicit bias so no one is singled out as an evil perpetrator.

So this is what I tell people when I'm trying to do implicit bias, look I'm not drilling into you, don't get resentful that's the whole strategy of people who try to make change or disruption, and I'm one of them. Okay but it doesn't go far enough so, why not? Now I'm going to draw a line and chose Tilly, of course Tilly has a book called Durable Inequality which was a very important book in sociology on social stratification, he's like a representative though of the whole thirty years of debate on this and he's a representative of one strategy of understanding social stratification. So Tilly has described a common form of narrative explanation as ubiquitous in everyday life and I think it's also ubiquitous in philosophy. A newer explanation works combining a standard story, now here is the standard story; to construct the standard story start with a limited number of interacting characters individual or collected, your characters may be persons but they may also be organisations such as churches in states or even abstract categories such as social classes and regions.

Treat your characters as independent, conscious and self motivated, make all of your significant actions occurrence consequences of their own deliberations or impulses, when that time states which your characters are now at with the possible exception of externally generated accidents you can call them chance or acts of god, make sure everything that happens results to become your characters actions. Now Tilly goes on just to size the key elements, standard stories provide 1) unlimited number of interactive characters. 2) Unlimited time in space. 3) Now I think this has to be qualified if you're talking about churches in the states but you'll get the idea, independent conscious self motivated actions. 4) With the exception of externally generated accidents all actions resulting in previous actions by the characters. Think of almost all of the examples that we used in our x type, they are all stories as far as I can tell.

Tilley argues however that whatever else we have learned about inequality social scientists have made clear that a great deal of social and inequality results from indirect, unintended collective an environmentally media, in fact mediated effects that vary badly into standard stories.

Okay so I'm going to look at standard story of social stratification and then we're going to add the implicit bias tweak. So the standard story of social stratification keeping the mind that stand stories apart from what Tilley has just described, here is an example. Greg is an employer who is considering three candidates for a job, Omi, Cathy and Eric, Greg is exquisitely sexist and racist and although Omi and Cathy are better qualified than Eric Greg hires Eric because he's a white male rather than Omi or Cathy. Repeat this scenario including applications for educational opportunities, access to health and financial resources etc. and this provides an explanation of some social inequality along the lines of race and sex.

Okay lots of people discriminate, that's how it happens. I think most of us would say well yeah but that's not how it happens because most of us are well intentioned and all of those people in all of those democracies are well intentioned and that's how we are able to hire the best candidate just

RCJP Distinguished Lecture 2014 – Sally Haslanger

because there's a white male. So let's move to what I'm going to call the nouveau story to social stratification and instead of explicit we have implicit. So it's the same as the standard story except Greg is not explicitly racist but only implicitly so. Greg's actions and those others like him are neither consciously or intentionally discriminatory nether the less repeated occurrences of implicit bias explain systematic inequality along the lines of race and sex. So I think that a lot of people have replaced that standard story for what I'm calling the nouveau story, so really the issue is we're all implicitly bias, we have these bad biases and we do some lumping around of people, when we see people on the street when we see that their dirty and whatever we think their homeless and we shun them and we see people who are overweight and we shun them, and we see people who are ugly and we shun them. And of course some on the base of race and sex and other kinds of things we made choices, we made decisions and we interact with them in ways which are problematic and while over this is inevitable throughout the bureaucracy and so this is the course of sex and race injustice.

Now although nouveau stories do not rely simply on contents of intentional action they remain I think limited in their ability to accommodate the kind of explanation that Tilly has in mind, but wait what sort of explanation does he have in mind? Now I'm not going to now go into Tilley's specific brand of his theory of durable inequality, we can talk a little bit about that if you want but I think there are multiplicity of ways that we need to explain social stratification without drawing on Tilley's in particular or these views about implicit bias, and what I'm trying to do here is throw out, get some plausible cases or examples of how this sort of thing works, referencing other kinds as well so there's three ways that structures in our culture can be explanatory.

I should mention maybe now we haven't given this particular report before so I'm kind of feeling my way about what you need to know when but a lot of people in the social sciences and feminist work and critical race work think that society is sort of constituted by social relations which have to do with institutional structures and their role in particular structures but also in culture. So social scientists talk about social relations roughly and humanities talk about culture and culture has to do with film and literature and popular culture in all of that sense. And so I'm going to be talking a little bit about the various ways that there are forces beyond the individual that might be relevant with social relations and culture.

So here are some structural constraints and enablement's, there's a simple case I believe Larry and Lisa are employed at the same company in comparable positions and they make the same salary, they have a child Mumu, they decided to be equal co parents of the child however Lisa is illegible for paid maternity leave and Larry is not illegible for any paid parental leave. They can't afford to have Larry take unpaid leave, Lisa becomes the primary carer with her experience of the first three months when she has leave and when she returns to work she chooses a more flexible schedule because she is the one who has the closer relationship with Mumu and is more familiar with Mumu's needs and Mumu depends on her. And ten years later Larry's salary is higher than Lisa's which gives him more power at home and in the work place.

This is a variant of an example that is given by Susan Oaken and elaborated by Anne Cudd but the idea is that there are structures like paid parental leave that can be implemented completely fairly and implemented according to the letter of the law without any kind of bias and still they have these bad affects. So a crucial factor is such a scenario that Lisa and Larry's decision making is relationally constrained, who are not in the position to make the decisions that are independent of each others in the context of finds of options that are available to each, that is their behaviour is affected by their positions in a structure. They're remaking the power that does without any bias explicit or implicit on the chart you individuals interact with. Now I'm drawing near the focusing on some work by Alan Garfinkel called Forms of Explanations and he has a great example I'll give you very briefly, so you imagine you're waiting for a class and Garfinkel he imagines he's grading on a curve so that only one

RCJP Distinguished Lecture 2014 – Sally Haslanger

student can get an A+ and it's going to be the student who breaks the best final. And so you say then Mary writes the best final and Mary gets the A in the class and you ask the question why did Mary get the A in the class? Well you could say well she wrote an amazing final but that's not a good explanation, that individual fact about her and her final is not a good explanation because Bob wrote an amazing final too but Bob didn't get an A. Mary got the A not just because she wrote the best final but because the rules of the curve said that only the best final could get an A. So here is the situation where you have to rely on structural facts about the background, the curve which says that only one person get an A and it might even be that Mary did write the best final right? But just saying that she wrote an original final saying some fact about her is not adequate because the distribution of grades is relationally constrained, only one person can get an A. And so facts about each individuals final is not sufficient, Rob wrote a great final, even saying Mary's final was better than Bob's that doesn't explain why Mary got the only A. What explains how Mary got the only A is the curve said that only one person can get an A so that's a very vivid say waiting for applause for professors, to see that there are these relational constraints and the Mary example, Larry and Lisa example is supposed to be it's not perfect but it's supposed to be the same kind of thing. When the distribution is relationally constrained then you can't just talk about the vast of individuals you have to break that structure into account.

Okay here's another one; social meaning, I've talked about this this is a work I've done on education systems and forthcoming in the voids review but it's also 'inaudible', so dismissed on class, Rajan and Jamal are public high school students in a history class together, the teacher Miss H and about three quarters of the class are white. In a discussion of the assigned material Rajan repeatedly interrupts Miss H to disagree with her and talks over the students when they try to answer her questions.

Miss H asked Rajan to stop interrupting and to wait his turn but this just makes him more agitated, eventually Miss H asks him to leave and to report to assistant principals office. Jamal and other non white students in the class take Miss H to be calling out Rajan because he's black and stop trusting her and as a result they don't engage the material and do poorly in her class. Now this is a very tiny little view of a lot of work in social psychology among other things and cultural psychology which talks about the importance of atmospheric trust in order to be able to learn affectively and when atmospheric trust breaks down then there are all kinds of withdrawal prophecies and optimism is depleted and ego depletion stuff happens, all the time stuff happens that makes it much more difficult for you to learn. And I learnt that this is relevant to understanding the achievement gap so for the purposes of the example let's suppose that Miss H has a strict policy of dismissing students from class who disrupt the discussion and prevent others from sharing their views and then she applies the policy barely to Rajan, she's not acting to Rajan in a way that is bias, nether the less her action has social meaning that she does not control. Such examples suggest that social meaning when reoccurring together with common psychological responses to pressurization and disrespect, for example Miss conducts the ego desertion act of pessimism is about her inner explaining the academic achievement gap.

So in general words and actions have meanings that go beyond their agents

intentions so think of virgin arthritis, the women comes into the doctor's office and says oh doctor I've have arthritis in my thigh and she doesn't have arthritis in her thigh because arthritis doesn't occur in her thigh and the meaning of the term arthritis is not determined by what is in her head because she thinks arthritis can be in the thigh, it's determined by public meaning. Lessig has an example of seatbelts, Lawrence Lessig is a Professor of law and he talks about travelling in Budapest in the mid 90's and getting into a cab and putting on a seatbelt and they're like is there something wrong with the driver? Now he didn't intend to insult the driver but putting on your seatbelt in a cab at that point in time in that place was insulting and I think then we can begin to localise generally.

RCJP Distinguished Lecture 2014 – Sally Haslanger

Speech acts, we perform speech acts that we don't intend like this happens I think you can insult the Queen for example, this is an example by Bretsky also, Clive's standing up when the Queen enters but suppose Clive doesn't know the social norms and he frustrates himself, he might have insulted the Queen or embarrassed the Queen or something like that but not through intention.

So there are these things social meanings and social meanings mediating our relationships with each other and they're not just what meaning your action has is not determined just by your intentions. Yeah so for example telling someone digging into a large serving of French fries that fries are unhealthy which, my brother in law's really good at this, he's very good at telling people just the facts, just the facts French fries are unhealthy because he's not very socially aware, but it has different social meaning depending on whom you're addressing. In the same I want to say for sending the student to the assistant principle for acting up in class, now you might want to say isn't social meaning a matter of attitude somehow? And here is one of the quotes from Lessig, 'Any society or social context where it's what I call here is social meanings, the semiotic content attached to various actions or inactions or statuses within a particular context.' And despite of the possibility to change in context station the affects of social meaning are their quote in an important way not optional, they empower or restrain individuals whether or not the individuals chooses the power of constraints. I think there are threads in the fabric of culture and they matter a lot. What he said about the meanings of one's behaviour will have a significant effect on how one behaves in general so think of scaring that threat when you believe that other people are going to interpret you as a representative of your social group and then that social group is thought to be bad at math or whatever then that has an effect on your performance. Notice even if no one in the circumstance actually forms those beliefs so it's a social meaning, social stigma works so social stigma works because various stereotype thread, even though nobody in the environment is going to be curating an exam actually believe the stigma. Andrea Anderson has another example of a current occurrence in the reservation book where her car breaks down in Detroit in a rough neighbourhood and she gets out of the car wondering what to do and a black man walks up to her and says I'm not going to hurt you I want to help. So she didn't have the stigma she didn't stigmatise him or have that belief, he didn't certainly have the stigmatising beliefs but they had to spend five minutes sort of assuring each other that they didn't have these because there was a social meaning there. And I think that people who do 'inaudible' language oh my gosh, meanings are public. Social meanings are derogatory or stigmatising true beliefs about meaning we all have systematic blindfold affects so beliefs about the meaning is going to potentially be harmful because it will lead you to be mistrustful.

Okay other than the cultural dimension, the first was the kind of structural dimension and then primarily keen on also what's in material dimensions so this one maybe is obvious but we'll go through it anyway. Bus schedule, Jason has a job at a factory in the suburbs his shift begins at 6am he's 'inaudible' (27:40) at allows the bus to get to work. He takes the first bus from his neighbourhood in the morning, after a forty five minute commute he arrives at his job on time. Due to cutbacks however the city has decided to reduce the bus service and there's no bus leaving the city in the morning that will get him to work on time so he asks for a shift change but he's not illegible. Maybe seniority allows, only if you have certain seniority can you get shift changes or they're only disrupted by seniority, and he loses his job. If you think a variant of this if you want, any kind that will accommodate a wheelchair, so lack of access to things, wealth, technology, transportation and other contributes whether it be social goods. It's a huge fashion in explaining social inequality, Jason's bus may be constrained by rules about shift changes, the city may constrained by the tax space and Jason enrolls in a similar position as purely constrained by the lack of resources.

I don't think implicit bias is at all relevant here, the case is just sketched that these are familiar and intended to be a reminder of some factors other than individual discrimination or bias but it's swaying persistent in equality. The point is not the discrimination has never played a role at any point

RCJP Distinguished Lecture 2014 – Sally Haslanger

in the history of the policies norms, meanings or distributions of resources rather than it's obvious claim, it's the narrative explanation of the sort modelled on a standard story or the nouveau story, this is pretty much all of the I think important factors in the persistence of social inequality. I think it's not even a stir to talk about the standard story or the nouveau story because all of this other stuff is going on. So there is a tendency among, so this is section five, remissional, the cultural, sometimes raw materials involve beat that (29:28) groups. There's a tendency among those who in force structuralistic counts of injustice to claim that social relations determine culture or ideology. 'inaudible' that these installations of production constitutes the economic structure of society and the whole foundation on which RCJP Distinguished Lecture 2014 – Sally Haslanger arises a legal and political and super structure and to which corresponds definite forms of social consciousness. The mode of production and material life conditions the general process of social, political and intellectual life it's not the consciousness of man that determines their existence but their social existence that determines their consciousness. I have to say I am extremely sympathetic to this but I'm not a crude Marxist. You can decide that for yourself whether you're in Marxist's club, I'm trying

not to. Explicit and implicit bias is simply ideology that's internalised while occupying the social structures its course but the individual attempts to correct from implicit bias is not only going beside the point, it is futile as long as the social structures remain. However there's a 'inaudible' sense of business sociology and related fields that social explanation applies the tension to the independence to structure, culture and agency, so there is controversy of how they're each defined. But to me quality is structural, this is Jennifer Imsquare in a paper where she's actually here criticizing a lot of the work on, I suppose of you who in advanced work would know about the Nancy Frasier stuff about recognition, she's arguing against the recognition emphasis by the distribution act and 'inaudible'. She's saying if equal is structural that is linked to the distribution of goods and resources and banking and everyday roles and interactions but it's also we continually we activate through agency. A lot of structural changes are changes in consciousness will form their own disruptive of the future reinforcing facets of domination, that's the Marxist one. We cannot even think ourselves out of oppression, moral freedoms or automatically from a redistribution of goods and resources so this is the other side of it; redistributing the goods, resources isn't going to be it because culture adapts etc., so you have cultural changes as well. We are agents and we are born both by culture and entranced in social relations so both of these are interdependent and if you can change culture that will social relations, that will change culture and then vice versa all round in a circle. Now the pessimistic take on this is that the relation and cultural dimensions reinforce each other by forming feedback loops, so for example stigmatising meanings, generate mistrust that alienate non like teens from school. At the lack of education and concern with professional success reinforces distinct advising meanings. So there is a pessimistic feedback group right? So the teacher throw Rajan out of the class, let's suppose that she is you know stigmatising or bias or let's suppose that she isn't but it's just that that's the social meaning right? So that she does that has this social meaning so Rajan and his buddies become disinvested in education right? And then they become less educated and have less jobs, that reinforces the stigma. So there is this loop that is problematic but there's an optimistic take on it and the optimistic take is that the varying appropriation in needs of reduction may not be necessary in order to go about social change. That's supposed to be a joke. For resisting agency and called counter cultural movements can make a difference and join the tension to correcting implicit bias can be part of the effort. So yes there are eventual underlying structures with meaning but part of what we need to do is disrupt that, challenge it, raise questions about it, convince the elites that this is automatic and then that can produce more adjust structures will which reinforce a better culture a less stigmatising culture.

If individual attention to implicit bias is valuable, so where I've argued thus far, where am I so far? I've said look, I've gone back and forth back and forth it's confusing. Look implicit bias, it's really hot these days but why is it so hot? Because we don't know that injustice is structural, yeah it is

RCJP Distinguished Lecture 2014 – Sally Haslanger

structural and all these layers have got nothing to do with implicit bias right? Oh but maybe if we see that social structure and culture are interdependent then the tension to implicit bias may make a difference after all because you don't have to be a total reductionists about culture, you don't have to say that culture just in Cartesian sense epiphenomenal because you can say there's this interdependence and implicit bias is programmed here in the culture in addition to the structures, so we philosophers we have something to do with culture and friendliness people working in literature and film studies and visibility studies, we have some input in the culture and our input into culture can convince elites and others to change their stigmatising beliefs and that can then get in trenched into new social deflations and with that positive spiral instead of the negative spiral.

That's how this started being in response of that. So significant in implicit bias is valuable then why does long lecture form doubts? And if individual agency can describe unjust structures why are their complaints about standard stories? And now I come back to standard stories, some of you may already know this although in section three I made doubts about the usefulness of stories in four I glide heavily in stories about Larry and Lisa or Rajan, Miss H and Jason. So I was telling stories too and so I said oh, narrative like stories, bad. Hey listen to these stories. So this is to show that narrative is valuable and explaining persistence equality. Know that tipping is not planning that narrative in general is at odds for explaining inequality; it's the focus on standard stories.

The first problem with standard stories is their individualism and I would add their psychologism and the same problem as we as theorists lose track of the fact that stories are produced through social processing, so let me say a little bit about that first point just to elaborate. The individualism and psychologism when in his views standard stories are going to be that what happens, that explanation of the inequality occurs by reference to the actions and beliefs and intentions of the individuals. In the stories that I was giving they also had to do with transportation systems, they had to do with social meanings that were beyond the beliefs and the actions of individuals.

So what I wanted to say, so the first point about, oh look didn't I just rely on them? I submit that I wasn't providing standard stories I was providing stories where themes were happening and the explanation of what was happening wasn't just through the actions of individuals or individuals beliefs or desires. So that's the percent. But then another thing is that we lose track of the fact that so many stories are produced in and through social processes, stories are a way that we create social meaning so we are the participants here as well as the explainers. We are explaining things through social through standard stories but we are also reinforcing and creating ideologies as well. I don't like to put it but you know I don't use that word as much as I'd like because people get turned off.

Okay so here's another quote from Tilley, 'Stories immerse from active social interchange, modernised resultants of interchange but in their turn constraints social interchange as well. They embody ideas disconcerting what forms of actions and interaction of possible, feasible, desirable and efficacious it's at least by implication what forms of actions or interactions, whether it be impossible, impracticable, undesirable or ineffectual. Even if the individuals involved harbour other ideas the imbedding of stories in social networks seriously constraints in our actions and it's collectives actions of which people in those networks are capable. And so one of the things you see with really interesting ethnography and social science is that ideology is passed on through stories, stories that can tell about what's possible and what's not possible, have a gamers system, have a succeed. We tell these stories all the time, Susan Silby calls it a kind of folk sociology that we all have and the folk sociology is passed onto each other even in standard stories typically. Okay now standard stories may be irresistible for humans but they are also valuable because they focus on the autonomy of persons and enable us to locate and judge more responsibility. So one of the reasons I think in ethics people are so excited about standard stories is that look humans are autonomist and we act on our beliefs

RCJP Distinguished Lecture 2014 – Sally Haslanger

and desires and we're free, and our capacity to do that makes us free blah blah blah. And now because of that we can judge moral responsibility because we just tracked the individual and their beliefs and desires and they we apportion more responsibility based on that. Tilley is aware of this he says people ordinarily carry on in their moral reasoning in standard story mode, they judge actual or possible actions via conscious motives and their immediately foreseeable affects. But as Tilley suggested before standard stories provide a explicable exorable guide to social explanation and I would add standard stories are an exorable guide as to what is morally relevant. The focus on individuals and their attitudes includes the structural and cultural context that both restrains and enables our action and the injustice that we mindlessly enact. They reinforce fictional conceptions of autonomy and self determination that prevent us from taking responsibility or our social adds stuff or the social meanings, the social relations and social structures that we enact. I also would like to suggest that I think standard stories tend to be framed ideologically, now what ideology we have available to us is and what hegemonic ideology we have available to us is what we use in framing standards stories, particularly what we need to do is break that down and come up with other ways of representing ourselves and our relationships to each other.

So here's a long conclusion of one really 'inaudible', it's not just sum up.

Thus far I've suggested that although there's a state for attention to implicit bias in social practice, it's only a small space and implicit bias should not simply be invoked in a standard story or an invoke story mode of explanation. I've also suggested that we should be cautious more generally in relying on standard stories, that they warrant a place as proper object of theorising not just a tool to theorise. I want to add two broader thoughts and the first is method illogical and the other is on ontological. So A) Methodology; a long standing issue in social science is roughly the relationship between first person understandings of action and social processes and third person on explanations of them. So this is for those of you who are familiar with mostly social science there is the verstan (42:26) people and there's the explanation people and the verstan people think that you've got to understand action, social processes sort of from the inside as interpretive, as governed by rational reflection and deliberation etc. etc. And then the explanation people are going to be those who say forget that stuff, it's all about income or all about something that you aren't aware of when making your choices and decisions, so looking at cultural correlation trying to make judgements about causation and stuff like that. It isn't first personal. Now of the least respective pretending to be at ours and in fear of relying themselves on one size quote to the other and I'm going to suggest that that isn't necessarily, that isn't necessary. Attention to the relation, cultural or deterrable symbolic feedback groups suggests that there's a dynamic relationship between explanation and edification or I would like to say explanation and emancipation. Our first person understandings of action and social processes for example in standard stories are culturally formed and critical distance is necessary in order to gain both descriptive in order to purchase on them. So you can tell all of this in our standard story mode all of our good reasons and all of our good intentions, beliefs and desires and all of that kind of stuff, that is a cultural formation and in order to get critical distance on that social formation I think we're going to have to get into possible explanations of it that aren't going to look so obvious from the first person point of view. We're gaining both descriptive and anomic purchase in affect social phenomena, social phenomenology cannot trump explanation. Social explanation in term offers resources to change our understandings of action and social processes but explanation itself is a tool and importantly a tool for, I think, self understanding. So social explanation should be gaged not only are scientific but also our interpretive and normative projects. Or at least interdependence between the emancipatory agency and explanation is at the heart of critical social theory.

So here is the idea; we go through life we can't help but go through it on our standard stories and we know we're pretty good at reconstructing our behaviour as rational and motivated by good

RCJP Distinguished Lecture 2014 – Sally Haslanger

intentions, etc. etc. but just as Marx said that religion is 'inaudible' people are rarely like that, there's going to be all kinds of social explanations that say you are self deceived this is not really what's going on etc. etc. and I think some of the implicit bias stuff is relevant there. But then what happens is that gives you critical distance on this self understanding, these social scientific stories give us critical distance, both normative and descriptive but then I also think that those explanations are going to have to be evaluated in light of the ways in which they give us new tools and new resources for thinking about ourselves. So it's not that that's part of what I think is important and valuable about critical social theory, it's that it's not just giving us story, giving us explanations that are inaccessible to us that we can't change ourselves in light of, what they're doing is offering new interpretations to new vocabularies, new self understandings. So just as there is this cultural, relational materials about the feedback group I think that's important in understanding what a good social theory is trying to do.

So that was the methodological point and here's the ontological point; critique of explanatory individualism often leads theorists to deny ontological individualism so for example Tilley's approach to social theory displaces the individual from the centre of analysis and instead focuses on relations, he says transaction, interaction, information flow exchange, mutual influence or social tie is the elementary unit. So at this point it's just an explanatory claim so when you're trying to explain what's going on in the social world you need to look at interactions and things like that and that's going to be the key explanatory tool. Now I'm sympathetic with this approach though I tend to focus on social progresses in a broader range or social relations, there are the interactionists where it's all going to be about direct interactions and stuff like that, I think that's too constrained but we don't have to get into that. But Tilley goes on and he says for relational realists, individuals, groups and social systems are contingent changing social products of interaction. So he is going to take that ontological next step and he's going to say not only are interactions and social ties the explanatory base of tools I'm going to use but the ontology is not a fundamental ontology of individuals so that's why I'm going to challenge this ontological ritualism that says social stuff, super beings on individual stuff.

I think we need to go that far that is to reject basic 'inaudible' (47:59) individuals or persons due to the failures of explanatory individualism. With a different meaning of Tilley's claim, and I don't think he would agree with this, but here's one that I want to often him that's more plausible. He said, 'The standard stories locate identities within individual qualities of some combination of attribute experience and consciousness then derive collective identities from attributes experience and consciousness shared by the individuals. And political life however collected by identities always forms as combinations of relations with others representations of those relations and shared understandings of those relations.' So this is a question that actually that's relevant to the last one, what is a collective and there are a lot of people that do social science and social philosophy where the collectives are just groups of individuals and groups and so groups of individuals have consciousness and so there's group consciousness, individuals have intentionality so the group intentionality so there's just this collecting lots of them together which makes you get a collective. I don't think that that's a good way to think about collectives but anyway we should distinguish individuals understood as persons and individuals understood as identities. So in this quote about standard stories Tilley's talking about identities, previously he was talking about individuals. 'But I am not my identity in the relevant sense because for I'm in survivor change of my identity,' however as Tilley suggest identities are relational and are not constituted by my attitudes and consciousness, so I think my gender identity isn't just a matter of what's in my head, roles of my gender can change and I can still continue to exist. So I'm trying to draw a clear distinction here between individuals and identities and I do think identities are relational. Tilley has a point however that is highly apt for certain philosophical approaches to social life, persons are not simply set so their intentionality and social world does not consist of compliant or collective sets of intentionality. So the persons I'm not just decided intentionality I have a body for example, I have relationships with other people I am a

RCJP Distinguished Lecture 2014 – Sally Haslanger

natural being in a natural world. And similarly social groups or collectives are not just collectives of the internationalities, factories, transportation systems; childcare centres, employment and poverty are also social phenomena. And that cause of the implicated in their existence and omission about my 'inaudible' whether I'm aware of it or not. So I'm suggesting here that you shouldn't understand the social world just in terms of collective intentionality, group agency and that kind of stuff, accept the social world is just a bunch of consciousness's that happen to work together because that's not what the social world is, the social world is structures and systems and buildings and foods and forks and knives, those are all part of the social world and I am implicated constantly in the production and the reproduction of all of that stuff whether I'm aware of it or not and I think what we're doing here which will recognise this maybe more recent emphasis on implicit bias and what it's really about.

Thank you so much.

Questions, I try to do my best to identify people as I see them first

Sadly I am troubled by your example about Rajan and Jamal because as a moral philosopher my mind moves immunologically to normative questions so I have to engage 'inaudible' disclaimer, but I felt that there was a normative inclusion floating around that example which isn't expressly commit yourself to, but which are dubious about. So I took you to be implicated or insinuating or suggesting that Miss H should not have sent Rajan to the assistant principal's office?

In my mind my Rajan and Jamal should not have been 'inaudible'

But this is what was troubling me is the policy of sending someone to the assistant principals office when they disrupt sounds reasonable

I agree

She is applying it fairly what is she supposed to do make an exception?

No the whole example depends on your institution at that point

So I guess the way I mean it 'inaudible' what are you supposed to do if the social meaning that some people might attribute, erroneously I might add to your action

But also its rational for them in the circumstances to interpret her in that way is what I would claim, so my claim is she has done nothing wrong, she's got a policy that's a reasonable policy she's applied it fairly, I don't think there's any, I built a case so that she's not at bias and that's she's fair. I want to also say that Rajan and Jamal and their ilk, they give it their background experiences in life and given the social stigma of black males of being overly aggressive and their experience continually of having people in their face about that, it's not implausible that they interpret her as being yet another white woman who can't deal with a black boy being excited in class or something like that. So what I was trying to create was an example where we don't want to really hold either a party morally responsible for doing something wrong, my point is the source of the problem is the social meaning, and that this happens all the time and we don't take responsibility, so in that social meaning of something that I also want to say is, we're all collectively responsible for, so just as we were talking before we're all collectively responsible for some people going hungry at night, we're also collectively responsible for social meanings that are stigmatising to people that affects them. Affects them very badly even though, and it's very much to do with the topic which is the next topic that you're going to talk, it's about how can you really think about collective responsibility for something when you're the one who did it, you did okay but the overall collective harm is still there. So that's what I'm trying to point to that gets included often in our discussion of these kind of things, because either Jamal had to be wrong to blame Miss H or Miss H had to be bias or something like that and

RCJP Distinguished Lecture 2014 – Sally Haslanger

I'm saying no, there's something else that is going on here at the cultural level that we need to take responsibility for.

Yeah but it doesn't answer the question of what Miss H should do?

So I think what has to happen is that Miss H needs to act on her principle that she should be aware or the vice principle should be aware of the consequences and then try to remediate some of the other consequences downstream right? So these are all in the case, in the paper where I talk about these things, these are all actual cases that I know of from the public high school because, for those of you who don't know I have African American children and they went to the Cambridge Latin school. And so I got a lot of, the kids that would come home, sit around the table, talk about what happened at school today and I'd watch them have these reactions and I'd engage with them and one of the things that was so problematic is that there wasn't any downstream effort to reengage what happened and when it happened and what could be done better.

So in fact I think that things that happen would build on the negative, so then Jamal and Rajan would go to class and it would be different the next day and Miss H would just take them to be that their bias might have kicked in right? Or maybe she was thinking that she was treating them autonomously or I don't know what she was thinking, but there wasn't any effort on the part of the structures in the school to recognise that this is happening, what can be done to reverse it? How you can train teachers to see that these are the affects and stuff like that. So here's another thing that happens to kids, when they're in a school setting where they get pissed off by something like this but they know if they get pissed off they're going to be viewed as an angry black male or whatever. They manage their anger and they manage their engagement with other people but no power is hugely ego depleting and if you are, so two things can happen, one is that you don't have the energy to listen to what's going on around you and also later in the day you might just blow up right at things like this? So there's all of these complicated dynamics so weren't they to happen is if you go to the assistant principle and the assistant principle goes uh oh, here's a situation where there might be downstream affects, let's try and find a way to have these kids have ego supplements during the day or something like that, do you know what I mean? If I think about how you can find ways in a day or magnets in destructors that will kind of be an antidote to the poison of social stigma if that makes sense.

I wanted to ask a question about the relation of the standard stories I really liked, you're saying that basically the implicit bias and still falling in standard stories if we run that progress, but it seems like on first glance to me it seems like implicit bias breaks the mould of standard stories more than the cases you give because after all implicit bias means that what happens is we don't independent conscious self motivated actions so unconscious things probably not result in action...

That's where the nouveau story was supposed to come in, they were the same in the individualism and the psychologism but different in the consciousness.

I'd be interested in voicing how they are not standard stories because while it's true that there are these elements that are outside usual choice that affect what goes on, that's true of everything like in the outside world always structures the backs of our choices so if we're using other standards not to the actual world but the social world, the destruction is out of our choices but it seems like I don't see how that's a different form of explanation of how that doesn't fall into sort of standard stories, individuals in brackets

I guess what I was, let's look at my conversation with Sarah I mean I think that when we tell the story of Rajan and Jamal and Miss H there will be tendency to say well what happened was due to the interaction between Rajan and Miss H and whatever and their beliefs, whether implicit or explicit,

RCJP Distinguished Lecture 2014 – Sally Haslanger

the policies that they were following and stuff like that, but where is social meaning? Social meaning isn't involved in there and what I'm saying is social meaning is a further factor that has to be taken into account in understanding human interaction and that standard stories and nouveau stories don't connect. Or in the case of Lisa and Larry I mean I have what I often call my New York Times explanation of social stratification of online success and it's women really like to demise and take care of their babies right?

So they all might be in this weary cut throat professional world, each of them is making an autonomous choice to stick with their jobs and stay home with their babies because that's the way women are right? Okay that's the New York Times explanation believe me, I don't actually project that as an autonomous choice, I think that in many cases it's the rational choice because given wage disparities and given the difficulty of finding affordable child care it's rational for women to quit their jobs and stay home. I also completely love it that some women like that better than they like their professional cut throat bias, fine. But to tell the story as if it's like each individual couple makes this decision because the women really wanted to, which she did, in all of these cases she can assume that she did because all of these individuals just happened to want to quit their job, just completely occludes the fact that there are considerable structural factors which make that the rational choice which make it as cultural factors that make it the case that it's easier for her to do that then for Larry to do it etc. etc. So I'm trying to say that those elements of the story are missing, so Jason is lazy because he doesn't get to work right? Or whatever, that is a little bit extreme, I wouldn't think many people would say that but why this group of people in this neighbourhood are unemployed I think it's very common to talk about well it's because they've got this bad culture in that neighbourhood, they've got their lazy or they're on welfare and that's the sort of, yeah but there's no bus system that can take them to where the jobs are so that's what I was hinting.

So 'inaudible' the way that you discussed a number of different components of injustice, cultural on the one hand neutral, but influences and culture and then bias with implicit or explicit, the specifics of 'inaudible' that you distinct to focus primarily on bias actions. For me it's 'inaudible' to that primarily the reference to what you call society needs where even those with potential low 'inaudible'. I was just wondering what kind of interest, whether you think that the developed prominence or proportions of these different times of injustice has tamed the consequence of world history or recent history, particularly imagining bias a matter of social progress and struggle if it contemplates with the bias, what if technological advantage makes structural factor more and more prominent over individual action?

Great question I think that a lot of people interpret the civil rights movement as having moved us from a world where both structural and attitudinal factors explain 'inaudible' quality and then that attitudinal stuff has shifted between explicit attitude or racist explicit attitudes have diminished and now you think homophobic attitudes etc. have diminished. But what happened was people thought, not everybody but a lot of people thought well, once we get rid of those bad attitudes we're home free, but then it's like no we're not home free, so then the next step what I worry about

is that there are some people who want to say oh that's just because they're still implicitly in us. And what I'm saying, no, you know why they're so implicitly in us? Because the structures really haven't substantially changed in the right kinds of way, so you just need phenomena like the U.S United States is more in terms of education, it's more segregated than it was in the 50's and 60's in terms of segregated schools and the reason is that it wants brown people with educations passed and so mandated integration was implemented. So mandated integration was implemented, there was huge white flight and so white flight or white goes out to the suburbs into more African communities that were known and then school systems are created geographically and then the cast states is what funds the schools system and so now the educational systems are now in fact more segregated

RCJP Distinguished Lecture 2014 – Sally Haslanger

and more 'inaudible' than they even were before the implementation of the brown people of education. So here's a situation where you want to say, well yeah attitudes are still bad, the attitudes are still bad in part because the structures didn't substantially change among the relevant dimension and so I do think that there's this interplay constantly that has to be understood between the awareness and the attitudes and the structures that isn't always taken into account understanding policies. So I do think that we moved, at least in North America, we've moved toward less explicit obscurity, while I do think that we still have many structures that reinforce, so my view about social practice is that we in our social practices constantly, every moment of every day, but we do kind of unthinkingly and that's what the 'inaudible' does, the 'inaudible' provides a disposition that enables us to navigate the social world. That stuff can persist even in the face of conscious humiliation of the kinds of beliefs. So I think that implicit bias is important here and is part of this sort of responsiveness to the social world with in that change many dimensions and wanting us to get us past those biases because they're embodied right? They're part of how we render the world.

Thank you for your question.

Let me offer you another case that might help you illustrate some of your points, a real life case that probably affects many of the people who are present here. That is, I'm sure you know that there is a serious problem at many post academic institutions in the United States that is the high dropout rate, particularly among first year undergraduates. So what happens often is they enrol in university funded class but they feel overwhelmed, they feel inferior, everybody else seems so much smarter than them and they have a bad result on their first chemistry test, they get discouraged and they dropout and they face the rest of their lives. They've come to university and they've failed and they go home and face the fact that they have and it turns out that these students who are most disposed to dropout there are some factors that identify them with being more likely to do so, one is their social economics etc. to cut it short. And the second is that the first one in their family to enter a post secondary institution, so I mean it's not as though the chemistry test is bias, the questions are not bias under explicitly or implicitly, that's an unforced factor, it's something in the system. So if you can identify these students ahead of time somehow and intervene or treat them in some special way so they have extra support

Yeah MIT has this wonderful campaign, as far as I know we have a Venezuelan president, Raphael Wright, and he's first generation in colleague and now he's a president of MIT and there are these posters all over campus of various, or he's one of them that says I am first generation, it's a portrait and it says I'm first generation and they're posted all over campus but they have highly successful, Nobel prize winning scientists and the president of MIT, but then students and staff of the faculty, there are tonnes of them on campus and I think that's an effort, I'm not saying it's successful but that's an effort to place the consciousness to equal that, there are many others here that are first generation and you're not the only ones who are first generation and then it provides information for 'inaudible' cares or 'inaudible' They'll look at it, identify with it and then see that there is support. But I think things like that could be important, I also think that it means contacting guidance councils and coming in the connections between guidance councillors and college advisors and things like that. So I think it's a very good example of where this needs to be going.

Unsurprisingly we have just over fifteen minutes.

Well thank you again for an interesting talk and I'll try and repress it. So it's interesting when you say that standard stories may be irresistible for human beings and any kind of coy about that, so I'll question you on that because it does seem to me that there's something right, I wasn't sure whether it was standard stories or stories and you also read that other kinds of narratives are available. I think that you write these kind of standards, these structures within stories is very

RCJP Distinguished Lecture 2014 – Sally Haslanger

commonplace, in the New York Times we can get TV movies that are weak, but even the New York Times doesn't always do that. Then there are all those modern eastern post modern novels that can benefit this. So in that would getting used to different kind of stories you think may help from here, or is there something about the standard story that is going to be providing an atmospheric efficiency or something like that?

That's a great question, I mean I think I'm not the best person to answer that because it's an empirical question and I want to allow maybe that they're irresistible, they're inevitable whatever, I think Tilley has an interesting point that there are more evaluations and I'm not opposed to more that I wish of individuals, don't get me wrong, I just want to think that there's more than that. And so it may well be that it's really important for us to do kind of more evaluation in terms of the individual waves, atmospheric stories. It may also be really important to passing on culture, passing on traditions in families, we made an awful job of this and whatever, so there may be really really crucial and important roles for standard stories, I didn't want to deny that. But the intense reliance on them I think can occlude this other sort of stuff but I don't really know, Tilley thinks that they are inevitable. But you're right there are other kinds of stories and we ought to, but I don't think we could live in our lives just telling post modern stories

Unless you mean less than finite, finite the pure complexity, I don't think it's very post modern, the complexity of interactions experience is really important to me

So that has complexity and contextual to enable, so I make a crucial point that Tilley's trying to make and I'm picking up on is to tell the story but also get some critical distance on that story, enable yourself to go, oh why didn't I tell the story about Winston this way? Was there something else going on here that we missed so that critical distance is what I think is crucial and that can happen in discussion and dialogue, so you tell the standard story and I say really? Are you sure? I can do it by just inserting a couple of individuals but that can also be stabilised as a standard story, I think that's what a lot of critical race theorists and feminists and 'inaudible' theorists and quiet theorists are doing is destabilising these standard stories to say really? You think it's all about this and that, those two individuals? Does that help?

So I this is also about standard stories, the first one is the fact that Mary getting an A example, it seems like the story was being told based on just to appeal with the curve system and it's missing something as well since it's proven in the system that she didn't get an A

Yeah you can't just be like, so 'inaudible'

So it's either the standard story will also be a part of explanation for why she missed out but the question is why shouldn't 'inaudible' played over the other and I just wanted, my worry is that this does end up being pretty related to the normalist stuff, so it seems like one of these 'inaudible' standard stories is because we're asking the question what should I do when I'm in that particular situation. It seems like the standard stories seems to get those kind of questions much better than the structural stories, so 'inaudible' which I see a 'inaudible' for standard stories just in terms of normative theorems.

So these pens are terrible but I find it really hard to talk about these things without the board at least once, so why did Mary get an A? Can you see that? You can't see it at all, okay. Why did Mary get an A? Dare I bet one thing you could do was just to talk about she studied really hard, she got a really good night's sleep, blah blah blah and she wrote informational and drawing final. But why did she get the A? I think you can't explain why she got the A without talking about the curve, so the

RCJP Distinguished Lecture 2014 – Sally Haslanger

claim I was trying to make isn't that standard stories or facts about individuals are, I was not trying the fact that individuals are never relevant, I was not claiming that in no case is a standard story or 'inaudible' or responsive. What I was saying is that it can't all be standard stories because the way explanation works you have to have a different maker and you're not going to have a different maker between Mary and everyone else in the class unless you can have the curve, and that's just the theory of explanation. But I wanted to grant that point that in fact I think that something especially interesting in your point in thinking about agency, what am I going to do and is that the role of standard story? My theory is that if you take that to be the crucial thing about standard stories and you haven't got these meanings and you haven't got the structures as understanding that all of our action is action within a structure, then you might make some bad choices about what to do as well.

Even though you said you wanted to avoid, or that you do avoid the normative stuff, your papers very helpful for the normative stuff

I'm very pleased because that's 'inaudible'

Okay and so I think there's a lot for you to say about the more evaluations of individuals or that answering that what should I do question. And so the way I understood that you were talking about was that you shifted the standard picture so the standard picture would be something like Miss H does nothing wrong, and what we might say you should just stop there and say she does nothing wrong because Miss H does something wrong. And now if we just look at her individual attentions and her individual actions she does nothing wrong, but if we look at her in terms of dissipation, in the social structure or how she's reinforcing these social meanings, she does something wrong, she's making these kinds of contributions and in among she does that she probably should do something to counteract that and then this gives her something, so this is just a black hole of normative helpful things so thank you.

So it's connecting to your work, you can say in sending him to the principle she didn't do anything wrong, she has a 'inaudible' post, she has a reasonable policy and she applies it fairly but none the less, and this is what I think a lot of people who work with responsible reading, she's participating and in so far she's participating in the structure that's reinforcing stigma, she needs to take responsibility for that and find a way to prevent these downstream affects or participate in an institution that works to change these downstream affects. So that's connected I think to some of the things about corrective responsibility, I just think that I'd worry though at a latter point that collective, I think it's a very tricky thing what happens at collective and what collective responsibility is but that's a longer conversation I hope we can have.

I was wondering about the conditions for enabling telling what's in non standard stories, so this is maybe too practical but I work on testimony and so I was interested in what individuals who to each other how they can affect

I think maybe if we could just speak up because I'm betting that some people in the back could here, you could even stand up and turn that way. That might be easier.

So I wondered if the conditions for enabling the telling and the uptake are listening to non standard stories, it's a practical question I don't know how much you want to talk about it, I think it's related also to the what should I do question because you're pointing to downstream answers and maybe, maybe if Miss H shows that hey class at the beginning of everything, let's do what I'm doing. Discussion, let's have a testimony about what's happening here to enable us to listen to determine it

RCJP Distinguished Lecture 2014 – Sally Haslanger

No completely I just drew that out of my hat as a possible situation, but no I think that pathological strategies here of trying to think about, so I in fact I do a lot of collective generation of ground rules for a class and have students sort of challenge each other in the class so it's not just the professor challenging the student and then that itself becomes a subject matter for conversation, it moves down the conversation. So there's all kinds of ways of restructuring the classroom so that it doesn't have to be I'm the teacher, you're the student, you interrupted me now out, that's a kind of high school mode of interaction. And I do think that there could be a lot more interesting stuff about training people to hear, training to people have to critical distance on their take-away and things like that and I completely applaud that. I'm sorry was there a response?

There's more but I don't want to

Okay but I do think there are, I would like to suggest that there are ways that we can create spaces where non standard stories and non standard listening becomes the norm and that I think that there's a really important goal and implication of, a non implication

So you theory in central theories in philosophy to the type of primarily sociology other than psychology and the fact that injustice is structural rather than personal, and you've also argued that agency, the personal and self personal on the one hand and social structures on the other hand co-construct one another to a kind of living affect. So what explicit and implicit bias do people have depend on social structures and the position of the archetypal structure, the 'inaudible' what social structures arise depending on people beliefs and intentions, values and so for example the differences in maternal and paternal practices is hardly explained by expectations that people have of what you want. So also the point that you're trying to intervene and correct or mitigate certain forms of structural injustice often won't work just to focus on people and their attitudes because you can change people's attitudes because social structures exist and it seems like the opposite is true, which you probably did note as well that changing, because of this looping affect, changing social structures might rid them temporarily but because the biases the same structures can be produced

Ones that actually have the same long term affects even if they're different in some ways, yeah reinforce the power structure

Yeah and can I say the times that you're suggesting the interventions that you did to take those at both levels, the structure and the psychology and it also seems like sometimes maybe one of the other intervention will be more affective, probably because one is more active in driving the 'inaudible' affects, probably because we'd been warmed to it that's it's user detained, one rather than the other 'inaudible' on how to counteract implicit biases, what lines might be able to be changed, what methods might be affected. So I guess in light of all the things that you've said it doesn't seem right that 'inaudible' psychology, it seems like both are important and that it's important to 'inaudible' not just focus on these biases but also focus on the social structures that those biases support for example and so, it doesn't seem like any problems were there unless we attend, we attend to both of them and psychologist attend to sociology and vice versa.

Yeah so good point, I take your point, I guess my experience of psychologists is that they tend to be more in the head than sociologists can be exclusively in the peer structure but I take your point. There are some psychologists who are very interested in the social frame that gives rise to these particular biases etc. and the social processes and there are some sociologists that don't think about psychology at all. But I think I was saying it in part because of I'm trying to but current, look the current is just flowing all the way to psychology and current science and how many people read sociology and philosophy? I don't think there are very many who, anyone here who read sociology?

RCJP Distinguished Lecture 2014 – Sally Haslanger

Yeah well there are a few okay, good but how many people read psychology? See so I think I'm saying that mainly to but the current but I do think you're right that you're going to have to work with them together.

I would like to ask about 'inaudible', I think the social explanation offers resources cause of it's critical distance to 'inaudible'. So I was just going to suggest is there a pessimistic opinion or the social explanation or produce rather than something else or is there, that's not informative, there's the hope that it ought to but in actual fact 'inaudible'

Yeah you don't get any and that's not, I'm not like that and we don't get it and we don't get any and whatever. That's actually really valuable I think you're right about that, I was reading something on Facebook last night an article about how to get people who disagree with you to open up rather than shut down and one of the interesting things I found is that, instead of they give their reasons, you give your reasons and whatever which tends to entrench people more is that you ask them to explain how their diagnosis works, how does that work? And so you try and probe them for more explanation and then they realise they can't give an explanation and then they're open to taking in new information about what would be an explanation.

So that's, a read my point, I haven't thought about this, I read it on Facebook no it was an article linked to Facebook that I read but I thought that that was kind of interesting and maybe something that could be useful here and it isn't saying let me explain me to you, but say you explain you how does it work? And as they find they're unable to do it then help them out with some further information and maybe they will be less resentful I don't know, but I think it's a really valuable observation.