To give an account of norms governing our uses of *generics*, and our *inferring*, showing how phenomena of *accommodation* can help explain the behaviour of generic judgements and pejorative uses of expressions.
The Wider Setting

This is a part of a collaborative research project *Constructing Social Hierarchy*, exploring anti-individualist approaches to mind, language and action, aiming to understand how we construct and maintain social hierarchies, so that we can better remedy social injustice.

The team: *Sally Haslanger, Karen Jones, Laura Schroeter, François Schroeter, me.*
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Muslims are terrorists.
Fs are Gs
Fs are Gs

... are pervasive.
Fs are Gs

... are pervasive.

... are basic.
Fs are Gs

... are pervasive.

... are basic.

... behave very strangely.
Mosquitos transmit \textit{RRF} — what does this mean?

All mosquitos transmit \textit{RRF}. Some don't. Some mosquitos transmit \textit{RRF}. True, but some mosquitos don't, and we won't say "Mosquitos don't transmit \textit{RRF}."]

Most mosquitos transmit \textit{RRF}. Most don't. Normal mosquitos transmit \textit{RRF}. Male mosquitos don't. They aren't normal?

Mosquitos are the kind of thing that transmit \textit{RRF}. They're also the kind of thing that doesn't—e.g. males, or those in Africa.
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Mosquitos are the kind of thing that transmit RRF.
They’re also the kind of thing that doesn’t—e.g. males, or those in Africa.
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- **INFERENTIALISM**: an approach to semantics that takes meaning to centre on *norms of inference*.

- **NORMATIVE PRAGMATICS**: an approach to semantics that takes semantics to centre on *norms of use* (perhaps including inference, perhaps not).

- My recent research concentrates on the connections between *normative pragmatics* and logic, via *proof theory*.
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An inferentialist analysis of pejorative predicates:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{x is German} & \quad \text{x is Boche} \\
\text{x is Boche} & \quad \text{x is cruel}
\end{align*}
\]

Using Boche in this way encodes a substantial connection between being German, and being cruel.

What does Boche mean, when it’s used like this?
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This isn’t restricted to pejorative expressions. People can use *standard* expressions pejoratively, too.

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{x is a talk on proof theory} & \quad \text{x is a } \textit{logic} \text{ talk} \\
\text{x is a } \textit{logic} \text{ talk} & \quad \text{x is boring}
\end{align*} \]

Are these inferences a part of the *meaning* of the pejorative expression?
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- **SEMANTICS**: accounts of the meanings of particular expressions.

- **METASEMANTICS**: an account of the space of possible meanings, and the different ways expressions can get their meanings.

- **PRACTICE**: Metasemantics, in particular, can be a partner for clarificatory and emancipatory possibilities for revising our languages and our practices.
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There are many accounts of the truth conditions of the generic

Ks are F

Any adequate account is very complicated.
Though there may be a further refinement or two needed, we can describe the circumstances under which a generic of the form ‘Ks are F’ is true as follows:

The counterinstances are negative, and:

If F lies along a characteristic dimension for the Ks, then some Ks are F, unless K is an artifact or social kind, in which case F is the function or purpose of the kind K;

If F is striking, then some Ks are F and the others are disposed to be F;

Otherwise, almost all Ks are F.

Sarah-Jane Leslie “Generics: Cognition and Acquisition,”

We don’t understand a generic by first grasping its truth conditions.
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We don’t understand a generic by first grasping its truth conditions.

We learn to use generics by learning norms for how to use them.
I take it that this sort of account makes sense of how we understand modal terms like possibly and necessarily.
I take it that this sort of account makes sense of how we understand modal terms like *possibly* and *necessarily*.

“Possibly p” and “Necessarily p” have truth conditions expressed in terms of *possible worlds*, but we don’t learn the concepts of possibility and necessity by way of some prior access to possible worlds.
To say that a state of affairs obtains is just to say that something is the case; to say that something is a possible state of affairs is just to say that something could be the case; and to say that something is the case ‘in’ a possible state of affairs is just to say that the thing in question would necessarily be the case if that state of affairs obtained, i.e. if something else were the case...

We understand ‘truth in states of affairs’ because we understand ‘necessarily’; not vice versa.

But what *do* they mean?

*The problem remains:* What are the norms governing generics? How do we understand them?
Let’s change tack for a moment.
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ELOISE: Yes, she's a bird.

This is beef. So, this is food.

ABELARD: Is this food?
ELOISE: Yes, it's beef.
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... or rather, what are we doing when we infer or explain?

- I won’t commit myself to any particular analysis of the norms governing inference and explanation. (c.f. Brandom, in *Making it Explicit*, and his view of the relationship between inference, commitment and entitlement.)

- These are *speech acts*, like *assertion*.
  
  (I can *infer* B from A despite believing B before believing A. Inferring, in this sense, isn’t *believing on the basis of*. The same goes for explaining or justifying.)

- Making an inference is also not to be identified with offering a deductively valid argument, or taking yourself to do so.
Reason giving is *defeasible*, or *non-monotonic*:

Tweety is a bird. So, Tweety flies.
What is inference? (Cont.)

Reason giving is *defeasible*, or *non-monotonic*:

- Tweety is a bird. So, Tweety flies.
- Tweety is a bird. *Tweety is a penguin*. So, Tweety flies.
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Why infer?

Why (do we/should we) care about how our claims relate to one another?

Why not just care about whether A and B are true, and ignore whether A is a reason for B?

(Or, why do children ask why instead of just asking whether?)

Why attempt to keep track of how claims relate to one another?
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It is hard to see how we could act on the basis of shared views without some kind of reason-giving practice.
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If we find a zebra...</td>
<td>Is this a zebra?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppose that <em>had been</em> a zebra</td>
<td>Suppose that’s <em>actually</em> a zebra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options for action</td>
<td>Options for belief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**PLANNING AND CONTINGENCY**

If we find a zebra...
Suppose that *had been* a zebra
Options for action
  * Subjunctive
    * "Metaphysical"

**THEORISING AND UNCERTAINTY**

Is this a zebra?
Suppose that’s *actually* a zebra
Options for belief
  * Indicative
    * "Epistemic"

It is hard to see how we could *act* on the basis of *shared views* without some kind of reason-giving practice.
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Tweety is a bird. So, Tweety flies.

— **Birds fly.**
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Claim 1: Generics make inferential transitions explicit

Tweety is a bird. So, Tweety flies.
— Birds fly.

She's a zebra. So, she has stripes.
— Zebras have stripes.

She has stripes. So, she's a zebra.
— Striped things are zebras.
— Striped horses are zebras.
I can make explicit my preparedness to infer $G_x$ from $F_x$ by saying

$F$s are $G$s.
I can make explicit my preparedness to infer $Gx$ from $Fx$ or to explain $Gx$ by way of $Fx$ by saying

$Fs$ are $Gs$. 
This explains many of the distinctive features of generics

- *Exceptions:* **Birds fly.** (Yes! Despite penguins.)

- *Failure of weakening of the consequent:*
  - Birds lay eggs. (Yes!)
  - Birds are female. (No!)

- Does Tweety lay eggs? Yes, Tweety is a bird. (Good!)
- Is Tweety female? Yes, Tweety is a bird. (???)
- Or, Tweety lays eggs since Tweety is a bird. (Good!)
  - Tweety is female since Tweety is a bird. (???)

- Low rate generics with striking properties:
  - Mosquitos transmit **rrf.**

Given that reason giving does admit exceptions, in the case of striking/dangerous properties, it is much better to err on the side of false positives than false negatives. At the very least, we are happy to explain this transmits **rrf** by granting this is a mosquito.
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Why *this* form?

We can infer from any A to any B.

Why are generics, of the form $\text{Fs are Gs}$, so prevalent?

In dialogue or in planning, the *focus* of inquiry is often fixed.

So, inferences of the from suitable for explication by a generic (from $\text{Fx to Gx}$) are widespread.
Why make inference explicit?
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To teach ...
Why make inference explicit?

To teach ...

... and to refine.
Training for Inference
Training for Inference

We communicate and coordinate on inferences: if you’ve learned that birds fly, you’ll accept “x is a bird” as a reason to conclude “x flies,” or to explain “x flies” by appeal to “x is a bird.”
The information conveyed can be local.

Consider a zoo enclosure with a range of horse-like creatures: I might say “striped ones are zebras”.
You can object to my inference
Fa. So, Ga.
in three different (related) ways:

- Deny Fa.
- Deny Ga.
- Deny the So.
Refining Inference

You can object to my inference

Fa. So, Ga.

in three different (related) ways:

(1) Deny Fa.  (2) Deny Ga.  (3) Deny the So.
You can object to my inference
Fa. So, Ga.
in three different (related) ways:

(1) Deny Fa.    (2) Deny Ga.    (3) Deny the So.

We have words for (1) and (2).
How do you voice objection (3)?
You can object to my inference

Fa. So, Ga.

in three different (related) ways:

(1) Deny Fa.  (2) Deny Ga.  (3) Deny the So.

We have words for (1) and (2).

How do you voice objection (3)?

Making inferences explicit gives us a way to argue about them.
What is it to *deny* that birds fly?
What is it to *deny* that birds fly?

Birds *don't* fly?
This is subtle

What is it to *deny* that birds fly?

Birds *don't* fly?

Fs are *non-Gs* \( \text{not (Fs are Gs)} \)

The grammar of generics makes denying them difficult.

We often move to more explicit quantification:

*many birds don’t fly*, or *not all birds fly*. 
The inferential analysis of generics explains this, too.

Resisting the inference from $Fx$ to $Gx$ does not, by itself, offer an alternative inference.
The inferential analysis of generics explains this, too

Resisting the inference from \( Fx \) to \( Gx \) does not, by itself, offer an alternative inference.

Neither does it make much of a claim at all, by itself.
The inferential analysis of generics explains this, too

Resisting the inference from $F_x$ to $G_x$ does not, by itself, offer an alternative inference.

Neither does it make much of a claim at all, by itself.

We’ll return to this topic later.
ACCOMMODATION & INFERENCE
The COMMON GROUND of a conversation at any given time is the set of propositions that the participants in that conversation at that time mutually assume to be taken for granted and not subject to (further) discussion.

— Kai von Fintel

“What is Presupposition Accommodation, Again?”

Philosophical Perspectives, 2008.
One way to enter the common ground

When uttered assertively, sentences are meant to update the common ground. If a sentence is accepted by the participants, the proposition it expresses is added to the common ground.

— Kai von Fintel

“What is Presupposition Accommodation, Again?”

*Philosophical Perspectives*, 2008.
Another way to enter the common ground

If there are drinks after the seminar, my son will come.

When I say this, the proposition that I have a son (and perhaps that I have only one son) is added to the common ground.
Another way to enter the common ground

If there are drinks after the seminar, my son will come.

When I say this, the proposition that I have a son (and perhaps that I have only one son) is added to the common ground.

This phenomenon is called *presupposition accommodation*. 
Another way to enter the common ground

If there are drinks after the seminar, my son will come.

When I say this, the proposition that I have a son (and perhaps that I have only one son) is added to the common ground.

This phenomenon is called presupposition accommodation.

(The details of how—and which—presuppositions are accommodated is a matter of debate and active research.)
Rae Langton explores the ethical contours of accommodation phenomena in *Accommodating Injustice*.
Rae Langton explores the ethical contours of accommodation phenomena in *Accommodating Injustice*.

Sometimes we find ourselves committed to substantial claims we never explicitly considered. We have *accommodated* them.
If you make the inference $F \alpha$, therefore $G \alpha$, 

and you meet with no objection, then not only are $F \alpha$ and $G \alpha$ added to the common ground, but so is the generic: $F$s are $G$s.
If you make the inference $Fa$, therefore $Ga$, 
and you meet with no objection,
Claim 2: Inference and the Common Ground

If you make the inference $F \alpha$, therefore $G \alpha$, and you meet with no objection, then not only are $F \alpha$ and $G \alpha$ added to the common ground,
Claim 2: Inference and the Common Ground

If you make the inference $F \alpha$, therefore $G \alpha$, and you meet with no objection, then not only are $F \alpha$ and $G \alpha$ added to the common ground, but so is the generic: $F$s are $G$s.
Of course ...

This could be highly *local*.

Recall: *she has stripes, so she's a zebra.*
Of course …

This could be highly local.

Recall: she has stripes, so she's a zebra.

Striped things (here) are zebras.
This isn't *presupposition* accommodation

The speech act of inference is *explicit*. It can be rejected, just as an assertion can.
This isn't presupposition accommodation

The speech act of inference is explicit. It can be rejected, just as an assertion can.

I can reject the inference Fa, so Ga, while accepting Fa and Ga.
This isn't presupposition accommodation

The speech act of inference is explicit. It can be rejected, just as an assertion can.

I can reject the inference Fa, so Ga, while accepting Fa and Ga.

Whether the inference is accepted or rejected should make some difference in the common ground.
This isn't presupposition accommodation

The speech act of inference is explicit. It can be rejected, just as an assertion can.

I can reject the inference Fa, so Ga, while accepting Fa and Ga.

Whether the inference is accepted or rejected should make some difference in the common ground.

If the inference is made explicit by a generic this can do the job.
Consequences

- This commitment (Fs are Gs) goes beyond the explicit subject matter (the object $a$) under discussion.
Consequences

- This commitment (Fs are Gs) goes beyond the explicit subject matter (the object α) under discussion.
- Since generics are *generic*, they can persist, even after the details fade from attention.
Consequences

- This commitment (Fs are Gs) goes beyond the explicit subject matter (the object α) under discussion.

- Since generics are generic, they can persist, even after the details fade from attention.

- We can find ourselves accepting generics (and perhaps, believing them) without ever having explicitly considered them.
PEJORATIVES
Pejorative Inference Pairs

\[ \chi \text{ is German} \]

\[ \chi \text{ is } \textit{Boche} \]
Pejorative Inference Pairs

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{x is German} & \quad \text{x is Boche} \\
\text{x is Boche} & \quad \text{x is cruel}
\end{align*} \]
Pejorative Inference Pairs

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{\(x\) is German} & \quad \text{\(x\) is Boche} \\
\hline \\
\text{\(x\) is \(x\) is cruel} \\
\text{\(x\) is a talk on proof theory} & \quad \text{\(x\) is a \(logic\) talk} \\
\hline \\
\text{\(x\) is a \(logic\) talk} & \quad \text{\(x\) is boring}
\end{align*}
\]
I make no claim about whether these inferences are somehow central to the meanings of the terms “Boche” or “logic talk”.
I make no claim about whether these inferences are somehow central to the meanings of the terms “Boche” or “logic talk”.

Though it seems that someone who uses “logic talk” pejoratively can talk with someone who doesn’t without necessarily being at cross purposes.
Pejoratives and Generics

Pejoratives straightforwardly give rise to generics.

Germans are *Boche*. *Logic* talks are boring.
Mosquitos transmit RRF.

Logic talks are boring.
Striking properties and generics

Mosquitos transmit RRF.

Logic talks are boring.

Muslims are terrorists.
Mosquitos transmit RRF.

Logic talks are boring.

Muslims are terrorists.

These are hard to uproot, or to argue against.
Striking properties and generics

Mosquitos transmit RRF.

Logic talks are boring.

Muslims are terrorists.

These are hard to uproot, or to argue against.

Not all mosquitos. Not all logic talks. Not all Muslims.
OPTIONS FOR CRITIQUE & REFORM
How to deny a generic

- To reject or deny Fs are Gs, you need to undercut the inference from Fa to Ga and the practice of explaining Ga in terms of Fa.
In a controlled environment, we can undercut the generic by being more *specific*, by moving to explicitly stated quantifiers.
How to deny a generic

- In a controlled environment, we can undercut the generic by being more *specific*, by moving to explicitly stated quantifiers.
  - Are *all* Fs Gs? Are *most*? How many?
In a controlled environment, we can undercut the generic by being more specific, by moving to explicitly stated quantifiers.

- Are all Fs Gs? Are most? How many?

This can work, but it is hard to resist forming generic judgements. Syntactic discipline takes work.
How to deny a generic

- When $G$ is a striking property, it’s not enough to say that many or most $F$s are not $G$s.
How to deny a generic

- When G is a striking property, it’s not enough to say that many or most Fs are not Gs.

  (After all, most mosquitos *don’t* carry RRF.)
One way to undercut the inference from Fa to Ga is to institute a practice in which the question of whether something is G or not doesn’t arise.
How to deny a generic

- When we care about the property G, we won’t want to revise the concept away. So another approach is to find an alternate explanation for Ga, other than Fa.
How to deny a generic

- When we *care* about the property G, we won’t want to revise the concept away. So another approach is to find an *alternate* explanation for Ga, other than Fa.

  - If not all species or genus of mosquito carry RRF, then we could refine our generic to the more specific one, that Mosquitos of genus *Culex* carry RRF, while agreeing that mosquitoes outside that genus *don't* carry RRF.
How to deny a generic

- When we *care* about the property $G$, we won’t want to revise the concept away. So another approach is to find an *alternate* explanation for $Ga$, other than $Fa$.

- If not all species or genus of mosquito carry RRF, then we could refine our generic to the more specific one, that Mosquitos of genus *Culex* carry RRF, while agreeing that mosquitos outside that genus *don't* carry RRF.

- Explanations of this shape might undercut the generic Muslims are terrorists, by replacing them with better explanations — such as research showing that domestic violence is a much stronger predictor of involvement in terrorism.
How to deny a generic

- In any case, denying a generic requires changing not only our explicit *theory*, but our dispositions to *infer*.
- These dispositions is expressed not just in the claims we make. They are revealed in how we string those claims together.
The strange behaviour of generic judgements can be explained by their grounding in our inferential practice. This helps us understand the difficulties and some of the possibilities for reforming and revising those practices and the views they represent.
THANK YOU!
Thank you!

SLIDES: http://consequently.org/presentation/
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