

Michele Bocchiola

Audiat et altera pars. Semel aut semper?

The aim of this article is to go at the roots of Ceva's theory of justice, exploring the implications of her view. After examining what I take to be the three philosophical pillars of her view (§1), I discuss two points about the parts involved in a conflict (§2) and the general metatheoretical approach (§3). The first point concerns the need to listen to each and every part of a conflict all the time, thus accepting any position, even those manifestly false or impossible to prove. The second point is about the metaethical agnosticism upon which the theory is based. These points need to be further discussed, as they could have important and innovative applications in the contemporary political-philosophical debate.

Gian-Luigi Bulsei

The useful science. Expertise and participation in public decisions

The complexity of the problems that require government intervention often forces policy makers to resort to science, to reduce as far as possible the uncertainties and support their decisions: but the relationship between expertise and public policies is not linear. Starting from the serious problems for health and environment caused by asbestos (the case of Eternit in Casale Monferrato), the article develops some considerations about the role of scientific knowledge and social participation on sensitive and controversial issues, involving citizens directly and require public decisions.

Emanuela Ceva

Interactive justice in conflict

This article spells out the sense in which a society where value conflicts are articulated in politics according to inherently just procedures is itself just. To this end, it clarifies the idea of interactive justice. On this idea, the terms of the parties' interaction during their conflict is a distinctive locus of justice, which is irreducible to the justice of the outcomes that are expected to emerge at the end of their interaction.

A minimalist theory of interactive justice for managing value conflict in politics

In this article, I clarify and defend two features crucial to the minimalist commitment of my recent proposal for a theory of interactive justice for the management of value conflict in politics. These features are the inclusiveness of its justificatory basis (that goes beyond the sphere of reasonableness) and the parsimony of its normative foundations (in the guise of metaethical agnosticism). These clarification and defence are important to vindicate the distinctiveness of my proposed theory with respect to the current philosophical debate on liberal justice.

Eleonora Montuschi

Objectivity and disagreement: The role of experts in policy-making decisions

What happens to scientific objectivity when it enters the realm of public debate and policy, and is asked to inform and guide the choices made in that realm? Surely consulting science in making policy is done with a view to making policy decisions more reliable, and ultimately more objective. Evidence-based policy is a typical example of this approach. However, in these contexts scientific evidence is normally, and often inevitably, taken into account alongside other relevant factors (political, social, economic, ethical, etc.). Such complex practical interactions constitute a challenge both for the very objectivity of scientific evidence (how far should science let extra-scientific factors interfere with scientific facts, without endangering the objectivity of evidence?), and for the objectivity of the role of the scientist as expert in the policy-making process. In this paper I address – with the help of a case study – the way by which science contributes to achieving objectivity in policy making, and argue that objectivity, though not exhausted by what scientific evidence contributes to it, still retains a crucial and meaningful role in public debate.

Nicolò Valenzano

Education for democratic citizenship and Philosophy for Communities in intercultural contexts

The first goal of this paper is to highlight the relevance of citizenship education. In the paper I underline the constitutive connection between democracy and educated citizens and its urgency for the present social-historical context. In the second part of the paper, I then introduce the concept of Philosophy for Communities, describe its main features and its structure. Moreover, looking at the Lipman-Sharp approach, I show that the Philosophy for Communities is derived from Philosophy for Children. My analysis is grounded in the so-called twentieth century practical turn of philosophy: starting from this theoretical framework, I describe philosophy as a social practice and show how Philosophy for Communities can contribute to the education of democratic citizenship in intercultural contexts. To better show the pragmatic virtues of this approach, I end the paper describing a community-based philosophical practice experience, realized by an association which pursues cultural and social integration. To conclude, I show how Philosophy for Communities can be conceived as an educational practice for community development and creation of social empowerment which can educate to a better democratic citizenship.

Federico Zuolo

The treatment of animals and the procedures of conflict management

Emanuela Ceva's volume (*Interactive Justice: A Proceduralist Approach to Value Conflicts in Politics*, Routledge, 2016) aims to deal with and propose a realistic solution to value conflicts in politics. In this article I test the applicability of her proceduralist account to the case of the disagreement about the treatment of animals. Despite Ceva's wide ranging concern for a variety of conflicts, in her book she does not analyze the case of the treatment of animals. But this case may be a real challenge because it is likely to become a source of new and persisting conflicts. The disagreement about the treatment of animals constitutes a value conflict because animal rights supporters reject many values entrenched in majority's practices and culture (the superiority of human beings, the permissibility to use animals for any human interests). Moreover, this conflict sometimes emerges in violent manners (for instance, in animal rescue and sabotages). In this paper, I distinguish different forms of animal rights advocacy and analyse under which conditions Ceva's approach

may be fruitfully be employed. Some parts of the multifaceted animal rights advocacy groups may enter in a conflict management procedure, while other more violent and non-cooperative parts are unlikely to do so. However, a conflict management procedure may still be beneficial even towards the relation with the non-cooperative parties.