



## CALL FOR ABSTRACTS

**Azimuth. Philosophical Coordinates in Modern and Contemporary Age  
Issue (2/2024)**

### *Critical Care*

*Editors:*

Prof. Jocelyn Olcott (Duke University, Durham, NC)

Tania Rispoli, Ph.D. (Duke University, Durham, NC)

\*\*\*

*Critical Care* invites explorations of the paradoxical and ambivalent aspects of care — of the ways that it implies both flourishing and repression, embrace and exclusion, and priceless and worthlessness. Further, care in one realm often implies carelessness in another. This special issue will examine these tensions within the field of care studies, considering how the provision of care can discipline normative values about appropriate modes, objects, and practices. Today, inequalities of care are normalized, and many care practices are unsustainable ecologically, socially, culturally, and economically (e.g., Benería 2008, Damamme, et al. 2017, Fraser 2016, R. Parreñas 2002; Razavi 2011). Solutions to the crisis of care have centered principally on state-, market-, and technology-centered approaches, but addressing this crisis demands a more thoroughgoing interrogation of human values, including developing shared understandings of the very concepts of care and its value.

The field of care studies has multiple temporal and spatial feminist genealogies, but a consensus exists that it involves relational, context-specific, labor-intensive processes. A commonly cited definition describes it as “a species activity that includes everything we do to maintain, continue, and repair our world so that we may live in it as well as possible. That world includes our bodies, our selves, and our environment, all of which we seek to interweave in a complex, life-sustaining web” (Fisher & Tronto, 1990: 40). In the US context, care studies have been historically associated with the debate developed in the 1980s by ethicists who argued for the superiority of an ethics of care to foster greater wellbeing than the liberal “theory of justice” (Gilligan 1982; Held 1993 and 2006; Kittay 1999; Noddings 1982; Tronto 1994) and with eco-systemic ideas of interdependence promoted by Ecofeminism (Mies 1986; Haraway 2003, 2008, 2016). Scholarship on social reproduction and care work (Bakker 1994; Delphy 1984; Federici 2012; Folbre 1994; Fraad, et al. 1994; Waring 1988; Weeks 2011), as well as the critiques suggested by critical race and black feminist theories pointed out that care is not only invisible and undervalued but also co-determined by hierarchies of race, gender, and citizenship status ((Boris and Parreñas 2010; Davis 1981; Glenn 2010; Gutiérrez Rodríguez 2010; Hill Collins 1990; hooks 2001; Hondagneu-Sotelo 2001). In the face of an enormous body of argumentation and evidence, the fact remains, however, that we continue to devalue the care labors required for the survival of what we purportedly hold most dear: our families, communities, cultures, and environments.

We invite abstracts proposal focused on three areas within care studies in which we find pronounced ambivalence. Following [the mission of the journal](#), we are particularly interested in original contributions that develop a creative argument in feminist theory, philosophy, intellectual history, genealogies and closely related fields of “Critical Care.” We strongly encourage contributions that give voice to underrepresented perspectives and sources.

- **Technologies between Care & Control.** During the height of the COVID-19 pandemic, there was a widespread argument that in order to care for one another, people had to put in

place a certain amount of control, both via lockdowns and contact tracing. Care in general, from healthcare to caring for the environment or dependents, implies a certain amount of “control” or “responsibility” over either human or more-than human care recipients. Moreover, as Lisa Stevenson has shown (Stevenson 2014), even states can claim the “need for care” as a way of producing further governance and surveillance. What is the relationship between care and control? Are they co-implied or mutually exclusive? Is it possible to imagine interdependent relationships of care beyond control and surveillance? What is the relationship between care and digital technologies?

- **Communities of Care.** Despite care studies’ emphasis on interrelationality, describing communities of care often implies a boundary that leaves an outside to that community. Some scholars (Escobar 2018; Puig 2017) argue that the ethics and politics of care should be developed in proximity. Caring for dependents or environment means to put “hands on dirt” (Puig 2017, 147). To care involves practice, touching, and only then an abstract knowing. Other scholars, despite recognizing the enmeshment of love and labor, interdependence, and exploitation, implied in care work, see a futurity of care in the development of public policies and welfare state measures (Fraser 2022). What does it mean to create a “community” of care? Should the community of care be intended as an extra-state or beyond-state space, or should it include the state as a potential actor for fostering better care? What is the relation between proximity and distance in developing a care politics?

- **The Value of Love.** A long-standing question in care studies has centered on the paradoxical relationship between care — not only the labor of social reproduction but also the affect, attention, and expertise required to care — and value. Care is often described as priceless but ascribed notoriously low market value. Care contributes to various forms of capital accumulation but remains invisible in any accounting of that value. In sum, care is seen both as an act of love and of labor. What is the value of love? How can the work of care be revalued? What are the strategies that workers and activists are putting in place? What is the future of care?

This CFA emerges in part from conversations with the Revaluing Care in the Global Economy network [Advisory Board](#), which will assist in contributing articles and identifying appropriate contributors. We will also distribute the CFA through the broader network and other channels. We anticipate that roughly half the submissions will come through solicitations and the other half in response to the CFA.

\*\*\*

*Azimuth* invites **abstract proposals** (no longer than 500 words) in English. Please send your abstract (including title of the prospected article) and short bio by **1 June 2023** to [olcott@duke.edu](mailto:olcott@duke.edu) and [tania.rispoli@duke.edu](mailto:tania.rispoli@duke.edu).

Complete drafts will be due 1 March 2024. Final drafts will be due 30 June 2024.

Authors whose abstracts/papers will be accepted, will be given a second deadline and further instructions for submitting full articles, according to the editorial rules of the journal (available at: <https://www.azimuthjournal.com/call-for-papers/>).

Final papers should not exceed 34.000 characters (spaces and footnotes included); admitted languages for final papers will be German, French, Italian, Portuguese or Spanish. All articles will undergo blind review process.