Summary of the doctoral dissertation in English

The doctoral thesis *Towards Inclusivity: (Re)thinking Otherness Anew. Selected Practices of Discursive Construction of Exclusion in Contemporary Philosophy* aims to search for an inclusive approach to otherness, mainly expressed in existential thought. Existentialism serves as a tool in this thesis to depict the image of the other and otherness. The goal is not to analyse the detailed solutions of existential philosophy but to use it as an illustration, to create the narrative of this work and compare it with other categories and theories of contemporary philosophy.

Why should we (re)think the other and otherness anew? The concepts of otherness presented by existentialist icons, namely Jean-Paul Sartre and Simone de Beauvoir, offer only some possibilities for defining them. These concepts centre around *anthropos*, making them appear homogeneous and one-dimensional.

The doctoral dissertation is divided into two parts dedicated to anthropocentric and non-human issues. In both parts, otherness is the central theme, evolving and transforming to lead us to inclusivity. In the first part, in the context of what is feminine, homosexual, and refugee, the ontological status of the other is not fixed and can undergo various transformations. This means that otherness can be devalued through the process of deontologisation.

The primary mechanism of exclusion, as defined in this thesis, responsible for this process is the deprivation of responsibility. As a result of its operation and the ongoing process of deontologisation, otherness transforms into Immersive Otherness, defined as engulfing the being, submerging it in immanence and reducing it to an object. Immersive Otherness is exemplified through the analysis of "woman as the Other" and "homosexual as the Other," with de Beauvoir's considerations as a guiding thought. Interestingly, otherness and Immersive Otherness, through deontologisation, can transform into foreignness, which is essentially destructive to the construction of the human subject. When we speak of the foreigner, we essentially reduce the being to an object for which no one wants to take responsibility. The refugee serves as an example of the foreigner, and the critical mechanisms in this chapter are spatial enclosure, securitization, adiaphorisation, orientalisation, racialisation, and the mechanism of unveiling (in the case of the female refugee, an additional mechanism of unveiling is added).

The second part focuses on the non-human in the context of otherness and the process of deontologisation. In the fifth and sixth chapters, a break is made with the traditional concept of human-nonhuman relations and the approach to the animal. Despite their importance, Enlightenment postulates often fail to consider the needs of non-human subjects, depriving them of agency and response-ability. The entire thesis is intertwined with the patriarchal model, as the asymmetric relationship between the human and the non-human largely stems from the functioning of the male-centric model. There is also a reference to contemporary theories of subjectivity that, when applied to existential tools, allows equipping animals with the ontological status of the other or the Immersive Other.

As a result of these analyses, the author proposes the concept of the "Chthulucene Kingdom" as a response to the patriarchal "Kingdom of Femininity" and "Kingdom of Animality." It is a proposal different from the patriarchal model and filled with collective, inclusive thinking, in which humans and non-humans have the ontological status of the other and live together, co-creating each other in mutual responsibility. However, to think about the "Chthulucene Kingdom," an anti-humanist approach and the application of defamiliarization practices described in this thesis are necessary.

Along with the "Chthulucene Kingdom," a new type of otherness emerges, completely different from Sartre's otherness or de Beauvoir's Immersive Otherness, namely affirmative otherness. It is not constituted based on the category of difference, as in existential thought, but rather emphasizes diversity. Affirmative otherness opens the way to creating inclusive spaces and thinking in terms of unisex.

The author proposes the unisex model as the conclusion of this doctoral dissertation. Unisex reflects titular inclusivity, as it goes beyond the binary category of gender while redefining it. It does not eliminate what is gendered but allows for various identity strategies, including non-binary and those that go beyond the classical (patriarchal) category of gender. The goal is not to abandon the category of gender as a solution to destabilize the patriarchal model but to view it inclusively, and the unisex model enables this approach for all subjects, both human and non-human.

In the unisex model, the subject is not a fixed monad but remains in sympoietic and symbiogenetic relationships. It does not assume divisions and binary oppositions in which the category of difference plays a crucial role, creating asymmetrical

relationships. The unisex model appreciates diversity, multidimensionality, heterogeneity, and affirmative otherness. It appears to effectively depict the process of becoming-with and mutual existence. Additionally, it highlights what has not been previously recognized in philosophy, particularly existential philosophy.

Let us appreciate the idea of shared life, which is not linear but depicted as the circle of life where Kronos time does not operate, but rather Aion, referring to circularity, cyclicality, and interconnected, fragile, and often complicated cohabitation.