

## Summaries of Covid mask literature: 1

*Author:* Doctor Terence Rajivan Edward (or 0161\_\_Rajivan)

*Draft version:* version 5 (1st April 2026, South Korea and Rob Kahn summary added and my Milan Kundera imitation; v.1. 27 March)

*Note:* these are most summaries from PhilPapers, mostly excluding empirical psychology - I plan to do another document for that. And [academia.edu](https://academia.edu) papers.

*Software used (freeware):* Google docs, Google scholar, PhilPapers (convenient citation).

1. *The puzzle of masked liberals*, by István Aranyosi. 2020. Writing about the USA, Aranyosi tells us wearing a mask is a signal of liberalism and not wearing one conservatism: "Wearing a mask is, of course, recommended by the government, but on the street it has gained new and unexpected powers: if you are not wearing a mask, you are seen by liberals as a selfish and criminal Trump supporter who does not care about his/her fellow human beings; and if you wear one, you are seen by conservatives as a virtue-signaling, moral grandstanding arrogant liberal." Aranyosi officially targets the impression that liberalism requires mask-wearing: much as liberalism supports a woman's right to abort, it should also support the right not to wear a mask. (But he also targets the impression of conservatives, because we associate them with acceptance of authoritarian action and there is evidence that wearing the mask reduces the risk of disease transmission and so various authoritarian countries - e.g. China and Turkey - demand mask-wearing.) To target the impression of what liberalism requires, Aranyosi presents Judith Jarvis Thomson's thought experiment of a famous violinist with a kidney ailment who has been connected without your consent to your circulatory system. (Um, school biology time!) It is morally permissible for you to disconnect - to unplug - though it will kill the musician, she thinks. There is a distinction between the right to life and the right to whatever will sustain one's life (e.g. this connection to you). Thomson thinks likewise a pregnant woman can abort a fetus in various circumstances. Aranyosi then presents how the mask situation is analogous: another's health depends on my mask-wearing; it is a burden on me wearing the mask. For liberals, one should be analogously free not to!

Manuscript available at: <https://philpapers.org/archive/ARATPO-6.pdf>

2. *Don't Uncover that Face! Covid-19 Masks and the Niqab: Ironic Transfigurations of the ECtHR's Intercultural Blindness* by Mario Ricca. 2020. Ricca asks us to recall the Court decision of April 11 2011 on the legitimacy of the French ban on face covering: "putting the veil on the face could legitimately be considered by the State as a conduct not attuned with the social requirements for the 'harmonious living together', at least in France." Ricca asks us to imagine a time traveller from then being transported to during the Covid epidemic, in which masks were widely worn. He asks, "How can the ban be accepted?" and "Wouldn't the changed social environment be initially perceived as a case of France having undergone Islamic conversion?" He presents a paradox (or attempted paradox, if easily solved): a woman during Covid wears a more Muslim mask both because of state demand and for religious reasons. She should wear it, for health reasons says the state, and given her religious motivation, she should not wear it: so should she wear it and not wear it?! A later section tells us of Britain. The virus spread from China and then greatly affected Italy, but Prime Minister Boris Johnson initially planned on business-as-usual, introducing his concept of herd immunity. Influenced by events in their home country, Italians in UK wore masks, unlike the majority, before mask-wearing was required. We are told, "a general mocking attitude suffused the relationships between Italians living in the their sanitary-ethnic inter-space and the majority of UK citizens."

Mario Ricca. 2020. Don't Uncover that Face! Covid-19 Masks and the Niqab: Ironic Transfigurations of the ECtHR's Intercultural Blindness. *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law* 35: 1119-1143. Available at: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11196-020-09703-y>

3. *Medical Mask Resellers Punished in Canada*, by Milton Kiang. 2020. Opening paragraph: "Recently in Vancouver, Canada, a family reselling medical masks were caught and slapped with a five-hundred-dollar fine for "operating without a business license". This was quickly followed by two undercover sting operations where two N95 mask resellers were caught and fined; treated as if they were thieves or drug traffickers, they had all their inventory seized by police. These crackdowns are the exact opposite of what governments should do, if they want to see an increased supply of medical masks to everyone who wants to buy them." Identifies an assumption of local mayor Brad West: masks are in finite supply, Kiang says supply is not fixed but alters with price signals - economics ABCs. ("Not fixed but not infinite," you say.) Limited supply and high demand will drive up prices, so government put in price controls, but Kiang says, "Putting in place price controls and anti-price-gouging laws, with the noble goal of keeping prices "affordable", means that customers will buy as much of an item as they can possibly can; this all but guarantees that the commodity will disappear from store shelves." Also attacks the mayor's assumption that health workers should have priority for obtaining masks. Appeals to equal need ("Don't you and I have a serious need for the masks, at least comparable to healthcare workers?") and equal right ("The average person has as much of a right to face masks as any healthcare worker, in order to protect himself and his loved ones") and beneficial consequences. Kiang also attacks the mayor's view that it is morally wrong to "Make a Buck" reselling masks. The reseller is not exploiting helpless populations apparently, rather "The reseller plays an important role in "the middleman phases of production", helping to bring a needed product to consumer with efficiency and the least amount of cost." Resellers work hard and also take on risks. Governments are driving trade underground: "Just a few days ago, five million face masks ordered by a Toronto doctor and her friend were highjacked at an airport in Shanghai. These masks are presumably bound for the black market where they can be sold for prices higher than the government-controlled "market price"."

Kiang, Milton. 2020. Medical Mask Resellers Punished in Canada. *Studia Humana* 9(2). Available at: <https://journals.wsiz.edu.pl/sh/article/view/225>

4. *Why Do Japanese People Use Masks Against COVID-19, Even Though Masks Are Unlikely to Offer Protection From Infection?* By Kazuya Nakayachi, Taku Ozaki, Yukihide Shibata and Ryosuke Yokoi. Whereas numerous Western authors criticize the refusal to wear masks in Western countries, this paper proceeds from the "opposite direction": it says that mask wearing does not offer much protection and asks why mask-wearing is widely adopted in Japan (and other East Asian countries). Several possible explanations are offered for the practice: altruistic motivations, self-interest with the belief that masks protect, desire to conform to a social norm, conformity as a response to an ambiguous situation, positive feelings from mask wearing disconnected from all the above. From their evidence, they conclude: "conformity to the social norm was the most prominent driving force for wearing masks." (But this leaves the question of how such a norm got going.)

Nakayachi, Kazuya ; Ozaki, Taku ; Shibata, Yukihide & Yokoi, Ryosuke (2020). Why Do Japanese People Use Masks Against COVID-19, Even Though Masks Are Unlikely to Offer Protection From Infection? *Frontiers in Psychology* 11. Available at: <https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/psychology/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01918/full>

4. *Masks, mechanisms and Covid-19: the limitations of randomized trials in pandemic policymaking* by Seán M. Muller. Muller says that there are ambiguous or negative findings from randomized controlled trials, regarding the effectiveness of masks in protecting against Covid, which is used to justify not wearing masks and not having a mask mandate. But he argues that there is a simple argument from germ theory for mask wearing, which should put the burden of evidence on those opposed to a mask-wearing mandate. He presents the germ theory argument as follows (my edit): 1. SARS-Cov-2 is a virus that is transmitted from one person to another. 2. The main source of transmission is respiratory droplets, either in the air or on surfaces. 3. Holding other factors constant, anything that reduces the volume of such droplets from contagious individuals will reduce transmission rates. 4. Masks worn over the nose and mouth that are not overly porous will block transmission of some proportion of droplets. Therefore 5. Masks should be worn. (Interesting for interaction between general theory and specific tests., evidence from RCTs being taken as the gold standard)

Muller, Seán M. 2021. *Masks, mechanisms and Covid-19: the limitations of randomized trials in pandemic policymaking*. *History and Philosophy of the Life Sciences* 43 (2):1-5. Available at: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s40656-021-00403-9>

5. *Wearing a mask makes us face our own mortality*, by Carlos Alberto Sánchez. 2021. Sánchez observes that the Mexican president, who was anti-mask wearing, tested positive for Covid. His stance was a security threat for America apparently. Anti-maskers were everywhere, including the US congress. Sánchez denies that the reason for their stance is preference for freedom: "they're afraid of facing the reality of their own mortality. Putting on a mask in this pandemic means that the wearer realizes that if she doesn't, she might get sick, and that if she gets sick, she might die. This is a recognition of one's frailty and weakness in the face of something that is obviously greater than any one of us." (It's an opinion piece!) He also says, "It seems to me that I am no less free than I was before I began wearing a mask "full-time." My world is bounded by laws and regulations that existed before any of this. I'm still limited by what I can and can't afford. I'm still encumbered by family responsibilities and my own physical abilities." Interestingly, amongst reasons for not wearing the mask, he considers aesthetic reasons. He writes, "Aesthetic reasons are not valid. I'm reminded of my youth, when some refused to wear seatbelts because they feared wrinkling their clothes, or, as was the case with my teenage self, not looking cool-while-driving. We are now unanimously agreed that seatbelts save lives..."

Carlos Alberto Sánchez. 2021. *Wearing a Mask Makes Us Face Our Own Mortality* (OPINION). Available at: <https://www.latinorebels.com/2021/01/27/wearingamask/>

6. *An Ontological Argument against Mandatory Face-Masks*, by Michael Kowalik. 2021. He begins with a general argument for face-masking wearing, which is rejected: "There are many respiratory viruses in continuous global circulation that can be deadly, including several coronaviruses (Roussel, et al. 2020) and seasonal Influenza. Moreover, novel viruses with pandemic potential can emerge and spread before an effective public health intervention could be instituted. If saving lives by wearing face-masks is a valid normative principle and the risk of potentially deadly respiratory viral infections is always present, then we ought to wear face-masks at all times when in the proximity of others." Kowalik's argument against this begins with the Still Face Experiment from psychology, designed by Edward Tronick: "infants find the absence of responsive facial expression more disturbing than other violations of normal social interactions." Kowalik then argues from phenomenology: "Unless I can compare my innate human likeness to the likeness of another there is literally nothing like being me, because being me entails awareness that I am like someone else. The mask

conceals our innate human-likeness from one another, and thus progressively, phenomenologically, disrupts the recognition of our common humanity." In short, I must perceive the face of the other and register its resemblance to mine, or I cannot even be human myself.

A manuscript available at: <https://philarchive.org/rec/KOWAHC>

7. *To Mask or Not to Mask: Epistemic Injustice in the COVID-19 Pandemic*, by Hsiang-Yun Chen, Li-An Yu, and Linus Ta-Lun Huang. 2021. The authors observe a greater reluctance to mandate mask-wearing and to wear masks in Western liberal democracies. They distinguish between sound science measures and precautionary policy. Sound science policy is based on established scientific fact, whereas precautionary policy aims to reduce harm unless one has good reason against its implementation. ("We are not fully sure if this will work but it is worth doing just in case.") They introduce the explanation that Westerners favour sound science policy whereas Asians favour precautionary policy. But they note 3 challenges. I present 1 and 3. 1: precautionary policies are used by European countries (e.g. concerning GMOs, climate change, biotechnology, stem cell research). 3: the negative reaction in Western liberal democracies is even in the face of sound science. This leads them to consider an alternative explanation, based on Miranda Fricker's concept of epistemic injustice and her related distinctions. "Testimonial injustice occurs when a speaker's words are given insufficient credibility due to negative identity-prejudicial stereotypes." Asian countries' previous experience of mask-usefulness is discounted, because of stereotypes. "Hermeneutical injustice occurs when there is a gap in the collective interpretive repertoire, such that marginalized social groups are at an unfair disadvantage in making sense of or communicating their socially important experiences." They write, "Western societies remained largely unaffected by the SARS outbreak and the 2006 bird flu and therefore lacked the hermeneutic resources to see the benefits of mask-wearing. Moreover, the meanings of masks in these societies are further complicated by anti-Muslim attitudes and resultant restrictions on facial covering in France and in Germany, for instance." (I tend to use epistemic injustice/hermeneutical injustice for when you feel lost and wonder 'what is going on here?' a lot, while others don't seem lost. For example, analytic philosophers are experts in logic but I find public papers with erroneous premise-by-premise reconstructions, such as not distinguishing between inference and conclusion, e.g. see the original text of Spelman.) Chen, Hsiang-Yun ; Yu, Li-an & Huang, Linus Ta-Lun (2021). *To Mask or Not to Mask*. *Techné: Research in Philosophy and Technology* 25 (3):503-512. Available at: <https://philpapers.org/archive/CHETMO-22.pdf>

8. *COVID-19 and the reenactment of mass masking in South Korea*, by Heewon Kim and Hyungsub Choi. The authors seek to avoid an analysis of the uptake of masks in South Korea by reference to deeply rooted cultural factors. They interestingly regard mask wearing for health-reasons in East Asia in general as led by Japan: "Here, as in other East Asian contexts, the use of masks has been introduced, largely through Japan, as instruments of public health responses against the spread of infectious diseases since at least the early twentieth century (Hyun & Sumida, 2020)." They tell us: "In the mid-2000s, the South Korean public grew increasingly concerned with "yellow sand" or hwangsa and Particulate Matter (PM). The perceived environmental crisis opened up a new market for disposable facial masks labeled as "hwangsamasks." Excessive competition led to deteriorating quality, which forced the government to intervene. In 2008, the Korea Food and Drug Administration (KFDA) issued a quality guideline, setting the standard for a new category of "healthcare masks." Now manufacturers were required to go through a strict test to assure the quality standard of facial masks." The mask policy of Covid-19 is not experienced by South Koreans as something

new, owing to these past experiences with health-based masks. The title suggests it is reenactment, but there is not a clear definition of this term: a repeating of an earlier experience?

Choi, Hyungsub & Kim, Heewon. 2021. *COVID-19 and the reenactment of mass masking in South Korea. History and Philosophy of the Life Sciences* 43 (2):1-4. Available at:

<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s40656-021-00400-y>

9. *Unmasking the Ethics of Public Health Messaging in a Pandemic*, by Anita Ho and Vivian Huang. 2021. Portrays how after Covid-19 cases appeared in China, the neighbouring regions (!) of Hong Kong, Taiwan, and South Korea used their experience from SARS in 2003-4 and MERS in 2015 to encourage mask wearing, with widespread compliance. Western countries, e.g. USA, Canada and Italy, discouraged mask use, citing lack of conclusive evidence: "the lack of efficacious evidence while expressing concerns that widespread mask use would deprive healthcare workers of personal protective equipment (PPE) needed for engaging with COVID-19 patients... In the United States, health officials expressed the worry that the public may not know how to properly wear masks, potentially leading to self-contamination..." In the US, different recommendations were issued by different local governments, sometimes conflicting with the advice of health professionals, and leading to "message fatigue." We are told, "In the current pandemic, there continues to be disagreement in the international scientific community regarding whether droplets or aerosols predominate in SARS-CoV-2 transmission, raising questions of the relative effectiveness of different types of face covering (Klompas, Baker, and Rhee 2020). However, observational evidence suggests that widescale mask wearing can reduce relative risk for infection and is a common factor in countries that have had more successful COVID-19 outbreak control (Schünemann et al. 2020; Lyu and Wehby 2020; Kenyon 2020)." Increasing consensus on this. But "it may be impossible to ascertain mask effectiveness in isolation, as there are other contributing environmental factors such as room air ventilation and gathering sizes." The authors recommend epistemic humility, but note that this may be taken for incompetence by the general public. Ethical considerations are generally based on utilitarianism. The authors recommend "especially in the context of a pandemic that has disparate impact on different populations, officials should start with the fair implementation of the least restrictive measures that can help to reduce population harm, particularly for those who are most disadvantaged." They recommend assessing the required degree of restriction and enforcement using a sliding scale: "For example, in rural areas with sparse populations, regions with low incidence rates, or outdoor spaces where people can keep appropriate physical distance, widespread mask use at all times may be less necessary, rendering compulsory mask orders that impose penalties for violation unjustifiable."

Ho, Anita & Huang, Vivian. 2021. *Unmasking the Ethics of Public Health Messaging in a Pandemic. Journal of Bioethical Inquiry* 18 (4):549-559. Available at:

<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11673-021-10126-y>

10. *Mask-less shopping is like drunk driving*, by Jonathan Spelman. 2022. Written in 2020, according to the author. Spelman rejects one argument for a ban on mask-less shopping (leaving aside a few exceptions) and favours another. The one he rejects is this (my formulation): (1) We ought to do what is best for public health. (2) Introducing a legal requirement to wear the mask during the Covid pandemic is best for public health. Therefore (3) we ought to introduce a legal requirement. In support of (2), Spelman asks us to consider a plausibly pre-symptomatic man who goes shopping. Spelman cites information that the Covid-19 virus is spread through exposure to respiratory droplets carrying the disease. He cites a study by Wei Lyu and George L. Wehby that "US states mandating the use of face

masks in public had a greater decline in daily COVID-19 growth rates after issuing these mandates compared with" states that did not. Spelman's objection is to (1). He presents this objection to the very general premise: "For any particular speed limit above some relatively low number, reducing the speed limit would promote public health. So, if all policies that promote public health should be adopted, it follows that we should dramatically reduce speed limits on highways. But few people, I imagine, would accept that conclusion." ("Why is he talking about speeding?" you ask.) Spelman instead offers this argument (my variation on his formulation): (1) Drunk driving should be outlawed. (2) Maskless shopping is analogous to drunk driving. Therefore (3) Maskless shopping should be outlawed. He writes, "states should outlaw mask-less shopping for the same reason they outlaw drunk driving, because it endangers non-consenting third parties for trivial benefits." (Paper has some information about changing policy in Ohio, by the way. But includes the inference in the conclusion!!!) Spelman, Jonathan. 2022. Mask-less shopping is like drunk driving. *Think* 21 (62):117-132. <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/think/article/maskless-shopping-is-like-drunk-driving/FF2A2B745EFE49BEDF70949D303890D9>

11. *COVID Masks as Semiotic Expressions of Hate*, by Rob Kahn. 2022. Kahn opens by acknowledging that Fox News host Tucker Carlson does makes some uncontroversial points about masks, e.g. medics had wrongly suggested a requirement to always wear them when outside. But Carlson then proposed scolding any mask-wearers, though at the time when mask-wearing was being rolled back: say that your mask is making me uncomfortable! (Kahn calls this turning-of-tables a clever move.) Khan identifies three moments in the earlier history of the mask: after the French revolution (the road to Thermidor), the mask is a symbol of aristocracy; the Ku Klux Klan mask wearing of the 1920s (it was also a problem in the 1870s); the burqa bans of Europe after 2005. Kahn says Leone says that masks in Japan signify a well-behaved citizen. USA critics view masks as for sheep - obedient types - or as like Burqas. One can buy masks with sheep pictures on them! (A lot of sheep metaphor analysis follows. Philips Carnes, who wrote an MA thesis on sheep metaphor, says sheep are regarded as "dirty, smelly, (reputedly) stupid animals unable to care for themselves and prone from wandering into the most awful situations, from which they cannot extricate themselves." But sheep is chiefly used as a metaphor for blind obedience, says Carnes.) The burqa association is quite different: associates masks with Otherness. Conspiracy theory: mask mandates are to make the whole world Muslim. Other comparisons: right-wing Representative Marjorie Taylor Greene compared mask mandates with the requirement that Jews wear a yellow star during Nazi times, then made a public apology and visited the Holocaust Museum. Islamophobia allows the Burqa comparison, says Kahn. Freedom is a main argument against mask wearing mandates. (Note: the earlier mask wearing of the KKK was considered unAmerican: little boys in a secret society.) Also apparently it takes a toll on children's spelling and hearing.

Kahn, Rob. 2022. COVID Masks as Semiotic Expressions of Hate. *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law - Revue Internationale de Sémiotique Juridique* 35 (6):2391-2407. Available at: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11196-022-09885-7>

12. *A normative view of madness from Kantian philosophy to understand anti-vaccine and anti-mask protests of 2020 and 2021*, by Johan Sebastián Mayorga Alberto. 2022. Title refers to anti-mask protests, but they are hardly discussed; the focus is more on anti-vaccine protests. The author provides much useful information on Kant's interest in the topic of madness in his pre-critical works. From the critiques, author identifies these Kantian rules: 1. Think for oneself; 2. To think of oneself in the place of every other person; 3. To think consistently. The author adopts an unusual and Kantian perspective on madness as an excess

of reason, a use of reason beyond the limitations of reason (Kant's first critique seeks to delimit the use of reason): "I understand madness as the overflowing of the rational rules whose constraints allow the regulated and valid experience for subjectivities." Protestors against measures to control the spread of Covid, in the name of liberty, are regarded as suffering from madness: "I understand madness as the overflowing of the rational rules whose constraints allow the regulated and valid experience for subjectivities." There is some reference to Foucault, but the subversiveness of Foucault seems absent.

Alberto, Johan Sebastián Mayorga. 2022. A normative view of madness from Kantian philosophy to understand anti-vaccine and anti-mask protests of 2020 and 2021. *Resistances. Journal of the Philosophy of History* 3 (6). Available at:

<https://resistances.religacion.com/index.php/about/article/view/100/165>

13. *Please wear a mask: a systematic case for mask wearing mandates*, by Robert Fumagalli. Defines risk as the probability of the occurrence of harm. Defines harm as the thwarting, setting back, or defeating of one's legitimate interest. And justifiable: "a given risk-imposing action (or activity) is justifiable if the action (or activity) respects the involved individuals' rights and yields a more favourable balance of overall expected benefits and overall expected harms compared with the other available actions..." Fumagalli recommends a mask-wearing mandate "in wide range of indoor settings where physical distancing is infeasible (eg, hospitals, public transport, supermarkets) and... the imposition of legal sanctions on those who fail to wear a mask (eg, fines)." Fumagalli says that Covid 19 infection can cause severe health-related harms, including damages to multiple organs, several long-lasting symptoms, and death. A mask-wearing mandate reduces these harms, as demonstrated by a wide-range of experimental and observational studies. Fumagalli notes that there is a high proportion of asymptomatic cases (people infected who do not experience symptoms) supporting his recommended mandate. (He says that mask-wearing reduces socio-economic costs, but notes that deaths from Covid can reduce retirement expenses.) Apart from reducing harms, he secondly recommends a mandate to prevent moral wrongs upon non-consenting others: violates their security and their respect (not wearing a mask conveys "My minor inconvenience outweighs a major risk to you"). He thirdly recommends a mandate because it leads to a fair distribution of expected harms and benefits. An individual A cannot expect an individual B to avoid indoor interactions, but can reasonably expect them to wear a mask to prevent harms. He considers some objections. "It is against autonomy to mandate mask wearing": his reply is that it is a minor infringement outweighed by gains (emphasizes not imposing non-consenting others to large risks). He also considers the objection that the mandate is against freedom. ("What is the difference between this and the previous objection?" you ask.) Fumagalli argues that certain specific losses to freedom (freedom to interact maskless) are probably outweighed by gains in overall freedom. You need to be healthy to do various things! What about slippery slope problems: more freedoms will go soon? Fumagalli says the evidence is in favour of governments being able to avoid sliding down the slope. The third objection is that we don't know the level of risk from maskless interactions. Fumagalli says we have evidence of Covid-19 cases in a nation's population, enabling reliable risk assessment. He also considers objections from risk is too low (says, "It's not"), too demanding on individuals (says, "It's mostly not"), and superior alternative policies. A mere recommendation is better than a mandate? Says that the mandate substantially increases mask-wearing, enabling the gains identified (reduced harm, moral wrong, fair distribution). (No consideration of herd immunity as an alternative policy???)

Fumagalli, Roberto. 2024. Please wear a mask: a systematic case for mask wearing mandates. *Journal of Medical Ethics* 50 (7):501-510. Available at:

<https://jme.bmj.com/content/50/7/501>

14. *Imitation of Milan Kundera on coronavirus: on Covid-19 masks*. 2026. I, Milan Kundera, was watching the television: young people protesting against the requirement to wear masks in the war against the spread of a new virus, Covid-19. Young attractive Parisians. At the front were a boy and a girl, university students I presumed. The young man surely hoped to seduce his comrade, after the protests. But would he not mask himself before the act of love? Surely he would. On the one hand, in the name of liberty, the protests are against the requirement to wear masks. On the other hand, when exercising a liberty, they mask: the organ of love is masked. I began to contemplate this paradox. What can explain this difference? It is of course not mere choice: in private affairs some choose to wear masks, as people do at fancy dress parties! No. Our young man feels obliged to mask. The only explanation can be this. The boy and the girl resist the mask of the face for the sake of beauty. They are able to find beauty without the mask: the beauty of strangers, beauty in one another, indubitable beauty. But in love, a mask is worn also for the sake of beauty, for the beauty of the sexual act will be destroyed if later, they find that a disease has been transmitted from one to the other. Available at: <https://philpapers.org/rec/EDWIOM-2>