From the Author’s Perspective:

Living in an Artworld

Noël Carroll
CUNY Graduate Center

Throughout my adventures in graduate school (the early nineteen seventies through the early nineteen eighties), I worked as a critic. I reviewed and previewed and otherwise commented upon motion pictures, dance, theater, performance art and some fine art as well. Undoubtedly, this was part of my persistent attempt to avoid writing successive doctoral dissertations. Living in an Artworld is a selection of that journalism, focusing upon my dance, performance art, and fine arts writings. I hope to publish my motion picture criticism in another volume at a later date.

When I was writing this criticism, I felt it was germane to the kinds of philosophical problems that most preoccupied me, notably questions about the concept of art. The philosophy I was taken by concerned the boundary between art and everything else. That frontier, often described as the gap between art and life, was precisely where the art of my initiation into the artworld thrived.

The kind of art I covered was primarily avant-garde, or, as we say now, cutting edge. It was designed to subvert expectations and to break free of the past. Thus, on a regular basis, I had to explain why what I was reviewing was art. With each deadline, one not only had to figure out—and articulate—why the work of the moment belonged to the tradition, but also whether or not it was any good.

Especially with respect to the former task, the concept of the artworld that was emerging in the philosophies of Arthur Danto and George Dickie was particularly useful. Artworks that seemed otherwise altogether inexplicable fell into place, so to speak, when one could identify the artworld theories, histories, or, at least, emerging themes that enfranchised them.

The artworld itself of that period was theory driven, making it the ideal place for a fledgling theorist to set up shop in. My philosophy and my journalism were in synch. As an artswriter I was constantly challenged to push the envelope, an exercise that fed back into my interest in the then-dominant obsession with getting a handle on the nature of art. For, I was constantly explaining why each new artworld-entry was art, giving me a wealth of material upon which to reflect when it became my turn to propound a philosophy of art. Indeed, I suspect that my critical practice influenced my philosophy inasmuch as my commitment to narrative as the means for identifying art probably flowed out of telling stories to my readers, sometimes on a weekly basis, about why this or that avant-garde breakthrough was art (or dance, or theater, etc.).

The artworld tendency to attempt to theorize about the nature of art from within the artworld itself was very pronounced when I entered the critical estate. Still under the shadow of Greenberg, even the minimalists, whom he eschewed, understood themselves to be involved in a reflexive project. If they differed from Greenberg at all, it was in the scope of their reflexivity—they often thought of themselves as not simply addressing the question of the nature of art, but also the nature of art in context.

Moreover, this is not only a description of minimalism in painting and sculpture of the time. The perspective also influenced the ways in which ambitious artists in film, dance,
and what was evolving as performance art all conceptualized themselves as well. Thus, though encompassing various artforms, my beat was, at least initially, a surprisingly unified artworld, one united by several converging theoretical commitments.

I began writing criticism in the early seventies as a dance and performance reviewer for Artforum. At that time, Artforum was expanding its coverage beyond the gallery proper into fields like film, photography, and video as well as dance and performance, not only because various gallery stars, like Robert Rauschenberg and Robert Morris, were experimenting with alternative media, but also because concerns related to reigning gallery aesthetics were also shaping adjacent artforms. One could justifiably apply the conceptual frameworks of minimalism, for example, to dance, as Yvonne Rainer did explicitly.

Of course, over the period in which I plied my trade as an artswriter, the artworld underwent seismic transformations. The most striking, perhaps needless to say, involved a shift from the more hermetic concentration on the nature of art and the experience thereof to a more culturally expansive and increasingly politicized approach to art—i.e., to an art that embraced other forms of theory, not exclusively artworld theories, but theories like Marxism, anarchism, and feminism (in short, ideologically progressive, critical theories of the status quo, both artistic and otherwise).

The sections on dance and theater in Living in an Artworld trace a parallel arch as art moves from narrow artworld preoccupations to an increasingly culturally engaged stance. To put it in a slogan, by the mid-nineteen seventies, the sixties were finally catching up with the artworld. Art moved from self-reflection to cultural and political activism, albeit often activism discernible only in the terms set by the pre-existing artworld. In fact, one of my primary goals in publishing Living in an Artworld is to document this important transitional period in the history of the artworld—a time of ferment and excitement now unfortunately faded in memory.

Because the art that I reviewed was self-avowedly radical, I, like many other critics of the period, viewed myself as having a responsibility to attempt to defend avant-garde practices from the surrounding culture. Consequently, much of the writing in Living in an Artworld is taken up with explaining—explaining why this dance has the shape it does or why that performance has just these ellipses. The effort is unmistakably to educate the audience—to supply the means to break through the veil of avant-garde strategies. As a result, my reviews implicitly advocate the kind of avant-garde experimentation upon which I report. Admittedly, there is some negative criticism in the collection, but probably not as much as there should have been. For, although I did not play the critic-as-champion role outright, I did tilt the table in favor of the avant-garde.

One of the most satisfying rewards for a critic is that one gets to have the first word on emerging art. Not only is it a wonderfully bracing challenge, but one has a real sense of accomplishment when the formula you craft for a stylistic tendency gets taken up not only by other writers but influences artists as well. An arts writer is not only an observer of history in the making, but a participant as well. As George Dickie stressed, an artworld calls for a range of different, inter-related roles. And this is eminently true of the avant-garde artworld where mediation between the artists and the audiences is notably pressing.

Philosophers become philosophers of art from several different directions. Some come from other areas of philosophy—from metaphysics, epistemology, philosophy of mind, or philosophy of language, for example. This is often evident in the style of their philosophy of art. I, however, came to the philosophy of art through art—from being a student of filmmaking and then a commentator on various other artforms. I suspect this is detectable in my approach to the philosophy of art. I come from inside the artworld. I encounter my problems on the ground, so to speak, and then look for resources to solve them anywhere I can find help, including the various social sciences, psychology, and, of course, various areas of philosophy. My philosophy is bottom up rather than top down. I don’t have a set of metaphysical convictions that I apply to the case of the arts, but I employ only as much metaphysics or philosophy of mind as is useful to solve this or that problem in the philosophy of art. That is why a great deal of what I do is metacriticism that, in turn, is rooted in the practice of criticism exhibited by Living in an Artworld.

Because the artworld I lived in was so theoretically driven, many of the problems that sent me to philosophy erupted from the discourse of artworld practitioners. Alternatively inspired by phenomenology, semiotics, and post-structuralism, artists and pundits alike passionately embraced various theoretical frameworks as the motivations for new work. In this artworld, theories often functioned like tactical counters. Politicized poststructural postmodernists would attempt to outflank allegedly phenomenological minimalists by accusing them of Idealism. The atmosphere was highly polemical and frequently the essays in Living in an Artworld join the fray.

Although I am usually fairly lenient with the theoretical excesses of the artists of the period, acknowledging the production of interesting work, however dubiously motivated by uninteresting theories, I am less charitable to my contemporary critics who were guilty not only of poor thinking, but, perhaps even more grievously, of bad writing. My artworld was cluttered with jargon. So a good portion of Living in an Artworld is devoted to scotching the theoretical pretensions of the critical establishment of the seventies and eighties. This is perhaps no more apparent than my recurring attacks on the very notion of postmodernism.

On the more positive side of the ledger, my interrogation of artworld notions of pictorial representation put me on the road to the naturalist theory of depiction that I developed soon after with regard to cinema. However, even here, I would stress that I typically embarked on such philosophical projects, not for the sake of pure philosophy, but instead, for example, for the purpose of identifying a concept of pictorial representation that I thought would best serve our understanding of the practice of artmaking and the criticism thereof.

The section on dance in the book begins looking at the poetics of post modern dance and its alliance with gallery minimalism. Standing back, from that starting point, one can observe through my coverage of the period an emerging reaction formation. If Yvonne Rainer said no to just about everything that was not movement in dance, the period of the nineteen-seventies and eighties responded by saying yes to everything that Rainer denied. Thus, in my writing, elements of dance earlier abjured begin to re-appear, including expression, narrative, references to the enviroring culture (such as TV), and finally even politics.

The move to the critical examination of mass culture and political engagement, as charted in Living in an Artworld, is even faster in the para-theatrical world of performance. Perhaps this was predictable, since theater/performance are more immediately and obviously discursive than dance, thereby making it a more likely and more malleable sounding board for cultural/political themes. Moreover, in both dance and performance, mere reference to the larger culture—including popular culture—tended to count, within the language game of the artworld, as political, both in the sense of decoding, in
imagination of that vaunted figure of the times, the semiotician, the artifacts of the dominant (and domineering) society, but also by being accessible—by speaking in the language of the people itself taken as a gesture of democratic practice.

The allusion to popular culture was perhaps no more evident than in the world of gallery art where the Pop Art of the sixties captured the imagination of a younger group of artists, such as the Metro Pictures group. This tendency seemed to coalesce around the mid-seventies and, of course, came to be labeled postmodernism. Perhaps 1976, the date of the founding of the journal October, is the most convenient event to nominate as the beginning of the postmodernist period. Increasingly gallery artists began appropriating mass culture imagery as recorded in several of the catalogue essays in Living in an Artworld.

At the same time, a sort of party line began to assemble itself around the work of the so-called postmodernist artists: on the one hand, the notion that the appropriation of popular culture imagery could be seen as a progressive political gesture, and, on the other hand, that the notion of postmodernism was not only a historical marker of a specific stylistic episode, but, rather, that it was the name of an epoch of world history—an ensemble of causally and thematically inter-related economic, social, political as well as artistic tendencies. These proposals always struck me as excessive and, as a result, I am progressively critical of them in the book, especially in the section on fine art, since that was where the theory of postmodernism was most developed.

The book also includes an essay on art and globalization, written long after my tenure as a working critic, because I think that globalization is the successor to the notion of postmodernism, as least in the sense of being the next big artworld idea.

To be honest, the order that I’ve just extracted from the arts coverage collected in Living in an Artworld benefits from hindsight. At the time, things scarcely seemed so coherent. In truth, the chaos was part of the fun. We walk into history backwards—I think McLuhan said—or was it that we see history unfold as if through the rear-view mirror of a moving car? Things always seem much more intelligible in retrospect—not only the movement of art, but a life as well. In that respect, Living in an Artworld is an autobiography of sorts.


View from a Bridge: Aesthetics as an Aid to Artistic Practice

Matthew Rowe
Independent Scholar

In the last two years I’ve been lucky enough to have delivered a series of seminars on analytical aesthetics to undergraduates in an art school in which Art Theory is the usual theory taught. Yet, thanks to the enlightened and adventurous academic staff there I was encouraged to present some ideas from philosophical aesthetics to the students. Discussing aesthetics with the students there, thanks to their willingness to take part, was completely rewarding and gratifying for me as a philosopher. Here, I’m going to set out why it might have been rewarding for them as art students to be presented with ideas from analytical aesthetics.

To begin, I’ll provide an overview of the seminars. Then I’ll go on to offer these seminars as an illustrative example of how ideas from philosophical aesthetics can be used as an aid to what we might call ‘practitioners within the art-world’—that is, artists, students, curators, critics, or even audiences.

The seminars were structured around a core of basic texts chosen both for their relative initial accessibility to a non-philosophy audience and for the range of discussion topics they could suggest. The texts and authors chosen were targeted at art students in that they were those which might (superficially at least) be regarded as most sympathetic to the art world and most relevant to the concerns of those involved in making artworks.

So, the seminars covered (i) the concept of art, (ii) artwork ontology, (iii) authorship and art making and (iv) mass art and the end of art. In fact, the range of topics covered within these headings included:

- The idea of indiscernibles thought experiments and institutional and historical theories of art.
- What, if any, are the differences between art and science?
- The history, formation and rationale behind existing art forms—why do we have the ones we have and not others?
- How can different artworks be destroyed or lost? When and how can we be mistaken about artworks?
- What sort of work do you have to do to make an artwork? Is there anything you can’t do?
- Authorship versus convention in artwork properties—how much is input by an artist’s choice and how much by the prevailing conventions of an art form?
- Style—whether this belongs to artists, artworks or movements—and whether it’s the preserve of the variable properties of artworks.
- Plagiarism, copying and influencing—the relationships between an artworks’ ontology and its critically relevant properties.
- Does it matter whether something is art or not? Or whether you are an artist? Is it more important that what you make is good regardless of whether it’s art?
- Is there a future where the concept of art will become redundant? Will art become just another form of production and consumption?

However, most crucial was how these philosophical topics were addressed. We tried to tackle each abstract or conceptual philosophical problem through the prism of an artist asking themselves what this problem might mean for their own work. So, the focus throughout was on them as art students with their own practice and how they might relate and apply these ideas to what they were doing in their studio that morning or evening.

So, for instance the topic of the Concept of Art prompted questions including:

- What work is the concept of ‘art’ doing in your practice?
- What is the earliest date in the history of art that your work could...
For any of your works, see if you can list the choices and decisions to making any of your pieces of work.

From the making artworks seminar:

• Take a work you have made: Set out what would have to happen for it to be (i) mislaid, (ii) misidentified and (iii) destroyed.
• In light of the answers above, set out, in terms of materials, what is integral to your work? What does this mean for what kind of artwork it is?
• Try to characterize the same work so it has a different answer to how it might occupy each of the above categories (i -iii).

Lastly, from the mass art and the end of art seminar:

• Think what you would have to do to a piece of yours to construct its Mass Art version?
• If not possible for a particular piece think what aspects of your piece prevent this?

It’s worth noting that these are questions and situations that expose and test ‘art,’ but they have been translated again—into tasks. Moreover, these tasks require you to be an art practitioner to do them; they are not ones that we as philosophers could do. So, now I think we’ve moved away from philosophical aesthetics and into what I hope would be a philosophically informed artistic practice.

What I’ve described above was only one specific approach, tailored to the particular concerns of art students involved in making artworks. It asked them to think about their subjects in the way philosophy does – from the outside in: This stands in contrast to much discussion about artistic practice in art schools, which is necessarily concerned with its content – what the students are trying to do in their work and how artworks function in terms of material, criticality, interpretation, ideology, etc. The seminars I did looked instead at structural questions—about why what the students were doing is art, what makes it art and what would stop it being art—the scenarios when, as it were, art breaks down.

Nevertheless, I think this type of approach is fruitful whenever we’re trying to present philosophical aesthetics to a non-philosophical ‘art-world’ audience. It’s an approach in which philosophical topics are presented, rather than examined—and I say this deliberately, to mark a crucial distinction. The seminars were not a course in philosophical aesthetics and their aim was not to deepen or generate a deeper critical understanding and appreciation of the nuances of the philosophical positions advanced—that, as I said to the students in the preamble to the course, was explicitly not the point:

“There’s one very important point to be made at the beginning: This is NOT designed to be a course in philosophical aesthetics, nor is it designed to be prescriptive towards any kind of art or critical practice—it is about applying another set of questions and paradigms to what you are already doing to enable you to have fresh perspectives on that work.”

This was in effect a statement of good faith—a contract with them as practitioners that I come to explore rather than to inculcate. And it’s this position that I’m advocating here: That it’s possible, and perfectly valid, to teach philosophical concepts without necessarily thereby needing to teach philosophy—where the intended results are not to increase the students’ philosophical nous and sophistication but rather to allow them to apply some philosophical concepts to their non-philosophy day jobs. And this is how philosophical aesthetics can be an aid to artistic practice.

Not all of what we do in philosophical aesthetics can do this—and that’s not bad—but a good deal can and when it can then that’s all
for the good. It’s my view that we can design similar courses using other strands of philosophical aesthetics that would be of interest to other specialist audiences—cultural theorists, cognitive scientists or intellectual property lawyers—both within and without the academy. However, if we are to do this kind of work with non-philosophy audiences then the aim cannot be to tell that audience of their error, or to present a philosophical position as the preferred way to think about their subject. Instead we need to lay out some philosophical positions to them, as the raw materials with which they themselves make something within their own subjects. We use philosophy to introduce problems or areas of debate so that they can, through considering their own everyday problems through this new prism of philosophical aesthetics, move them on within their own subjects.

Additionally, this approach is not applying a philosophical theory to a situation in the world with the expectation that philosophy can provide an answer. Rather, we’re asking whether thinking like this will provide them with help with the questions they’re dealing with from within their subjects. The aim is to talk on our terms in respect of the content of a course but on their terms for the use of the material presented within that course. The intended outcome is that we combine some of our philosophical theories with the practitioners’ own work to come up with better work for them and more informed theory for us. Instead of us standing on their ground in order to judge or critically appraise them by philosophy’s standards—or indeed letting them do the same to us—what might be called the ‘audit approach’ on each side—we recognize these different standpoints and different criteria by which we judge the others’ activities. So, for example, philosophical aesthetics may judge the art world’s material in our discipline according to its internal consistency and how their work illustrates, confirms or counters our theories about art; similarly, the art world may judge our work by its ability to open up fruitful ways of thinking about and making artworks.

Working this way requires us using what could rather grandly be called a ‘principle of translation,’ where philosophical issues are translated into practice-based questions, which are in turn translated into practical non-philosophy tasks. This requires us to think about theoretical constructs and philosophical positions in such a way as to produce practitioner-based questions and activities. Our basic approach must be to ask ourselves: “How could this affect what you do if you were actually involved in this activity? Our basic attitude to our material will be “How can this be of use to you, our intended audience? Or “Look at this stuff I’ve brought with me—is any of this useful to you?” Can you use any of it on your own terms to make your work more fruitful?” When we do this, what we must not expect is to get philosophy back from our art-world audiences (the art students, after all, were not getting artworks from me).

There are, of course, dangers and risks to such an approach. What was missing in my seminars was any prolonged or deep philosophical engagement with the positions offered. So there is the risk that presenting philosophical topics in this way might encourage a superficial, or a mis-understanding, of philosophical ideas. Secondly, there’s the related worry that we’re providing a little knowledge of these ideas—and that this, for similar reasons, is a dangerous thing. And perhaps there’s a slight distaste among us philosophers for this kind of ‘philosophy-lite’ approach, in which we’re presenting philosophical ideas without actually doing philosophy with them.

These risks are real. However, I think that they are manageable and justifiable. This is because in doing this kind of work, we’re not training philosophers and we’re explicitly not providing philosophical courses in philosophical aesthetics. Rather we’re providing non-philosophical courses in philosophical aesthetics—they aim to provide tools to art-world practitioners in order to make them more critically self-aware, so that they have a wider range of positions at their disposal with which to carry on with their core work. The point is to enrich one subject through the debates of another. We’re not asking them to do our core work. We continue to do that—they enrich it with their art-world engagement.

In my view, if we recognize this difference of approach but commonality of subject matter, the results can be that an artist’s acquaintance with philosophical aesthetics can become a practical source of high quality artistic practice and that artistic practice can provide philosophy with a perhaps more nuanced reading of existing philosophical problems. Moreover, as people that make the kind of stuff that we philosophers talk about, they can make work that hands them a whole new set of problems, situations and considerations back to us philosophers.

To conclude: My examples here of the translation of philosophical topics from one strand of philosophical aesthetics into applied discussions, into practice-based tasks, was my own no doubt naïve application of this way of working. When I did it, thanks to their own efforts and goodwill, the students did indeed bring their own experience of being an art practitioner into the discussions—and it was this practical application that was where the real philosophy was in the work we did together. Why might this be valuable to philosophers? Well, it shows that our great subject can have a relevance to the art world that it may not otherwise have. Moreover, it shows that a philosophical approach to a subject may have uses outside of the philosophical arena—that there is room for applied philosophical aesthetics.

The moral? Perhaps we should continue to look at our own philosophical research and say “Who else might get sparked off by this?” and not be afraid of them not quite taking from it what we might take from it. That’s not the most important thing—the spark is the most important thing. We should approach other subjects with an open mind, an open heart and a bag full of philosophical goodies. And they of course, should do the same for us. That way aesthetics can be a guide to practice, research, society and debate. That way we all—the art world, science, law—but especially aesthetics—win.

Endnotes


2. I am grateful to Mary Anne Francis, Sherri Irvin and to the participants at ‘The State of Aesthetics’ conference, Institute of Advanced Studies, University of London, June 2011, where a version of this paper was prepared, for helping to bring this paper to fruition.
About My Art

Michael Krausz
Bryn Mawr College

Michael Krausz is the author of Rightness and Reasons: Interpretation in Cultural Practices, Varieties of Relativism (with Rom Harre), Limits of Rightness; Interpretation and Transformation: Explorations in Art and the Self, and Dialogues on Relativism, Absolutism and Beyond: Four Days in India. Krausz is contributing editor of eleven volumes on such topics as relativism, rationality, interpretation, cultural identity, metaphysics of culture, creativity, interpretation of music, and the philosophy of R.G. Collingwood. Krausz is the Artistic Director and Conductor of the Great Hall Chamber Orchestra at Bryn Mawr, comprised of forty-six young professional musicians. Krausz has mounted thirty-three solo and duo exhibitions in the United States, Great Britain, and India, and has participated in many group exhibitions. He studied art at the Philadelphia College of Art. He is a member of the Artist’s Exchange (Delaware), a guild of a dozen professional artists who critique each other’s works. In 2009, Delaware by Hand bestowed upon him the distinction of “Master.” Krausz is represented by Gallery 50, Rehoboth, Delaware. Recent works may be seen on his website: <http://www.krauszart.com>.

I have been actively painting for about forty-two years. My paintings depict open meditative spaces, simultaneously displaying multiple spatial planes. Upon color fields, I superimpose inscriptions or ciphers of no literal significance. My works concern the emergence and dissolution of ciphers in infinite spaces. Sometimes the ciphers are small and delicate. Other times they are larger and assertive. Sometimes the marks arise from hand or wrist motions. At other times they arise from elbow and full-arm motions—similar to my gestures used while conducting the Great Hall Chamber Orchestra. While I am right-handed with my baton, I am left-handed with my brush.

With wide horse-hair brushes, I grind powdered pigments into the subtle surfaces of museum board. Then, with thinner brushes, I apply the ciphers. My thinner brushes are made of the hairs of deer, elk, and fox. They have a life of their own. After dipped in water-based pigment, with only slight pressure on museum board, they make very fine, thin lines. With greater pressure, a brush’s bulbous base releases a swath of pigment on to the surface. After the ciphers dry, I smear their residue, leaving visible traces of my motion. I characteristically

Michael Krausz, After China III, 32x40, mixed media.
Black and white reproduction by permission of the artist.
use earth tones: raw umber, burnt umber, burnt sienna, red oxide, as well as graphite and black. Often ciphers are applied with India ink. With a final fixative spray, the colors emerge in unpredictable ways, ever more vibrantly.

As I begin, I have a general vision in mind of what the painting will look like when it is completed. Yet I allow the materials their own life. As a work unfolds, the materials suggest their own possibilities. Sometimes unintended results are welcome, sometimes not. I am intrigued by the possibilities of the media. Their sheer materiality is satisfying. As I work on a particular piece, I am aware of its place within a larger body of works. Just as a single work may embody emergent features, so too may a series of related works give rise to emergent directions. These features and directions may become apparent when I view a series as a whole, for example, in a solo exhibition.

I think of my recent artistic path as following one trodden before me by Mark Tobey and Mark Rothko: Tobey, for his extraordinarily evocative linear brush work; Rothko, for his deeply moving color fields. In addition, I have been inspired by Japanese and Chinese calligraphy as well as by the conceptual and spiritual spaces of Buddhism and Hinduism. In earlier times, I was influenced by Ellsworth Kelly’s minimalist hard-edged paintings, and by Ben Nicholson, for his contiguous harmonious geometrical reliefs. I have long been inspired by the works of Constance Costigan, for her metaphysical surrealistic “inscapes” that evoke quietly sensual infinite spaces, fashioned with meticulously layered graphite. Others whose work I have particularly admired include Adolph Gottlieb, Franz Kline, Robert Motherwell, Jackson Pollock, and—still earlier on—minimalists Ad Reinhardt and Agnes Martin.

I never have a title in mind before starting a new work. Rather, I settle upon a title after a painting’s completion. Sometimes the title of a piece suggests itself after I have had a chance to live with it a while. Sometimes a viewer will see something in a painting that I myself hadn’t seen before. Sometimes a painting’s title will suggest itself in relation to other paintings. At other times, a title may be related to the location at which it was made. Sometimes a work will be numbered as part of a series. More importantly, my titles characteristically do not impart assertions of what a work is about. Rather, I offer them as commendations: “Try this way of looking at it! See what happens.” I find my way as I make it. I create the spaces in which I wish to dwell. Sometimes, as in After China, III, the result is a scene I could not have imagined before starting the work. Sometimes the scene provides a space that invites my vicarious entry.

I had not been particularly visually aware until I was twenty-eight. Then, rather suddenly, painting came upon me. It was then that I visited the studio of noted artist, Leah Rhodes. Upon seeing her large shaped canvases, I had what John Dewey called a “consummatory experience.” I suddenly experienced myself in the space of Rhodes’s works instead of looking at them. I experienced an “interpenetration” of my self into the space of the painting. Suddenly, I became extremely visually sensitive—to spatial relations, to colors, and more. As a consequence of that experience, I needed to paint. As a matter of “inner necessity,” as Wassily Kandinsky would have put it, I had to paint; and paint I did—obsessively! After one year of intense work, I had my first solo exhibition at a local bank. It featured shaped canvases and abstract, minimalist serigraphs. That was the beginning. But what was this originating consummatory experience of selflessness—of non-duality between self and other, between subject and object, between artist and work—where binary oppositions are “dissolved” or “transcended? Arthur Danto helps me here. He describes such non-dualistic experiences as:

high moments . . . of pure creativity, when artist and work are not separated by a gap of any sort, but fuse in such a way that the work seems to bring itself into existence. At such points—and any creative person lives for these—there is none of the struggle and externality that marks those phases of artistic labor in which inspiration fails and the work itself refuses to cooperate . . . which is the state at which . . . so much of Oriental philosophy . . . aims.2

Robert Henri helps as well. Speaking of modern art, he says:

The object . . . is the attainment of a state of being, a state of high functioning . . . whether this activity is with brush, pen, chisel, or tongue, its result is but a by-product of this state, a trace, the footprint of the state . . . [It] is fundamental to creative activity, while skills and measurements are secondary.3

Here is my personal program, as I call it. I understand my creative work to include more than “thingly” products. It includes process as well as product, verb as well as a noun, act as well as outcome, doing as well as what is done. It recognizes nondualistic experiences as benchmarks of my creative life path. It allows for unintended by-products of the mix of media and spontaneous movement.

Several related questions arise here. Should we count a personal program such as mine as relevant for the interpretation of its ensuing products? Does my personal program indicate what my paintings mean? Or does it indicate only what motivated their production? This is not the place for me to elaborate upon such questions. For now, as regards the interpretation of my paintings, I leave that to others.

Endnotes


---

Editors’s Note: Michael Krausz’s article is part of our continuing series in which ASA members reflect on their work as artists and the relationship between that work and their philosophical writings on the arts.
Reminiscences of Peter Goldie

Elisabeth Schellekens
Durham University

Most of those who met Peter Goldie will remember their first impression of him. Here was a man whose piercing eyes revealed a sharp intellect and powerfully focused energy. His unflinching gaze had an intensity which not everybody could meet. As his Ph.D. student, I used frequently to be asked by my peers what it was like to work with such an intimidating person. My answer was always the same: he might not suffer fools lightly, but he is in fact incredibly helpful, kind, understanding, funny and, above all, generous.

Peter’s character was in fact full of these apparent paradoxes. He was a profoundly emotional man who lived his feelings thoroughly and thoughtfully, and yet the only change that registered on his face might be a slight tightening of the lips, or a momentary glint in the eye. His direct conversational manner, very confident and ‘to the point,’ nonetheless concealed a certain shyness that could on occasion transmute to impatience. He was always deeply modest in relation to the thinkers and scholars he studied and wrote about, but was at the same time keenly aware of his own intellectual abilities. He could be irreverent and ironic, but was incapable of being disrespectful. He always approached any new project with humility and circumspection, conscious—as indeed everyone who encountered him also was—of the fact that he would make a success of it.

These qualities were of course originally displayed in Peter’s first career, in the corridors of financial power in the City of London. He qualified as a chartered accountant aged 22 at the firm of Edward Moore and Sons, rising to become a partner there only three years later—their youngest ever. A few years later, he joined the merchant bank Guinness Mahon as director, eventually becoming chief executive of Abaco Investments before turning 40.

Peter’s second career as a philosopher began in 1990, when he enrolled as an undergraduate at UCL, at the age of 44. He graduated with first class honours before moving to Oxford where he took a B.Phil.—winning the highly coveted Jowett Prize—and then completing his D.Phil under the supervision of Bernard Williams. Subsequently he spent two years lecturing at Magdalen College before taking an appointment at King’s College London in 1998. In 2005 he was appointed Samuel Hall Professor of Philosophy at the University of Manchester.

I first started working with Peter towards the end of my first year as a Ph.D. student at King’s. My main focus at the time was on meta-ethics but after three or four months it became clear that my research was taking me in the direction of aesthetics, an area that had hitherto only been of secondary interest for Peter. He approached our new field of enquiry with a voracious appetite, his reading on the subject easily equalling mine, and there was never any sense in which he felt the urge to refer me to a more established expert in the field.

This kind of thing was typical of Peter. I remember him offering a fellow Ph.D. student, who had found herself stranded without a supervisor, towards the end of her third year of research on the philosophy of economics, to read up on the subject just in order to help her complete her thesis. Whether he was literally discovering an area at the same time as his student or simply inspiring that sense of discovery in them, he always took seriously the questions and problems brought to him by students and colleagues, junior and senior alike. Above all, one never had a sense that there was an area of philosophy he “didn’t do,” a rare virtue in these times of increasing specialization.

I never knew Peter while he worked in the financial world, although I have met one or two people who did, but one common thread running through his two careers is abundantly clear: he was brilliant at seeing opportunities and seizing them. Getting to grips with a new area of knowledge, he would lose no time in sizing up the “market,” so to speak, sensing immediately which areas would benefit from better exploration, which questions needed answering, and so forth. It was thanks to this kind of insight that our joint work on the philosophy of conceptual art, for example, got underway. Or later, when we developed aspects of my thesis into a research project on neuro-aesthetics and what we called ‘esthetic psychology,’ his acuity in seeing where links needed to be uncovered or strengthened was invaluable. In terms of his own research, he always navigated the field between philosophy and psychology with great dexterity, weighing seriously the questions and answers provided by neighbouring disciplines such as evolutionary psychology and neuroscience but never becoming so absorbed by it that his own line of inquiry would lose its integrity.

Many of Peter’s philosophical interests derived from his love of literature, and perhaps in particular the work of Musil and Conrad. Quotations from these authors litter his work on the emotions, with Peter always choosing examples whose nicety and profundity would add weight and bring clarification to many important points in the philosophy of the emotions and in that of the philosophy of mind and moral psychology more widely. A particular point to which he often returned was his insistence on the importance of narrative in relation to our self-understanding and our own access to our emotions and other mental states. As he put it in one of his more recent publications, examining the subject of grief:

“The emotion of grief is a kind of process—a complex pattern of activity and passivity, inner and outer, which unfolds over time, and the unfolding pattern over time is explanatorily prior to what is the case at any particular moment... The pattern of a particular grieving is best understood and explained through a narrative account... because narrative accounts in such cases have very powerful explanatory, revelatory, and expressive powers... It is because grief is a process of this kind, narratable in this way, that its parts ‘hang together into a coherent whole’” (Ratio, June 2011, pp.136-7).

His love of literature also surfaced at least obviously inappropriate moments. During conference papers which he felt to be lacking of interest, he was in the habit of scribbling down a quotation on the back of a hand-out, passing it over to quiz me on its origin. They made for interesting reading, but guessing was never very challenging: it was always either Conrad or Musil.

His taste for the good things in life extended outwards, to the theatre and opera house, to the worlds of fine wine, vodka, cricket and—perhaps most unusual for a philosopher—fast cars. In music one of his greatest loves was always Handel, though we once developed a theory that a preference for Handel over Bach would equate, in philosophy, to a preference for Hume over Kant, and vice versa. I’m not sure if the model was supposed to carry over into a preference for Maserati over Ferraris, but I wouldn’t be surprised.

In both his person and his writing style, one of Peter’s great gifts was to very quickly build up a personal relationship with his col-
leagues and readers, giving them a sense of that he could identify with them deep down. It is no wonder that his first, and perhaps last, philosophical love lay with the subject of the emotions. But beyond any lasting philosophical implications his work and teaching will prove to have had—and I think few would deny these will be significant—it is clear that as a man and as a writer that he touched people deeply. As but one of many to have worked closely with Peter over the last decade or so, I received nearly 150 messages of support after his death, some even from people I had never heard of. If grief is, as Peter argued, a process, it will no doubt be one that our academic community is only beginning. We have not just lost a valued colleague but also a very dear friend.

CALL FOR NOMINATIONS

SELMA JEANNE COHEN PRIZE IN DANCE AESTHETICS

In memory of Selma Jeanne Cohen, the American Society for Aesthetics established in 2008 a $1000 biennial prize in dance aesthetics, dance theory, or the history of dance. The next prize will be for a critical article or book of distinction published in English in the biennium from July 2010 to June 2012.

The prize winner will be selected by a committee of three members appointed by the President of the ASA and will be notified by September 2012. The award will be announced publicly during the national meeting of the ASA on 24-27 October 2012 in St. Louis, MO. The winner will be encouraged but not required to attend the meeting. The prize may not be awarded if, in the opinion of the judges, no nomination of sufficient merit and appropriateness is received.

The ASA selection committee welcomes published work of distinction that contributes to dance aesthetics, dance theory, or the history of dance. Publication is understood to mean publication in venues with peer review recognized by the scholarly community and that are permanently available to the interested scholarly community of students and researchers. Nominations will be judged based on significance of the topic or issue, quality of the research, quality of the writing, originality, and contribution to the dance literature.

Submissions should be directed to Dabney Townsend, ASA Secretary/Treasurer, at P. O. Box 915, Pooler, GA 31322 or Dabney.Townsend@armstrong.edu The nominated article or book must be submitted in full. Electronic submissions of articles are preferable, if available, in PDF format replicating the original publication. The deadline for receipt of nominations is 1 August 2012.
News from the National Office

The membership up-date for the 2012 calendar year is now complete. Thanks to everyone for renewing for 2012. Renewal notices for 2013 will go out late in 2012. Currently, we mail both The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism and the Newsletter to all members who have paid their membership dues no later than the end of the first quarter of the calendar year. Our publisher, Wiley/Blackwell, has suggested that we might consider a default distribution by email instead. Print copies would be available to those who request them, perhaps at a small additional charge. Postage and printing costs are increasing rapidly, especially for international mailing. Electronic delivery, especially for international members, might well be more reliable as well as offering a major saving for the society. While I have not done the calculations, I suspect that our modest membership dues do not cover the costs. This change would be a major innovation, but as electronic publishing becomes more common, it is likely to become the norm. We already offer ASAGE (the ASA Graduate E-Journal) exclusively electronically. I emphasize that this is only a suggestion from the publisher at this time. It will probably be discussed at the board meeting in St. Louis, and input, both pro and con, would be appropriate at this time. I repeat, no action has been taken, nor will any be taken without discussion and board action. I might add, however, that since a new membership directory is scheduled soon, I may decide to distribute that electronically to see how it goes.

The 2012 annual meeting will be October 24 through October 27 at the Millennium Hotel in downtown St. Louis next to the Arch. It is time to put that meeting on your calendar. More information will be sent as we get nearer to the meeting. The 2013 meeting is scheduled for October 30 through November 2 at the Sheraton San Diego Suites at Symphony Hall. The hotel occupies the floors directly above the Symphony Hall. At this time, the performance schedule for the Symphony Hall has not been set, but I have been assured that there will be something interesting available while we are there. Aaron Meskin will be the program chair, and Jennifer Judkins will handle local arrangements with assistance from Mary Devereaux. In 2014, we will meet in San Antonio at the invitation of Trinity University and Andrew Kania. I am in the final stages of negotiating a hotel contract for that meeting. San Antonio is a great tourist destination, and we will be on or near the River Walk. This would be a great meeting to bring the family to. As soon as I have 2014 complete, I will be working on a site for the 2015 meeting. I welcome suggestions, and an invitation would be most appreciated. Sites on the east coast might have preference, but any place not too close to San Antonio is a possibility. Our policy states only that the meeting sites should be “geographically diverse.”

For the 2012 meeting in St. Louis, the board of trustees voted to offer a small rebate to graduate students who attend the meeting and stay in the meeting hotel. Details will be available as we get closer to registration.

Everyone is reminded that the ASA offers two prizes. A prize for an outstanding monograph in aesthetics by a member of the society and published in the previous year (2011 in this case) is offered each year. The Cohen Prize in dance aesthetics is offered in alternate years. It will be given in 2012 for an article or book published in 2010 or 2011. That prize honors Selma Jean Cohen and her work promoting dance aesthetics. She left a substantial gift to the ASA, and income from that gift helps fund the prize. The Cohen Prize is open to anyone. Committees of senior members of the society have been established to recommend the awards. Any member of the society may nominate a work, and self-nominations are in order. Nominations should be sent either to me or to Paul Guyer. The committees are already at work.

Each year, the ASA elects members to the board of trustees and in alternate years, an election is held for vice president. The vice president succeeds to the presidency without further election. The board of trustees nominates candidates for these positions, and members of the society may also nominate candidates by submitting a nominating petition signed by at least eight members of the society. Two trustee positions will be open for terms of three years beginning 1 February 2012. Suggestions for consideration both for the trustee positions and for vice president should be sent to me or Paul Guyer in advance of the St. Louis meeting. The board of trustees also selects the program chair for subsequent meetings. Anyone interested in serving as program chair for the 2014 meeting should express interest by writing me or Paul. The board of trustees, in its wisdom, has voted to pay the hotel and at least a portion of the travel expenses for the program chair at the meeting in question.

See you in St. Louis, Louis (and everyone else).

Dabney Townsend
Secretary-Treasurer
American Society for Aesthetics
P. O. Box 915
Pooler, GA 31322
Telephone: 912-748-9524 912-247-5868 (cell)
e-mail: <dabney.townsend@armstrong.edu>
web site: <www.aesthetics-online.org>

Aesthetics News

ASAGE


Contemporary Aesthetics

Contemporary Aesthetics has just published a special volume on Artification. Fifteen papers by scholars from different disciplines and countries explore various issues associated with the emerging phenomena of involving art and art-like practices in those fields normally not associated with art, such as business, science, sports, interior decoration, among others. Ossi Naukkarinen of Aalto University, Helsinki, and Yuriko Saito of Rhode Island School of Design guest-edited the volume, with generous support from the Editor of Contemporary Aesthetics, Arnold Berleant. This is a part of the three-year research project on Artification funded by the Finnish Government. Contemporary Aesthetics is a free-access, peer-reviewed online journal.

Contemporary Aesthetics has also published a special volume devoted to art and aesthetics in Southeast Asia. Contributors include Ananta Sukla, Patrick D. Flores, Flaudette V. May Datuin, Stephen Davies, John Clark, and Apinan Poshyananda with work devoted to the historical and cultural background of the region, allegorical art in the Philippines, the painting of the Thai artist Phaptawan SuwanNAKUDT, Legong Dance in Bali, modern Thai art, and the Indonesian artist Heri Dono.

Completing its first decade of publication, Contemporary Aesthetics is freely and fully
The American Society for Aesthetics Graduate E-journal (ASAGE)

The American Society for Aesthetics Graduate E-journal (ASAGE) welcomes aboard the new Managing Editor, Mike Gutierrez (Loyola University Chicago), and Book Review editor, Robbie Kubala (Columbia University) for a 2-year term. Deep appreciation is extended to the outgoing editors, Dr. Aili Bresnahan (Temple University) and Zach Jurgensen (University of Oklahoma) for their dedication and fine work. ASAGE will continue its mission of providing a rigorous platform for advanced graduate-level research in aesthetics. For information on contributing as an author or blind reviewer, please visit <www.asage.org> or contact Mike Gutierrez at <mgutierrez123@yahoo.com>.

Accessible on line at <www.contempaesthetics.org>. The journal reflects a range of philosophical and cultural perspectives and invites submissions on all aspects of contemporary aesthetics. Information on submitting to Contemporary Aesthetics can be found on the journal’s home page. For more information contact: Arnold Berleant, P.O. Box 52, Cassine, ME 04421, U.S.A., tel. 207-326-4306, <editor@contempaesthetics.org>.

Journal of Philosophy and the Moving Image

We are pleased to announce the publication of Issue 2 of Cinema: Journal of Philosophy and the Moving Image, which is now available for free download at <http://cjpmi.ifl.pt/2-contents>.

Cinema: Journal of Philosophy and the Moving Image is an international peer-reviewed publication devoted to the philosophical inquiry into cinema. It gathers scholars and contributions from different philosophical traditions and it is published online by the Philosophy of Language Institute, Faculty of Social and Human Sciences, New University of Lisbon.

Postdoc Research Position

A 24 month Postdoctoral research position is available at the emotion centre (at paris 6 university/ CNRS and La Salpetriere hospital) in collaboration with the Jean Nicod Institute (Ecole Normale Supérieure/Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales/CNRS). The fellow will work with Dr. Stéphanie Dubal (Emotion center) and Dr. Jérôme Pelletier (Jean Nicod Institute) on the neural basis of emotion perception in art. The program will consist in leading Neuroimaging experiments on the perception of emotions in Chinese art. The fellow will join our multi-disciplinary program that brings together researchers in the field of social sciences as well as specialists in cognitive science and an artist around a common goal, which is to understand the perception of emotions in Chinese art.

Applicants should have a PhD in affective/cognitive neuroscience or a related field with a conceptual background in the study of emotion. Applicants should have experience conducting fMRI studies or MEG studies and conducting data analysis. Ability to work well in a multidisciplinary highly collaborative research team would be advantageous. You should be willing to work closely with collaborators like philosophers and artists. Review of applications will begin immediately, and will continue until the position is filled.

Please send a letter of interest, a CV, some letters of reference as well as relevant reprints of research articles to Stéphanie Dubal <stephanie.dubal@upmc.fr> and Jérôme Pelletier <jerome.pelletier@ehess.fr>.

Announcing Philosophyofculture.org and Philosophyofmusic.org

These websites launched 8 January 2012. The theme of the site is Continental Approaches to Philosophy of Culture, Cultural Theory, and Cultural Studies. The site features Distinguished George F. Kneller Philosophy of Education Chair at UCLA Professor Douglas Kellner’s work on Nietzsche, Adorno, The Frankfurt School and British Cultural Studies, Baudrillard, as well as other selected essays in the field.

<http://www.philosophyofmusic.org/> was updated on 8 January too, and reflects Continental, Analytic, Historical, Literary, and Multicultural Approaches to Philosophy of Music. The site features, among others, University of South Florida Ph.D. candidate in Philosophy Jeff Hinzmann’s work on Virgil Thomson’s Philosophy of Music.

Philosophy in Review

This year’s February issue of Philosophy in Review (PIR) is now online at the following web address: <http://journals.uvic.ca/index.php/pir/index>. We are also extremely pleased to announce that Dr. Constanine Sandis (Oxford Brookes University) and Dr. Manuel Bremer (Universität Düsseldorf) have joined Philosophy in Review as associate editors. In addition to enjoying the reviews in this most recent issue, you may also want to view our “Books for Review” page, which we update with each new issue. It is an extensive list of the most recent publications in philosophy. If you are interested in reviewing again in PIR – or even if you are interested simply keeping abreast of the latest publications in all areas of philosophy – we invite you to browse that page: <http://journals.uvic.ca/index.php/pir/pages/view/books>.

Also, if you have any colleagues who you think would be especially suited to review any of the books you see on our website, please let them know about our “Books for Review” page and/or encourage them to contact us at <pir@uvic.ca>.
The ASA (Pacific) meeting took place in the glorious grounds of Asilomar from 11-13 April. The forecast rain occurred mainly during sleeping (or—for Keren Gorodeisky—early morning exercising) hours. Delegates were treated to two panels and thirteen papers. The panels were entitled ‘The Aesthetic Properties of Persons’ (Carol Gould, Eva Dadlez, and David Goldblatt) and ‘Art and Science’ (Renee Conroy, Stephen Davies, David Davies, and Amy Coplan). Papers were by Robert Stecker, Jason Boaz Simus, Edward Winters, Anna Pakes, Michelle Saint, Mary Beth Willard, Stephanie Partridge and Andrew Jordan, Scott Clifton, James Harold, Chris Williams, Susan Song, Hahn, Josh Johnston and Oisin Deery, and Emma Esmaili. The comments were of a uniformly excellent standard. There were 48 participants: eight and a half Brits; five UBC graduate students; two Edinburgh graduate students. Despite the traditional night in Cabone’s and the absence of Danish Pastries (for which apologies to Professor Kivy), sessions were well attended and the discussion was everything one would expect. The conference organizers were Eva Dadlez and Derek Matravers. Thanks, as usual, to Russell Quacchia and the genius loci, Amy Coplan. It happens again next year; book early.

Respectfully Submitted,
Derek Matravers

The Eastern Division Meeting was once again held in the Old City District of Philadelphia at the Best Western Independence Park Hotel. “Losing the Body: The Later Art of Jacques-Louis David” was this year’s Monroe Beardley Lecture and was delivered by Michael Fried of Johns Hopkins University. While focusing quite closely on the paintings of Jacques-Louis David, Fried’s talk gave a concise account of his well-known work on “ab-sorption” and “theatricality.” Susan Feagin’s plenary lecture on the philosophy of theatre fruitfully explored the relationship between scripts, performances, and productions.

Garry Hagberg, Lydia Goehr, and Jerrold Levinson all presented papers on improvisation in a panel organized by Margaret Moore in honor of Philip Alperton’s work. Phil was present and gave gracious commentary on the three quite disparate talks. The conference hosted two other special panels—one on the Institutional Theory and the Aesthetic and the other on metaontology. Gary Iseminger, Brandon Cooke, and Simon Fokt discussed the merits of the institutional theory, while Andrew Kania, James Young, and Julian Dodd had a lively session on the metaontology of music.

Music and performance was the theme of a session that included a talk by Andrea Baldini and one co-delivered, with ample musical examples, by David Clonewy and Robert Rawlins. The session was rounded out by the commentaries of Philip Jenkins and William Day. The session on Aesthetics and Ethics saw new work by Christie Mad Udhir, Aaron Smuts, and Alessandro Giovannelli. Andrew McGonigal commented on Mag Udhir while Noël Carroll responded to Giovannelli’s engagement with his work on sympathy. Larry Shiner was another commentator responding directly to criticism of his work—in this case Martin Donougho’s talk, “After Kristeller.” Sue Spaid’s talk, “The Role of Exhibitions in Conceptualizing Artworks,” had a response from Ivan Gaskell.

Katherine Tullmann and Jérome Pelletier gave talks on neuroscience, fiction, and aesthetics with commentary by Mark Rollins and Nada Gatalo. Literature and fiction were given disparate philosophical treatments in Iran Newman’s and Bradley Elicker’s talks, with Newman focusing on imagining logical impossibility and Elicker exploring the ontological significance of the visual elements in novels. Cathleen Muller commented on Newman’s paper while John Brown took up Elicker’s argument. Henry Pratt showed that two prominent theories of film produce the odd result that Monday Night Football counts as a documentary. Anthony Aumann argued that aesthetic and cognitive values are not neatly separable while Denise Vigani explored the role of the artist’s intention in the evaluation of artworks. Darren Hick, Sonia Sedivy, and Anthony Cross were commentators. Finally, Adorno, Dewey, Sartre and Ricoeur were mined for insight by Casey Haskins, Lior Levy, and Serge Grigoriev. Rich commentary was provided by Espen Hammer, Kathleen Higgins, and Beau Shaw.

The geographical scope of universities represented was impressive this year. Along with the usual range of area universities—Princeton, Villanova, Columbia, CUNY, Rutgers, Temple, etc.—people came from far and wide: University of Leeds, Institut Nicol, University of St. Andrews, Manchester University, University of Toronto, Gonzaga University, University of Victoria, University of Houston, Trinity University, University of Texas at Austin, Central Oklahoma State University, College of Charleston, University of South Carolina, Appalachian State University, University of Illinois at Springfield, and more.

The program co-chairs would like to thank everybody who agreed to chair a session and helped keep the schedule running smoothly: Nola Senczyszyn, Tiger Rohlott, John Dyck, Garry Hagberg, Oscar Barragan, Margaret Moore, Erum Naqvi, John Carvalho, Brian Sourcek, and Kristin Gjesdal. We would like to give special thanks to those who served on this year’s review committee: Philip Alperson, Hanne Applequist, Aili Bresnahan, David Carrier, John Carvalho, Brandon Cooke, Alessandro Giovannelli, Espen Hammer, Gregg Horowitz, Michael Kelly, Aaron Me-skin, James Shelley, and Scott Walden.

Please direct any questions concerning the 2013 Eastern Division Meeting to the conference organizers Jonathan Neufeld (College of Charleston), Kristin Gjesdal (Temple University), and John Gibson (University of Louisville).

Thanks to everyone for helping to make this a great conference.

Respectfully Submitted,
Christopher Bartel, Appalachian State University
Jonathan Neufeld, College of Charleston

Graduate Conference in Aesthetics
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
22 April 2012

The British Society of Aesthetics is running an essay prize competition, open to early-career researchers in aesthetics. The aim of the prize is to encourage and reward new talent in the field of aesthetics. The winning author will receive £750 and an opportunity to present the paper at the Society’s 2012 annual conference. The winning essay will normally be published in the British Journal of Aesthetics.
The competition is open to early career researchers, including postgraduate students, who are within three years of receiving a PhD. Persons in doubt about their qualifications are encouraged to consult the Administrator of the British Society of Aesthetics in advance. Entry is not limited to members of the BSA nor to residents of the United Kingdom.

The essay may be on any topic in aesthetics or the philosophy of art. The maximum length is 7,500 words (including footnotes). The panel of judges will comprise members of the Executive Committee of the British Society of Aesthetics and the Editors of the British Journal of Aesthetics. If, in the opinion of the judges, no essay that merits publication in the BJA is submitted, the prize will not be awarded. The decision of the judges is final.

Submissions should be clearly identified as entries for the BSA Essay Prize and be sent electronically to the Administrator of the BSA, Caroline Auty, at <admin@british-aesthetics.org>. Each entry must be accompanied by an abstract not exceeding 150 words. Entries that are too long or without an abstract will not be considered. Essays should be prepared for blind review and should follow guidelines for submissions to the British Journal of Aesthetics. Each entry should contain a separate title page giving the name, institution and address of the author. Candidates must supply evidence that they are eligible for the prize. The winning essay will normally be published in the British Journal of Aesthetics, and it is a condition of entry to the Prize competition that the essay has not been (and will not be until the result of the competition are announced) submitted for publication elsewhere.

For more information about the prize and full submission requirements see <http://www.british-aesthetics.org/prize.aspx>.

Deadline: 30 June 2012

Revised and Expanded Edition, The Daily Show and Philosophy

We are looking for a limited number of new essays on topics not covered in the first edition. Two possible new topics would be: 1) race and/or sex and gender in The Daily Show and 2) the Rally to Restore Sanity. If either of these or any other new topic appeals to you, please contact the volume editor, Jason Holt, at <jason.holt@acadiau.ca>.

Deadline for abstracts: 29 May 2012

Architecture and Image
19-20 October 2012
Boston University

What is architecture? How is architecture understood and how should it be understood? With the rise of phenomena such as ‘starchitects,’ avant-garde investigations of different creative mediums, parametricism, and contemporary forms of architectural pragmatism, and with the increasing specialization of construction processes, how do we identify when something is and is not architecture? Or have questions of architectural identity simply become irrelevant?

The 2nd PhilArch conference calls for a return to, or continuation of, explicitly philosophical inquiry into the character of architecture. In particular the conference seeks papers on the theme of architecture and its ‘image,’ broadly construed. Topics may address questions such as: Is architecture constituted by its history or by an atemporal, formal structure? Is a pure architectural object possible? What role should marginal practices play in the conceptualization of architecture? What is architectural representation? What is the relationship between models, drawings, and images and built architecture? Is architecture always the re-presentation of other content, or does it create its own meanings?

The Boston University Department of Philosophy invites the submission of papers from diverse philosophical backgrounds aimed at the careful clarification of architectural thought. Preference will be given to papers related to the conference theme.

Send complete papers (3,000-5,000 words) with a 150 word abstract, formatted for blind review, to <architecture.philosophy@gmail.com>.

Deadline: 31 May 2012

Film-Philosophy Conference 2012
London, England
12-14 September 2012

Film-philosophy continues to grow as an important discipline within the fields of both film studies and philosophy. The Film-Philosophy Conference brings together scholars from all over the world to present their research on a broad range of topics within the subject area. This year’s event will feature a special screening and workshop at the BFI Southbank, to coincide with their Hitchcock Retrospective. We are open to any topics on the subject but would particularly welcome papers related to the films of Alfred Hitchcock.

Abstracts should be 200 - 300 words long and papers, including clips - which we strongly encourage - should not exceed 25 minutes. We accept panel submissions with a maximum of three speakers and a length of 90 minutes.

Fees will be announced shortly. You must register a free account with the conference website in order to submit a proposal. Both individual and panel proposals must be submitted through the conference website (no initial cost involved): <http://www.film-philosophy.com/conference/index.php/conf/2012/about/submissions>.

Deadline: 31 May 2012

Celebrating the Work of Peter Goldie
The University of Manchester, England
14-15 September 2012

This international conference celebrates the wide-ranging and influential work of Peter Goldie, Samuel Hall Professor of Philosophy at the University of Manchester from 2005 until his death in 2011. Confirmed plenary speakers are Robert Hopkins (Sheffield), Matthew Kieran (Leeds), Dominic McIvor Lopes (UBC), Derek Matravers (OU), David Papineau (KCL), Joel Smith (Manchester), Ronnie de Sousa (Toronto), and Kathleen Stock (Sussex).

In addition to the plenary sessions, there will be time devoted to brief submitted papers. We invite papers for presentation in 30-minute sessions (20 minute presentation plus 10 minute discussion). Submissions on any topics germane to Peter’s work – e.g. the emotions, the philosophy of narrative, aesthetics, and ethics – will be considered. Please send drafts (abstracts, if preferred), for blind review to <Julian.Dodd@manchester.ac.uk>.

Deadline: 8 June 2012

Arts and Ethics
Trinity Western University, Langley, British Columbia, Canada
18-19 October 2012

There is long history surrounding the relationship between the arts and ethics. The arts affect individual identities, communities, and relationships between people and their environments. The arts can contribute to the
ethical life of a community, as exemplified by public art and theatre. Some people have been suspicious of the role of the arts on individual ethical outlooks, as reflected by censorship and ratings labels. The arts can also affect relational ethics, either positively – as in the case of a caregiver singing to a child – or negatively – as in the use of music to encourage violence. Another strand of thought argues that the arts do not mean anything outside of themselves and are therefore isolated from ethics. Each theory of the relation between arts and ethics leads to different views of the ways the arts are experienced and gives rise to different responsibilities for producers and experiencers of the arts.

This conference welcomes submissions from any discipline that explores the topic under consideration. Please submit presentation abstracts (300 words) and a short bio (100 words) to <Jeff.Warren@twu.ca>. For more information, visit our website at: <http://www.twu.ca/vergeconference>.

Deadline: 15 June 2012

Eventalaesthetics is a platform that searches for the meaning of the work of art in the technological, the utile, and the polluted; and from art forms or cultural practices that developed in or rely upon urban or industrial environments and ideologies. We welcome both full-length articles (4,000-10,000 words, excluding endnotes) and Collisions (1,000-2,000 words). Collisions are brief (but well-written and thoughtful) responses to aesthetic experiences that raise philosophical questions for discussion, but that do not necessarily enact the discussion in full. More information on Collisions is available at <http://eventalaesthetics.net/for-authors/>.

Please send your submissions electronically in MS Word format (doc or docx files), double-spaced in a legible font, in accordance with The Chicago Manual of Style (endnotes, please). Be sure to accompany your submission with an abstract (max. 250 words), a bibliography, and at least 5 keywords that may be used as search terms. Articles must be in English, but we welcome either American or British spelling provided the submission remains consistent throughout. Before submitting, please review our submission requirements, review procedures, and copyright policy at <http://eventalaesthetics.net/for-authors/>.

Finally, email your submission to <eventalaesthetics@gmail.com>. Direct any inquiries to the Editors at the same address. For announcements of forthcoming issues and future calls for authors, please sign up for our email list at <eventalaesthetics.net>.

Deadline: 1 July 2012

Somaesthetics Essay Prize

The Center for Body, Mind, and Culture at Florida Atlantic University is pleased to announce its first annual Somaesthetics Essay Prize competition. The award for the 2012 prize will be $500. Essays should be academic in style and focus on the interdisciplinary field of somaesthetics from such perspectives as philosophy, aesthetics, art history and theory, literary and cultural studies, dance, design, music, theatre, cognitive science, gender and sexuality studies, sports, movement, and health studies. The prize essay will be recommended for publication in an upcoming special issue of the philosophical journal Pragmatism Today on somaesthetics.

Submissions should be between 6,000 and 9,000 words in length, including notes and references, and should be e-mailed in Word format to <bodymindculture@fau.edu>. Essays will be evaluated by an interdisciplinary panel of judges appointed by the Center for Body, Mind, and Culture. Essays should follow the guidelines specified in the Chicago Manual of Style.

Deadline: 1 September 2012

International Society for Philosophy of Music Education, The Ninth International Symposium on the Philosophy of Music Education

New York, New York 5-9 June 2013

Submissions are invited for the Ninth International Symposium on the Philosophy of Music Education in New York City at Teachers College Columbia University, 5-9 June 2013. This symposium will bring together a diverse array of international philosophers, scholars, teachers, teacher educators, and performers interested in engaging in philosophical research concerning music education. The symposium seeks to encourage and stimulate discussion on a wide range of topics relating to the philosophy of music education from international and interdisciplinary perspectives.

We are very pleased to announce that Estelle Jorgensen will be our featured keynote speaker. Jorgensen is founder and editor of Philosophy of Music Education Review, general editor for the Counterpoints: Music and Education series at Indiana University Press, founder of the Philosophy Special Research Interest Group for the US National Association of Music Education (NAfME) and co-founder of the International Society for the Philosophy of Music Education.

Papers must be in English, not exceeding 6000 words, and formatted using Microsoft Word. An abstract of no more than 250 words must accompany the text. Authors will certify that their papers have not been published elsewhere and are not under review for other conferences or publications. All submissions will be blind peer-reviewed by a panel of international scholars.

Paper submissions should be sent to Cathy Benedict, co-conference chair, at the following email address: <cathy.benedict@fau.edu>. More information about the International Society for Philosophy of Music Education (ISPME) and submission procedures can be found at: <http://ispme.net/>.

Deadline: 1 October 2012

The Philosophical Quarterly: Philosophy and the Expressive Arts

Would you like to win £1,500? The Philosophical Quarterly invites submissions for its 2012 international prize essay competition, the topic of which is ‘Philosophy and the Expressive Arts’. From Plato on, philosophy has had an uneasy relationship with expressive arts such as narrative, poetry, drama, music, painting, and now film. If philosophy today can learn from science, can it learn from the arts as well—or even instead? If so, what can it learn? Does expressive art access truths, particularly ethical truths, that cannot be expressed any other way? If it does, what can ethicists and other philosophers say about these truths? If it does not, what differentiates expressive from merely decorative art? Some philosophers insist with Wittgenstein that “whatever can be said at all can be said clearly”. In that case, are artistic uses of language such as metaphor and imagery just “color”, as Frege called it – just ways of dressing up thoughts that philosophers, by contrast, should consider in their plainest possible form?

We welcome submissions of 8,000 words or fewer addressing these or other questions about philosophy and the expressive arts.
Electronic submission is preferred and contributions may be sent as email attachments to <pq@st-andrews.ac.uk>. Essays should be typed in double spacing. Most formats are acceptable, but PDF is preferred. Alternatively, non-electronic submissions may be sent to the address below. Three copies of each essay are required and these will not be returned. All entries will be regarded as submissions for publication in the Philosophical Quarterly, and both winning and non-winning entries judged to be of sufficient quality will be published. All submissions should be headed 'The Expressive Arts’ Prize Essay Competition (with the author’s name and address given in a covering letter, but NOT in the essay itself) and sent to: The Journal Manager, The Philosophical Quarterly University of St Andrews KY16 9AR Scotland, UK

Deadline: 1 November 2012

Special Issue of Art and Philosophy (Sztuka i Filozofia) on Art, Judgment and Criticism

Papers are invited on all aspects of art, judgment and criticism. Various concerns and disagreements among philosophers and art critics about the correctness of artistic judgment, the extreme pluralism of the contemporary art world, and the nature of artistic properties (largely response-dependent and seen as culturally embedded), prompt a broad range of philosophical questions. Philosophical interest in art, judgment and criticism has often highlighted the importance of objectivity of artistic judgment and the role of criticism that implements evaluation. In addition, some aspects of the artworld indicate the hierarchical nature of art. However, equally often, the idea of objective art judgment has been challenged and attempts have been made to replace it by various subjective approaches. Art and Philosophy (Sztuka i Filozofia), the biannual academic journal offers a forum for discussion about whether, at least, a moderate version of objectivism of critical judgment is still well founded or, are we just limited to one’s own personal perspective. The issue will contain invited essays as well as papers selected from an open call for papers. This issue of Art and Philosophy is scheduled to be published just before the Nineteenth International Congress of Aesthetics in Krakow in 2013. Guidelines for contributions: Abstract of paper – approx. 200-300 words; Length of paper – not exceeding 6000 words. All submitted articles must be formatted for blind review. Please send your submissions to Ewa Bogusz-Boltuc, <ebogu01s@uis.edu>

Deadline: 31 December 2012

Rivista di Estetica: The Aesthetic Experience in the Evolutionary Perspective

Aesthetic experience (AE) has enjoyed an increase of interest over the last several years, even in cognitive sciences and evolutionary psychology. This special issue will focus on the topic of AE in an evolutionary perspective. The aim is to approach the most intense controversies afflicting the recent and multidisciplinary debates. What is AE for? Is AE an adaptation or a by-product? What is the relationship between AE and the goal of knowing? Has AE a mental distinctiveness? What mental processes (perception, cognition, imagination, affect, emotion) are involved (exalted) in AE? What is the relationship between AE and evaluation? What is the articulation of the natural and cultural bases of AE? Has AE the same properties occurring with natural phenomena, cultural artifacts, works of art? How old is art? Is an animal (non-human) AE possible? Could a machine simulate mental processes usually correlated with AE?

Deadline: 30 January 2013

Upcoming Events

ASA Rocky Mountain Division Meeting
Santa Fe, New Mexico
13-15 July 2012

Keynote Address: Cynthia Freeland, Artist at Work: McCreery Jordan.

Registration Fees and Hotel Rates: Regular Registration: $125 Emeritus Faculty and Graduate Students: $65. Daily room rates (not including taxes, etc.) are available to conference participants as follows: Picuris Suite, $169. Reservations may be made by calling the Hotel Santa Fe at 855.825.9876. Please make sure they record your reservation under our room block by mentioning “American Society for Aesthetics.” The hotel booking code will be made available to participants once they have registered for the conference via the American Society for Aesthetics website.

Attention Grad Students: There is a youth hostel located a few miles south of the conference location and w/in walking distance of the RailRunner commuter train.

ASA Annual Meeting
St. Louis, Missouri
25-27 October 2012

St. Louis, Missouri is the home of one of the earliest American philosophical movements, the St. Louis Hegelians. In honor of this history, the program committee has emphasized the following, broadly Hegelian topics: the Ontology of Art, The Nature and Value of Artistic Symbolism, Art, History, and Art History or the End of Art, Arthur Danto’s Philosophy of Art, Art and Religion or Politics, Aesthetic Cognitivism, Method in Aesthetics, The Aesthetics of a Non-Western Art, The Aesthetics of Nature vs. the Aesthetics of Art, and Expression.

Please see <http://www.aesthetics-online.org/events/index.php?events_id=410> for further details or contact Rachel Zuckert, Chair of the Program Committee, at <r-zuckert@northwestern.edu>.

Canadian Society for Aesthetics
Waterloo, Canada
26-28 May 2012

The 2012 annual meeting of the Canadian Society for Aesthetics will take place in company with meetings of other Canadian associations, including the Canadian Philosophical Association, as part of the 81st Congress of the Humanities and Social Sciences. Inquiries in English may be sent to Ira Newman; Department of Philosophy; Mansfield University; Mansfield PA 16933 (USA) <inewman@mansfield.edu>. Those in French to: François Chalifour; Département des arts, Cégep de l’Outaouais, Campus Félix-Leclerc, 820 boulevard La gazpe, Gatineau, (Québec) Canada J8T 7J7 .fchalifour@cegepoutaouais.qc.ca.

Athens Institute for Education and Research 7th Annual International Conference on Philosophy
Athens, Greece
28-31 May 2012

The Athens Institute for Education and Research (ATINER) was established in 1995 as an independent academic organization with the mission to become a forum, where academics and researchers - from all over the world - could meet in Athens and exchange ideas on their research and discuss the future developments of their discipline. Since 1995, ATINER has organized about 150 internation-
al conferences and has published over 100 books. Academically, the Institute consists of four research divisions and twenty research units. Each research unit organizes at least an annual conference and undertakes various small and large research projects.


Contemporary Confrontations Between Art, Morality, and Politics
University of Nanterre-Paris X
1-2 June 2012

Reflection on the epistemological divides separating art, morality, and politics, allows for a redefinition of the ongoing cultural dialogues which constitute contemporary thought. The analysis of the intersections of these three cultural notions will further understanding of the role each of them has in the community, and contribute to philosophical discourse regarding the renewal of their respective stakes in this new century.

Accommodation: Information on accommodation can be found on the conference’s webpage. For additional information, please write to Pauline Colonna d’Istria <p.colonnadistria@hotmail.fr>, or Florian Gaité (florian@floriangaite.fr), or Roberto Merrill (nrbmerrill@gmail.com).

Perceptual Tensions, Sensory Resonance Contemporary Opera and New Music Theatre
University of Toronto
8-9 June 2012

When it premiered in 1976, *Einstein on the Beach* by Robert Wilson and Phillip Glass stretched audience members’ experience of time by saturating sensory perception over the opera’s five-hour duration. 2012 will see the revival of *Einstein on the Beach* in a new production slated for international tour. In conjunction with performances of this production in Toronto, the University of Toronto will host a two-day interdisciplinary conference on Opera and forms of New Music Theatre, that takes perception and sensory experience as its starting points. Addressing collaborative creation and the changing reception of opera and new music theatre in the last fifty years, this conference seeks to draw upon varied fields including perception, sensory studies, affect theory, audience studies, phenomenological and aesthetic theories, narratology, and the nature of contemporary operatic staging and theatricality. For more details, contact <Perceptual.tensions@gmail.com>.

Society for Cognitive Studies of the Moving Image Conference
Sarah Lawrence College and NYU, New York
13-16 June 2012


Members of SCSMI seek to understand, among other things, the ways in which perceptual, psychological and neural processes relate to spectators’ affective responses, to their comprehension of narratives and other film forms, and to the saliency and effects of particular stylistic features of films. Members also raise questions about how artistic strategies, such as narrative construction, audio-visual technique, and the creation of emotional responses, may be amenable to naturalistic explanations in a cognitive framework. Members are likewise interested in the implications of empirical findings for film theories, as well as philosophical theory-building and conceptual clarification.

The 2012 SCSMI conference will be held at two venues in New York: Wednesday 13 June-Friday 15 June: Heimbold Visual Arts Center, Sarah Lawrence College, 1 Mead Way, Bronxville, NY 10708. Information about the venue can be found at: <http://www.slc.edu/about/campus/academic-arts/Heimbold_Visual_Arts_Center.html>. On Saturday 16 June, the venue is Department of Cinema Studies, Tisch School of the Arts, New York University, 721 Broadway, 6th Floor, New York, NY 10003. On the morning of the final day of the conference, buses will transport conference participants from Sarah Lawrence College to the Cinema Studies department at New York University. A day of paper presentations will be followed by a guest speaker, a reception, and a closing banquet (for an additional fee). Buses will then transport participants back to Sarah Lawrence (about 30 minutes each way). Information about the venue can be found at: <http://cinema.tisch.nyu.edu/page/home.html>.

Art as a Mode of Enquiry: Graduate Symposium
University of Oxford, England
16-17 June 2012

"Art as a Mode of Enquiry" is a graduate symposium organized by doctoral students in art and art theory at the Ruskin School of Drawing and Fine Art, The University of Oxford. The two-day interdisciplinary conference will take place on the weekend of the 16th and 17th of June 2012 and will be accompanied by an exhibition of site-specific works at the Ashmolean Museum by current DPhil students. For more information, contact <gradsymposium2012@ruskin-sch.ox.ac.uk>.

Graduate Conference “Musical Perspectives”
Warwick University, UK
18-19 June 2012

The workshop aims to discuss the different possible approaches to music: it being an abstract art, music can be related to the different forms of expression of the human thought and, as consequence, it can be differently investigated according to the chosen mode: a phenomenological, artistic, aesthetical or epistemological one, and so on. By doing so, a new interest is hopefully raised in understanding our everyday (and often under-valued) dealing with music, not only under a theoretical light, but also in consideration of its technical applications. Students and staff will have the opportunity of acquiring a more complete and -by no means- panoramic vision of the musical sphere as the highest form of human artistic production, and to understand why the latter has in itself the power of deeply affecting the individuals, both rationally and irrationally.

The Guest Speaker is Maestro Prof. Mirko Guerrini (“P. Mascagni” Music Academy, Lvomo; Visiting Professor at the Monash University, Melbourne) who is also a composer, an arranger, a conductor and a performer.

Inquiries can be directed to: <A.Bouzas@warwick.ac.uk> or to <D.Smith.11@warwick.ac.uk>.

Science, Art and the Sacred
Leeds, UK
27 June 2012

In collaboration with the Leeds Art Gallery, the AHRC funded project “Method in Philosophical Aesthetics: the challenge from the sciences” (<http://www.nottingham.ac.uk/humanities/aesthetics/index.html>) will be
hosting a major public event on the relationship between science, art and religion on the evening of the 27 June 2012. This evening event will take place in the Gallery and will consist in a dialogue with three internationally renowned philosophers of art: Gregory Currie of the University of Nottingham, Gordon Graham of the Princeton Theological Seminary and Roger Scruton of the University of Oxford, University of St Andrews, and the American Enterprise Institute. The event will be moderated by Matthew Kieran, Professor of Philosophy and the Arts at the University of Leeds. There is no charge to attend this event.

For further information e-mail Dr. Jon Robson at <jonrobonson@gmail.com>.

**European Society for Aesthetics Conference**

Universidade do Minho, Braga & Guimarães, Portugal
25-27 June 2012

Please send all your questions to the conference organizers: <esa2012@europa.org>.

**Philosophical Aesthetics and the Sciences of Art?**

Leeds, UK
28-30 June 2012

The conference is organized by the AHRC funded research project 'Method in Philosophical Aesthetics: The Challenge from the Sciences. See <http://www.nottingham.ac.uk/humanities/aesthetics/index.html>. Philosophers are now used to paying close attention to the results of theoretical and experimental work in the sciences. This has been long-standing practice in the philosophy of the sciences, and it is now common in the philosophy of mind. The practice is growing in the philosophy of language and in ethics, where there is controversy over the authority of linguistic and moral intuitions. The practice is less common in aesthetics, but it is beginning to develop, most notably in appeals to theories of vision in disputes about pictorial perception, and reference to empirical work on the emotions and imagination in the discussion of our engagement with fiction. Such interventions are controversial in some quarters; more controversial still are claims that work in the neurosciences and in evolutionary psychology can deepen, perhaps even revolutionize, our philosophical conceptions of the arts. Some argue that such studies will not make any positive contribution to understanding the nature and value of artistic experiences; the most we can hope for from them is that light be shed on empirical side-constraints.

Enquiries should be addressed to Dr. Jon Robson at <jonrobonson@googlemail.com>.

**Ethics and Aesthetics of Architecture and the Environment**

Newcastle Upon Tyne, UK
11-13 July 2012

The subject of aesthetics is often taken as dealing with questions of mere beauty, where the word ‘aesthetic’ is colloquially interchangeable with beauty and liking. Someone might, for instance, explain their liking the look of a particular object on the basis of its ‘aesthetics’. Interestingly, even within the specialized architecture discourse, the aesthetic is largely discussed on the basis of an object’s appearance. Yet, the aesthetic is not limited and should not be limited merely to the way things look. Any philosophically informed aesthetician will contest this limited view, saying something along the lines of ‘the aesthetic is everything’. The aim of this conference is therefore in part to address this discursive limitation in architecture and related subjects by broadening the aesthetic discourse beyond questions relating to purely visual phenomena in order to include those derived from all facets of human experience. See <http://ispaconference.wordpress.com/> for details.

**Understanding Value: A Graduate Conference on Value**

University of Sheffield, England
11-13 July 2012

Determining the nature of value is a project that has a bearing on most areas of philosophy. For this reason, we hope to bring together graduate students working on a range of philosophical topics (including ethics, metaethics, aesthetics, epistemology, political philosophy and philosophy of mind) to discuss value. The conference will focus on a discussion of value from the perspective of three philosophical disciplines, broadly construed: (i) ethics; (ii) epistemology; and (iii) aesthetics.

More information is available at <www.understandingvalue.webeden.co.uk>.

**Seventh International Conference on the Arts in Society**

Liverpool, UK
23-25 July 2012

The conference and its companion journal provide a scholarly platform for discussions of the arts and art practices, enabling an interdisciplinary conversation on the role of the arts in society. They are intended as a place for critical engagement, examination and experimentation of ideas that connect the arts to their contexts in the world - in studios and classrooms, in galleries and museums, on stage, on the streets and in communities.

Full details of the conference may be found on the conference website at <http://www.artsinSociety.com/Conference>.

**Paris International Congress of Humanities and Social Sciences Research**

Paris, France
24-28 July 2012

The congress will bring together humanities and social sciences (HSS) researchers, scientists, academicians, experts, engineers, developers, administrators and other HSS research-related professionals and practitioners from all over the world. The aims are to promote multidisciplinary dialogue and mutual cross-fertilization of ideas and methods; to offer a place for participants to present, discuss, and showcase innovative recent and ongoing HSS research works and their applications or development; to update on, and explore new ways and directions; and to take advantage of opportunities for contacts, interaction, international collaboration and networking. All areas of Humanities and Social Sciences research are invited: anthropology and ethnicity; applied mathematics, statistics and sciences for HSS research; archaeology; area studies; arts; business administration; classics; communication studies; cultural studies; demography; development studies; economics; environmental studies; epistemology; gender studies; geography; history; information science; international relations; languages and cultures; law; linguistics and language sciences; literature; philosophy; policy; epistemology and methodology of multi-, inter-, trans- and cross-disciplinary HSS research; political science; psychology; religion; research policy, administration and strategies; and sociology. The languages of the congress are English and French. For more information and registration: <http://education-conferences.org/homehss.aspx>. Contact: <Paris-Conference@analytik.org>.

**Artification: Ideas and Practices**

Helsinki, Finland
15-17 August 2012

The research project Artification and Its Impact on Art will arrange a three-day conference on the theme of artification. (On the project please see <http://www.artification.arts>.**
The neologism artification refers to situations and processes in which something that is not regarded as art in the traditional sense of the word is changed into something art-like, art-related, or into something that takes influences from the arts. Often this means mixing art with non-art and creating new kinds of hybrids. In recent years the phenomenon has been widely discussed, using various terminologies, in many contexts such as philosophical art theory and sociology of art, as well as in art-and-business and art-and-health care discourses. Differing ideas on why artification happens, whether it means compromising the autonomy of art, and how it affects the conceptual, institutional and practical levels of art have been presented.

Please contact Matti Tainio at <matti.tainio@aalto.fi> for details.

International Conference “Rethinking Pragmatist Aesthetics”
31 August-2 September 2012
Wroclaw, Poland

The aim of this conference is to reflect on pragmatist aesthetics’ history and current condition, but also on its potential to address the most pressing problems of contemporary philosophical aesthetics, and to project the future avenues for its progress. In particular, we welcome submissions that: provide historical accounts of pragmatist aesthetics’ development; address aesthetic themes in the work of classical pragmatists (Peirce, James, Dewey, F.C.S. Schiller, etc.) and/or neopragmatists (Rorty, Goodman, Margolis, Shusterman, Putnam, et al.); deploy a (neo-) pragmatist perspective in addressing a given aesthetic problem or in interpreting concrete works of art; provide a comparative analysis of pragmatist aesthetics and aesthetic theories developed in other philosophical traditions or in different disciplines – for instance in analytic philosophy, continental and post-continental thought, evolutionary psychology, psychoanalysis, etc.

For more information, contact Prof. Leszek Koczanowicz <leszek@post.pl> or Dr. Wojciech Malecki <wojciech.malecki@wp.pl>.

Film-Philosophy Conference 2012
London, England
12-14 September 2012

Film-philosophy continues to grow as an important discipline within the fields of both Film Studies and Philosophy. The Film-Philosophy Conference brings together scholars from all over the world to present their research on a broad range of topics within the subject area. For more information, see the conference website: <http://www.film-philosophy.com/conference/index.php/conf/2012/about/>.

Aesthetics in the 21st Century
University of Basel
13-15 September 2012

Ever since the turn of the century aesthetics has steadily gained momentum as a central field of study across the disciplines. No longer sidelined, aesthetics has grown in confidence as evidenced by recent works by major contemporary thinkers such as Jean-Luc Nancy (Muses II), Jacques Rancière (Dissensus; Aesthetics and its Discontents) and Alain Badiou (Handbook of Inaesthetics). In this vein, aesthetics does not merely designate a discipline concerned with theories of art, but more fundamentally the primacy of sensation and sensual encounter itself. Even though these recent developments return to the work of the canonical authors, some contemporary scholars reject the traditional focus on epistemology (Baumgarten, Kant) and theorize sensation and the sensual encounter in terms of ontology instead (Harman, Shaviro). It is according to this shift that speculative realists have proclaimed aesthetics as ‘first philosophy’ and as speculative in nature. With speculative realism sensual encounter becomes an event that even no longer necessarily implies human agents. This is in alignment with the general speculative realist framework for thinking all kinds of entities and objects as free from our all-pervasive anthropocentrism which states, always, that everything is “for us.” In this speculative realism several important twentieth-century precursors, most notably Heidegger, Whitehead, Deleuze and Badiou with their respective concepts of event, (aesthetic) experience and encounter. This conference explores the resonances between these twentieth-century thinkers and their concepts and the recently awakened interest in aesthetics, especially in its speculative realist guise. Hosted by the University of Basel’s Department of English the conference is particularly interested in the possible implications of what could be termed the new speculative aesthetics for literary and cultural studies. Thus, the conference aims at staging a three-fold encounter: between aesthetics and speculation, between speculative realism and its (possible) precursors, and between speculative realism and art and literature.


The British Society of Aesthetics 2012 Annual Conference
Oxford, England
21-23 September 2012

Confirmed Keynote Speakers include: Kendall Walton (University of Michigan) will give the Wollheim Memorial Lecture; Jancis Robinson (www.jancisrobinson.com) will give the Empson Lecture. Programme Committee: Catharine Abell (Chair, Manchester), Dan Cavedon-Taylor (Birkbeck), Bence Nanay (Cambridge/Antwerp), Dawn Wilson (Hull), Mahlet Zimeta (Roehampton). For more information, see <http://www.british-aesthetics.org>.

SPSCVA at the APA Eastern Division Meeting
27-30 December 2012
Atlanta, Georgia

The Society for the Philosophic Study of the Contemporary Visual Arts (SPSCVA) will hold its divisional meeting in conjunction with the Eastern divisional meeting of the American Philosophical Association. Please contact the Eastern Division coordinator Christopher Grau at <grau@clemson.edu> for more information.
Would you like to be featured in “Active Aestheticians” in the next issue of the American Society for Aesthetics Newsletter?

Please share information about your professional achievements with the editors via at either: <goldblatt@denison.edu> or <henry.pratt@marist.edu>.