Saddened by his passing, the editors are devoting this issue of the Society’s Newsletter is to Arthur Danto. Henry Pratt and I were so pleased that Arthur wrote such a personal essay for the Summer 2010 Newsletter (available at <http://www.aesthetics-online.org/articles/index.php?articles_id=47>) on the occasion of his exhibition of his prints at the University of Illinois. His illustrated essay, “Stopping Making Art” was a wonderful account of his work with woodcuts and of how his interests shifted from making art to writing about it philosophically. We are all better off for that.

I’d like to add a few brief personal remarks of my own. I heard Arthur present his artworld paper at the University of Pennsylvania when I was graduate student there in the 1960’s and, thus inspired, became part of his NEH seminar at Columbia while he was drafting The Transfiguration of the Commonplace. Simply put, those weeks were a remarkable turning point for me and I knew I was absorbing a different way of thinking, not only about art, but of philosophy in general. So, in touch in many contexts over the years, who else would write to say he was “thrilled” that I signed on as an editor of this newsletter?

Of all the things that could be said about Arthur’s contribution to aesthetics, to art criticism and to the wider world of philosophy, as others in this issue will say so very well, I’ll say only this: that he was a joy to listen to and a pleasure to read—no small virtues in philosophy. His essays for The Nation exemplified his generosity, his deep appreciation of the work of others and an understanding that the interpretation of art often calls for stories that expand into the very culture of which they are a part.

This issue contains remembrances and tributes by Noël Carroll, Michael Kelly, Jonathan Gilmore, Daniel Herwitz and Fred Rush and the editors are thankful for their essays. In particular, we are grateful to Lydia Goehr, not only for her own excellent written contribution, but for her recent photographs of Arthur as well.

David Goldblatt
The Age of Danto
Noël Carroll
CUNY Graduate Center

Arthur Danto was the most important Anglo-American philosopher of art of the second half of the twentieth century and his influence continues today. Interestingly, Danto’s earliest philosophical reputation was not primarily based on his work on art, but upon his contributions to epistemology, metaphysics, and the philosophies of action and history.

Danto’s career as an aesthete began with his encounter in 1964 with Andy Warhol’s Brillo Box. Thinking about that work led Danto to develop both a theory of art and a philosophy of art history, both of which, in turn, underwrote his stellar career as an art critic for the magazine The Nation.

The insight that Danto derived from Warhol’s Brillo Box was that art was not something that the “eye could descry.” That is, you cannot tell that something is an artwork simply by looking; art is not a perceptual category. After all, Warhol’s Brillo Box, which is art, looks just like Proctor and Gamble’s Brillo boxes, which are not art. The difference between an artwork and its real world counterpart, in other words, can be indiscernable. What makes something art is something you cannot see—a context which Danto called the Artworld—an atmosphere of history and theory.

This approach to theorizing rejected dominant formalist approaches from Clive Bell to Clement Greenberg. It signaled a momentous change in Anglo-American philosophy of art that began to take the history and context of art far more seriously.

At the same time, because philosophers—such as Nelson Goodman, Richard Wollheim and Danto, who had established reputations in arenas of philosophy other than aesthetics—began to write about art, the discipline of the philosophy of art itself gained unprecedented prestige.

Because of Danto’s forays outside of analytic philosophy—including books on Sartre, Nietzsche, and Hindu mysticism—many readers tended to miss the fact that Danto is an essentialist. That is, his philosophy of art seeks to define the ahistorical essence of art. He has not claimed to have nailed down the concept of art completely, but only that he has identified two necessary conditions that anything that is an artwork needs to satisfy. Namely, something is a work of art only if it is about something and only if it embodies or articulates whatever it is about in an appropriate form. For example, Warhol’s Brillo Box is about, among other things, the commodification of art, a theme it embodies, appropriately enough, by being indiscernible from a commercial object.

As should be evident, this formula for identifying art is also serviceable as an elegant recipe for pursuing art criticism. On this view, the task of the art critic is to determine what the artwork is about and then to explain how the stylistic choices the artist elected embody (or fail to embody) the meaning or content of the artwork. And this, of course, is the patent for the art criticism Danto produced so magnificently as during his tenure as an art critic.

If Danto’s philosophy of art sounds like Hegel’s, the same can be said of his philosophy of art history. For, like Hegel, Danto argues that art history has come to an end. What Danto means by this is that the kind of progressive, modernist narratives of art history propounded by Greenberg and his followers are no longer available—that is, can no longer be told. Why not? Greenberg thought of modernist art as a reflexive adventure of self-definition—of artists exhibiting the essential features of their medium, like the flatness of the picture plane, by means of painting in a way that exemplifies those very features. But this assumes that art status is a perceptual property. And Warhol, according to Danto, stopped this story in its tracks by showing that artworks could be indiscernible from real things, like Brillo boxes.

In other words, Brillo Box showed that art could look like anything. And if artworks can look like anything, then artworks do not possess some unique manifest properties that painters can show forth emphatically or foreground. For Danto, Warhol liberated artists from the allegedly historic responsibility to define the medium of painting by means of painting. Art history with a capital H—art history with what the Greeks called a telos or guiding purpose or end—is no longer feasible. Instead, artists can explore whatever purposes they choose and in any visual style they fancy. We have entered what Danto calls a post-historical period of art, a phrase perhaps more apt for the pluralism of the present period than the notion of postmodernism since it is not tethered narrowly to certain privileged themes such as pastiche and the representation of representation.

Danto’s philosophy of art history is intimately connected to both his theory of art and his art criticism. In order to deliver up the ahistorical essence of art, one must defend one’s definition of art from the future—from artworks now unimagined. Danto thought he achieved this by establishing that post-Warhol art can look like anything. That means that future artists cannot make anything—anything visual—that would refute his theory.

But Danto’s philosophy of art history also suits his mode of art criticism. In fact, his history and his criticism are made for each other. The critic Danto can handle anything the art world can serve up, no matter what it looks like. The work just has to be about something and to be embodied in a form that Danto can explain successfully in terms of the way in which it articulates its meaning or content (its aboutness). In short, Danto’s critical approach, as derived from his theory of art, is perfectly adjusted to the pluralism of the post-historical period of art history that Danto himself has both discovered and christened.

The intricate, unified package of art theory, the philosophy of art history, and the practice of criticism that Danto has constructed is arguably unrivaled by any other contemporary commentator. That it so perfectly fits the contours of our post-historical condition warrants thinking about ourselves as living in The Age of Danto.

Life with Art
Lydia Goehr
Columbia University

Arthur Danto once told me that having been born on the first day of the year (the year was 1924) he felt obliged to do something important. When I asked him what I should then do having been born of the year (the year was 1924) he felt obliged to do something important. When I asked him what I should then do having been born on January 10th, he replied, “obviously not as much as me.” He did do something important. He stands as one of the four giants of the Anglo-American tradition, with Stanley Cavell, Nelson Goodman, and Richard Wollheim, who together rearticulated the terms for how philosophers should think about the arts as part of a broad philosophical vision each had of the world. Danto held his so-described “analytical
philosophy of art” as “of a piece” with his analytical philosophies of history, action, and knowledge. Before achieving world renown for his philosophy of art, he was much admired as a philosopher in these other domains. At first, when writing on art, he intended to write a work titled The Analytical Philosophy of Art to match several of his previous books. But very quickly he found himself turning away from this bland title to one indicative of the transfiguration in his thought that would allow him to escape some of the restrictions of a philosophy to which however he remained lifelong devoted. He found a way to enhance analytical philosophy, to bring it to life by engaging in a mode of description, in perfectly crafted and entirely illuminating detours, that would result in his being recognized as the leading philosophical critic of the art most especially of his own times. With similar conviction, he imported themes he variously drew from Hegel, Nietzsche, and Sartre—he wrote monographs devoted to the latter two—and from a Zen Buddhist whose teachings he experienced at Columbia University. Of his more than thirty books and hundreds of articles and art-critical pieces, his book The Transfiguration of the Commonplace marked a turning point in the philosophy of art and in the life of a man whose nickname happened also to be Art. Although he never wanted philosophically to overcome the gap between art and life—everything about his thought was aimed at preserving the difference—he lived his life in the pathways of art with a transformative joy and optimism. He turned what others experienced as nightmares—and there were plenty in the twentieth century to choose from—into dreams for a better human condition liberated from the political and speculative tyrannies of a world that, in different ways, he regarded over, ended, and out of date.

When I first met Arthur, it was on a bus in Sweden, over thirty years ago. The bus was transporting a whole host of eminent philosophers to a conference on the theme of intentionality. Why I was on the bus is irrelevant to the story. But pertinent was the fact that I had just begun my studies in the philosophy of music and finding myself sitting “next to Arthur Danto” gave me the chance to describe the paper I was writing on the relevance of Kripke’s thought to music. Arthur listened with the utmost charity, although little, he later told me, inspired him. But he also told me that he never forgot this encounter. Getting to know him later, I realized that he forgot few persons, that nearly every meeting was special to him in some way. He found something to admire whatever the age or status of his interlocutors.

My next encounter afforded me an opportunity to describe Arthur Danto in public. It was the year, if my memory serves me right, that I offered the history I had written of the American Society for Aesthetics to the Society at their annual meeting. Coming from England, I was naïve about many things to do with America. So when I read in preparation for my speech that Danto was “the art-critic for The Nation,” I assumed that meant that he was akin to “the Poet-Laureate of the United States” (for I did not know then of the magazine to which he would contribute for many years). So this is how I described him. The audience laughed, but when I learned of my mistake, I was pleased that I had imported a suitably honorific content into what otherwise would have been a true but bland description. My descriptive leap perfectly fitted Danto’s theory of narrative sentences as developed in his philosophy of history and it equally well suited a person who really did become in America the poet laureate of the philosophy of art.

When twenty years ago I came to teach at Columbia, I became very close to Arthur, although this doesn’t mean that he was always content with my approach to aesthetics. On one occasion, he remarked that my gaze was far too focused on Europe and that I should open my eyes to the world around me—by which he really meant New York. And so, reading between the lines, I began to write about his work, American to the core, although still in deliberate juxtaposition with the work of a German aesthetic theorist, Adorno, in whom I retained a devoted interest. For a decade, I worked tirelessly on Danto and Adorno even to the point of naming these two figures as one: AdorDanto (and by then I really did adore Danto). My intellectual project was difficult for many reasons, but for this reason in particular: that whereas Adorno felt like a figure of the past, having died in 1969, Danto was very much alive and living next door. Because I wanted to get his views right, it became all too easy for me to call him or pop over to his apartment and ask him what he had had in mind when writing this or that. One morning, he called me on the telephone to tell me that although he was willing to talk to me about everything else in the world, I should, in writing my book, treat him as I was treating Adorno, as unavailable as far as his intentions were concerned. Since I knew Danto was an intentionalist, my first response was to laugh and my second to wonder whether he was offering me a telephone version of the intentionalist fallacy—that all the intentions I needed to know were there to be read from his work, so no telephone call was needed in addition. Finally, however, I came to understand something else: that though Arthur was an intentionalist, intentions had been the last thing he had ever really appealed to in interpreting the art of his contemporaries. Much more, he had drawn on facts of friendship and, more important, on “being there” in the right place and time—as he was there to see those Brillo Boxes, which, stacked up on the gallery floor, allowed him to take a final stock in his philosophy of art. More even than becoming an eminent critic of contemporary art, he became a storyteller of his life with artists whose company he so much enjoyed. To be an intentionalist might be the stance of the philosopher, but how this translated into an art criticism was never as obvious as Danto sometimes claimed it was. When I finished my book, Danto said almost immediately that he did not recognize his views. I told him that it served him right, that he should have been more forthcoming on the telephone. He laughed and reminded me of how intentionality had been the way our long friendship had begun.

At Columbia, each year and for many years, I offered a year-long, graduate aesthetics course, a survey that was nicknamed “From Plato to Nato.” Nato was of course Danto, who generously agreed to come to the last class to present his work. The students sizzled with excitement when he appeared, even to the point where one very sweetly came up to me after class and said, “Oh Professor Goehr, it was so nice to meet a real philosopher face to face.” That Danto was the real thing was true; that he was the culmination of a long road that had begun with Plato was also true; he even, in his early life as a woodcut artist, produced an image that uncannily depicts Socrates as Arthur himself would later look. Artistic depiction always, he argued, transfigures. Even if I was a little miffed by not even being a candidate, in this student’s view, for entry into the philosophical world, I blamed myself for offering a syllabus that rendered all the philosophers I taught almost indiscernible in appearance. So, as years passed by, I increasingly stressed the teaching to which Danto was most committed, that in the face of indiscernibility, don’t be taken in merely by what you see: work out wherein the differences between things lie. For then things that look the same will no longer stubbornly be assumed to be the same sort of thing. And when we come to understand that, so many more ways of appearing will be granted entry into the hallowed halls, be they the halls of philosophy or of art.

In the last months, weeks, and days before Arthur’s death, I spent many hours in his company. Often we turned to opera as a medium for communication. I would take my iPad over to his apartment and play him arias from operas. He recalled having heard many of the great singers, but above all, he told me, he loved Amelita Galli-Curci. On one of these occasions, Arthur began to sing, in perfect Italian,
the opening love duet from La Bohème. The last piece he had read by me was an essay on this opera set into comparison with the red squares with which he had begun his book The Transfiguration of the Commonplace. Not able to hear very well anymore, he watched me listening to the aria and began to describe what he was seeing. He saw me not as listening but as singing to him. I did not know that this would be the last image he would ever have of me and me of him. Two days later, he received the first copies of a book for which he had been waiting a long time: the book that was his life and work, produced by the Library of Living Philosophers. A few hours later he lost consciousness with the joy of knowing that he had left his world in good order and that he would meet again the friend with whom he had spoken every day for sixty years, Richard Kuhns. Not the belief but the image I have of Art and Dick now again taking a walk somewhere each morning in deep conversation is a comforting one in this time of mourning the loss of two friends who meant so much to me and so very much to each other.

Danto was born the year Puccini died. I had always wanted to write about them both together, which is what I have recently been doing and will continue to do. My book is not about endings and new beginnings, but about beginnings, first lines, which is where Arthur always was, given the excitement with which he woke each day to write. A year or so ago, he called me one morning when writing his last book, What Art Is, to tell me that he had suddenly understood something that he had never understood before: why Warhol and his Brillo Boxes were so central to him in allowing him as a philosopher to know what art essentially is. I did not dismiss his thought as repetitive; on the contrary, I thought back to how he had begun his Transfiguration with a red square that had been described by the philosopher who had so famously reversed the terms of repetition. Danto's last thought about art had all the freshness of spring. He named the thought a wakeful dream. He had the ability to look at something so profoundly familiar — almost commonplace — as though he were looking at it for the very first time. His work now stands before us, asking to be read anew, filled to the philosophical brim with the spirit of Art.

In Memoriam, Arthur Danto

Daniel Herwitz
University of Michigan

Arthur Danto was born in Ann Arbor Michigan in 1924 and grew up in Detroit. He served in the military during the Second World War, driving trucks in North Africa and Italy. "I had a really great time," he told me, making me wonder if anything at all could not, given his fascination with life, turn into an adventure. After the War he studied Art History and Art at Wayne State then in Paris, becoming a printmaker of significance, a maker of images in the manner of German Expressionism, woodblocks with figures articulated in a chaotic swirl of lines, barely discernible in the intensity. At a certain moment in the 1960s he took the decision to give up art, believing his work out of step with the Zeitgeist. This decision was made on philosophical grounds and without regret, for Arthur was already a philosopher dedicated to thinking through the conditions through which object, performance and gesture may become art, spinning a theory as intricately inventive as any work of avant-garde art. He had taken the decision to continue at university and gotten a PhD at Columbia, and after a brief stint working in the philosophy of science turned to aesthetics. He was to spend most of the rest of his working life in the classrooms, galleries and museums of New York, ending up Johnsonian Professor of Philosophy at Columbia while also serving as art critic for The Nation magazine.

It is well known that Arthur's eureka moment on the road to Damascus took place at a West 58th Street gallery, the Stable Gallery, where he witnessed an exhibition of oversized Brillo boxes by Andy Warhol. Offered in play as a way of blurring the distinction between industrial and fine art, Arthur transformed Warhol into a philosopher in gel (one who wore his gel tightly). In Arthur's view Warhol's boxes became revelations of the conditions that turn ordinary, real things into works of art. These conditions could not be anything visual, since the box in the supermarket was (more or less) visually identical to the one in the gallery but only the one was fine art. The man in dark glasses and a wig had hit on, with Arthur's prompting, Leibnitz's problem of indiscernibility: that what makes two virtually identical things different in kind has to be something hidden and abstract. That's something, Arthur argued in the Journal of Philosophy in 1964, could only be a background of shared theory: a set of concepts constructing terms for the box in the gallery to "make a statement" to the art world. Warhol could press the limits of the art world (with a supermarket box) and get away with it only because these concepts, at a moment of performance art, abstraction and pop were in place. Not that Warhol's gesture was without controversy. Many took Warhol's antics to be the attention grabbing of a drugged out denizen of the Velvet Underground whose pasty skin bespoke the need for a sunlamp if not a two-week vacation in Miami Beach. But the very fact of controversy proved (to Arthur) that the concepts were in place to allow for the argument.

It only remained for Arthur to articulate all the philosophy he believed implicit in Warhol's gesture, and thus to complete a long history of avant-garde experimentation. On his reading of the avant-gardes they had always been in the project of self-discovery, which Warhol then brought to completion. Who needed to make expressionist woodcuts when the true thrust of art history had ended up in his lap?

Great aestheticians often stake new philosophy on the art of their
time: Roger Fry on Cézanne, Richard Wollheim on British figurative art, Friedrich Nietzsche on Wagner (till he got burned). Arthur’s double was Warhol. When he published his theory of art in the Journal of Philosophy no one knew what to do with it, exactly in the way no one knew how to take Brillo Box. Arthur’s thinking was ahead of the game. Utterly dedicated to making a contribution to philosophy he did so in the manner of an avant-garde artist, riding the curl of history and finding it on the streets of New York. It is not fortuitous that the book he would publish after his work on the art world in 1964 would be Nietzsche as Philosopher, which similarly befuddled the New York philosophical world, a world, which at that time believed Nietzsche a freak if not a Nazi. What followed was an endless litany of works in philosophy and art criticism, each filled with dazzling insight and unforgettable philosophical twists.

When he became critic for The Nation magazine in the 1984 (a post he held until 2009) postmodernism was in high swing, and he became its most imaginative theorist. Having completed the project of self-discovery, Arthur believed (in a Hegelian manner) that art history was completed, freeing art to pursue a prism of new possibilities in the manner of a thousand flowers blooming. This was in fact what was happening in the New York art world, where the intense anxieties of the art historical movement (whose military quarters were the Cedar Bar) were giving way to a kind of populist individualism with each artist free to experiment with any style for any reason, composing paintings in which German expressionism meets Italian Manierism, Abstraction reacquaints itself with the human figure and Duchamp turns into a TV serial. This efflorescence was tailor-made for Arthur’s abundant generosity, he could be free to like everything, or at least find everything fascinating. Not that he was without complaint. In an essay in The Nation called “The Painting of Importance,” Arthur bemoaned the new high seriousness whose point seemed to be to make a work of art seem important rather than be it by carrying the aura of deep meaning and struggle with form while in fact bespeaking no message at all other than size and a lot of scratching on the surface and a deep title taken from the Second World War. Certain bad boy artists of the 1980s he chided as adolescents, the kind who come out of their bedrooms in the American suburbs only to tell their parents to stuff it, and return to their television sets (now they would be insulting each other on Facebook). He had the pulse of America just as he had the pulse of art. But he never ceased to be cheerful for he found each twist in the inscrutable pattern of life a new surprise, giving him something new to think about. The worst thing in life, to twist the words of Warhol, is not having anything to think about.

Arthur’s big mind was a generous one. He welcomed serious thought from all quarters whether it criticized him or not. I had in 1992 submitted a book for publication that criticized parts of his work and when he read the manuscript he wrote me: “Rather than duking it out, what can I do to help you get this book published?” Two years later I was coming out of a shop somewhere on the East side when I ran into him hurrying to a lecture. His warmth was unmistakable. Not ten seconds after he greeted me, an artist who had been living in Italy commenced as a cautious, half-hearted read developed into an avid one, and I saw for the first time how one might do something exciting and innovative in aesthetics. Still, I did not arrive in New York entirely convinced. I did not meet Arthur until my second year in graduate school. He taught a seminar called, I believe, simply “Topics in Aesthetics,” which I discovered, in practice, meant “read a book with Professor Danto.” The course consisted entirely of discussing the philosophical issues raised by a book (of Arthur’s choosing) and writing up a paper on some topic covered. I do not remember what book we read that term. I have retained an impression that it was not very good, but that didn’t matter because what I found out was that the book was just a prop for Arthur to discuss his own views. That was much more exciting of course! Arthur was what Harold Bloom calls a “strong reader” and his somewhat impetuous and even impertinent style was a chance, in essence, to talk with Arthur about Arthur—about his work. He held forth, seamlessly integrating great chunks of his own aesthetics with both historical views and real-world examples from the visual arts against which one might test the theory. I remember writing a too-long paper on the connection of semantics and ontology in Arthur’s view as I understood it. I hesitated to turn it in. It contained a number of objections, which I thought he might take to be snotty and superficial. The paper in fact was the model of politeness, but I thought that he might not like being objected to and I did not arrive in New York entirely convinced. The degree to which I was open to the philosophy of art was due to having picked up, pretty much at random, a copy of Arthur Danto’s Transfiguration of the Commonplace from a bookstore in Atlanta. What commenced as a cautious, half-hearted read developed into an avid one, and I saw for the first time how one might do something exciting and innovative in aesthetics. Still, I did not arrive in New York entirely convinced. I did not meet Arthur until my second year in graduate school. He taught a seminar called, I believe, simply “Topics in Aesthetics,” which I discovered, in practice, meant “read a book with Professor Danto.” The course consisted entirely of discussing the philosophical issues raised by a book (of Arthur’s choosing) and writing up a paper on some topic covered. I do not remember what book we read that term. I have retained an impression that it was not very good, but that didn’t matter because what I found out was that the book was just a prop for Arthur to discuss his own views. That was much more exciting of course! Arthur was what Harold Bloom calls a “strong reader” and his somewhat impetuous and even impertinent style was a chance, in essence, to talk with Arthur about Arthur—about his work. He held forth, seamlessly integrating great chunks of his own aesthetics with both historical views and real-world examples from the visual arts against which one might test the theory. I remember writing a too-long paper on the connection of semantics and ontology in Arthur’s view as I understood it. I hesitated to turn it in. It contained a number of objections, which I thought he might take to be snotty and superficial. The paper in fact was the model of politeness, but I thought that he might not like being objected to and I did not arrive in New York entirely convinced. The degree to which I was open to the philosophy of art was due to having picked up, pretty much at random, a copy of Arthur Danto’s Transfiguration of the Commonplace from a bookstore in Atlanta. What commenced as a cautious, half-hearted read developed into an avid one, and I saw for the first time how one might do something exciting and innovative in aesthetics. Still, I did not arrive in New York entirely convinced. I did not meet Arthur until my second year in graduate school. He taught a seminar called, I believe, simply “Topics in Aesthetics,” which I discovered, in practice, meant “read a book with Professor Danto.” The course consisted entirely of discussing the philosophical issues raised by a book (of Arthur’s choosing) and writing up a paper on some topic covered. I do not remember what book we read that term. I have retained an impression that it was not very good, but that didn’t matter because what I found out was that the book was just a prop for Arthur to discuss his own views. That was much more exciting of course! Arthur was what Harold Bloom calls a “strong reader” and his somewhat impetuous and even impertinent style was a chance, in essence, to talk with Arthur about Arthur—about his work. He held forth, seamlessly integrating great chunks of his own aesthetics with both historical views and real-world examples from the visual arts against which one might test the theory. I remember writing a too-long paper on the connection of semantics and ontology in Arthur’s view as I understood it. I hesitated to turn it in. It contained a number of objections, which I thought he might take to be snotty and superficial. The paper in fact was the model of politeness, but I thought that he might not like being objected to and I did not arrive in New York entirely convinced. The degree to which I was open to the philosophy of art was due to having picked up, pretty much at random, a copy of Arthur Danto’s Transfiguration of the Commonplace from a bookstore in Atlanta. What commenced as a cautious, half-hearted read developed into an avid one, and I saw for the first time how one might do something exciting and innovative in aesthetics. Still, I did not arrive in New York entirely convinced. I did not meet Arthur until my second year in graduate school. He taught a seminar called, I believe, simply “Topics in Aesthetics,” which I discovered, in practice, meant “read a book with Professor Danto.” The course consisted entirely of discussing the philosophical issues raised by a book (of Arthur’s choosing) and writing up a paper on some topic covered. I do not remember what book we read that term. I have retained an impression that it was not very good, but that didn’t matter because what I found out was that the book was just a prop for Arthur to discuss his own views. That was much more exciting of course! Arthur was what Harold Bloom calls a “strong reader” and his somewhat impetuous and even impertinent style was a chance, in essence, to talk with Arthur about Arthur—about his work. He held forth, seamlessly integrating great chunks of his own aesthetics with both historical views and real-world examples from the visual arts against which one might test the theory. I remember writing a too-long paper on the connection of semantics and ontology in Arthur’s view as I understood it. I hesitated to turn it in. It contained a number of objections, which I thought he might take to be snotty and superficial. The paper in fact was the model of politeness, but I thought that he might not like being objected to and I did not arrive in New York entirely convinced. The degree to which I was open to the philosophy of art was due to having picked up, pretty much at random, a copy of Arthur Danto’s Transfiguration of the Commonplace from a bookstore in Atlanta. What commenced as a cautious, half-hearted read developed into an avid one, and I saw for the first time how one might do something exciting and innovative in aesthetics. Still, I did not arrive in New York entirely convinced. I did not meet Arthur until my second year in graduate school. He taught a seminar called, I believe, simply “Topics in Aesthetics,” which I discovered, in practice, meant “read a book with Professor Danto.” The course consisted entirely of discussing the philosophical issues raised by a book (of Arthur’s choosing) and writing up a paper on some topic covered. I do not remember what book we read that term. I have retained an impression that it was not very good, but that didn’t matter because what I found out was that the book was just a prop for Arthur to discuss his own views. That was much more exciting of course! Arthur was what Harold Bloom calls a “strong reader” and his somewhat impetuous and even impertinent style was a chance, in essence, to talk with Arthur about Arthur—about his work. He held forth, seamlessly integrating great chunks of his own aesthetics with both historical views and real-world examples from the visual arts against which one might test the theory.
at. In the intervening years, Arthur had been a co-supervisor of my dissertation, supported me vigorously in getting my career off the ground, gave visiting lectures at the places I taught and we met many, many times at conferences, at bars, over meals, and at his apartment on Riverside Drive. With my good friend Lydia Goehr, whom Arthur deeply admired and loved, I visited him two days before he died. But the misunderstanding abided.

Arthur resisted my characterization of his view that artworks embody their meaning as a form of social expressivism. I considered this not a criticism at all. The expressivism I had in mind was bound up with what I took to be a Hegel-inspired social externalism about the meanings of artworks, to which I took Arthur to be fully committed. I thought and still think that Arthur’s aesthetic theory both conceptually and historically combines the two major trains of thought that preceded his own account, representationalism and expressivism about content, but in a way that transforms both strands. This faintly Kantian taxonomy appealed to him as a matter of philosophical historiography; but I believe he thought that bringing his views too close to expressivism implied that his account was psychological. He preferred a formal way of putting his point that he loosely modeled on Frege’s account of concepts as functions, a formulation that he made in his blockbuster essay “The Artworld” and in altered form in Transfiguration. But Transfiguration had the power it did because it substantially fleshed out the internal structure of his views, and I was concerned that the structure did not cohere quite the way he thought, especially if one took as canon law his rather minimal formal definition of a work. Arthur’s formal side liked to express his view that “interpretations constitute artworks,” by construing interpretation as a “function” that “mapped” art-content onto physical objects. But to my mind this did not rule out an important sense in which a work might be said to express interpretation through content. His connection of content to concepts such as “point of view” and “metaphor” in the later chapters of Transfiguration seemed to me to offer an account of expression, not of artists’ intentions through works perhaps, but certainly of the art itself. He came to call this embodiment, but I could not see the difference between that and, coupled with the idea of an artworld and its “atmosphere of theory,” the sense of expression I took to be part of his debt to Hegel. In the end, I guess I thought that the formula Arthur used to represent the relation of interpretation to work was more gesture than substance, a nod to the way analytic philosophy was done in the day but not really much more.

Was Arthur right that I misunderstood his views? Perhaps. Was I right that social externalism was a part of the view? Perhaps. Arthur’s own character was not to belabor disagreement. There was his definitive shoulder shrug, not dismissive but reconciliatory: if we disagreed, so what? The reason I detail the disagreement and its unsettled nature is that it tokens something deeper, I have come to think. In his letters to Wilhelm Fliess, Freud asserted that projection is a process in which one takes negative traits of oneself that are difficult to accept and recognizes as such and ascribes them to another in order to both make criticism of the trait possible and reduce anxiety. Subsequent psychoanalytic theory has refined this Freudian understanding somewhat, but retains the emphasis on the negative character of what’s projected. This seems too restrictive; for there are plenty of cases where projection operates in tandem with positive self-assessment. Projection of positive qualities can be a function of wanting others to be like oneself or oneself to be like others. Where the other person is someone one finds deeply admirable, even lovable, that seems especially plausible. What my and Arthur’s disagreement about the internal structure of his aesthetic views meant, why I kept coming back to those views and wanting to make sense of them in what I took to be their own terms, was about more than simply settling something philosophically. After all, was I really saying to Arthur: look, I understand your views better than you do?

Perhaps part of what Arthur taught me was the importance of letting go. Philosophical disagreement is not so important finally; it is subservient to imagination and intellectual depth. Sometimes disagreements are productive, sometimes not. And sometimes they are productive for a while and then peter out. The value in letting go is to be able to start over again someplace else, someplace where the philosophical imagination operates with more impetus and range. That Arthur could treat his own work that way, as something he was willing to let go of, expressed a deep trait in him. I know that I must in time let go of Arthur, but that has always been a difficult thing to do.

Working with Arthur

C. Danto

Michael Kelly
UNC-Charlotte

I first met Arthur in person when I was being interviewed in 1986 for the Managing Editor position at the Journal of Philosophy at Columbia University (he was President of the Journal). The second, informal interview took place at the December annual meeting of the American Philosophical Association, held that year in Boston. Arthur suggested that we meet at the Institute of Contemporary Art, located at the time next to a fire station on Boylston Street. When I arrived, Arthur was talking to a few friends, so I waited, thinking we would be meeting alone. But he called me over and introduced me to Nelson Goodman and Richard Wollheim, who were standing in front of a contemporary work on paper by David Salle. If Goodman was wondering when the work was art, if it was, and if Wollheim was closely seeing in the work hoping to discern it as whatever the artist intended it to be, Arthur was mischievously disinterested in making any aesthetic judgment of it, though he was already an art critic for The Nation. He was instead trying to understand what could account for the work’s ontological status as art. It embodied meaning, he divined, even if the meaning it embodied were largely to provoke vexing questions about art among some of the world’s leading experts at the time. Whether good or bad, Salle’s work corroborated Arthur’s definition of art as embodied meaning, to which he added “wakeup dreams” as a third criterion in his last, recently published book, What Art Is.

I worked closely and fortunately with Arthur for sixteen years. In the long run, however, he ruined my life as an employee, and I told him this, because he was so generous, judicious, and respectful that I came to expect similar treatment everywhere else I have worked since leaving Columbia. If I have not found it in other employment situations, and if I have not developed the same leadership qualities on my own, both are less a criticism of others, myself included, than confirmation of how special Arthur was in this regard. Should there be an afterlife, Arthur should be president, even if work is not required.

At the same time, Arthur had an uncanny, enviable ability to deflect any criticism of his philosophy, and perhaps of his person too. While he could seem aloof in doing so, he was really returning the criticisms to the senders, cleverly inviting them to think instead about their own ideas. Any such exchange with Arthur was an opportunity, hopefully characterized by wit and erudition on the interlocutor’s side too, for each person to become clearer about her ideas, not simply as one’s
own but as ideas. This is perhaps why Arthur did not have many, if any, students in the typical academic way that a prominent philosopher might foster students to develop and sustain his theories. Rather, he encouraged independent thinking, which was his gift as a teacher and friend.

Turning back to art, it is still hard to forget the image of Arthur, 40 years old, standing amidst the stacks of Brillo pad, Delmonte peach, Heinz ketchup, and other cartons in the Stable Gallery in April 1964, where he famously had his epiphany about art. None of it made any sense to him as art, though he was a relatively successful practicing artist, making wood-block prints in an expressionist or mannerist style, while also teaching philosophy at Columbia. He stopped making art roughly around the time of the Stable show, I believe, for he decided he could no longer continue doing both art and philosophy. Why did he choose philosophy? Because more than art alone, philosophy enabled him to make sense of the art that did not make any sense. But first, since he determined that no existing definition or philosophy of art could explain why Warhol’s Brillo Boxes were art when their supermarket equivalents were not, Arthur had to discover a new definition, which he somehow found in those boxes and which anchored his essentialist philosophy of art for forty-nine years, and beyond.

Arthur is and will remain exemplary, as a philosopher and critic, because of the way he understood the intimate relationship between philosophy and art, and especially because of his insistence that the philosophy of art be calibrated to contemporary practice, and not just to Warhol’s or Salle’s work. Whether or not people agree with Arthur’s philosophy of art, they should appreciate that he worked harder than anybody, perhaps ever, to correct philosophy’s tendency to disenfranchise art because it allegedly steals our attention and diverts us from truth. He always believed, despite the postmodern turn in culture contemporaneous with his Stable epiphany, that philosophy’s ultimate goal was still truth. But he also thought that at times it could not achieve that goal without art. After all, knowing the essence of art is a way of knowing truth and, he argued, this truth is revealed only by art, though it then had to be articulated by philosophy. It turns out that art discloses something about the nature of truth, and not just in relation to art, for truth is truth.

Like Baudelaire and Hegel, a fusion of writer and thinker Arthur embodied in many ways, he believed you could find the universal truth about art only in its contemporary embodiments, for that is where such truth lives. That is also where Arthur lived, and where we will always find him, playfully and generously philosophical as ever.

ACD, In Memoriam

Jonathan Gilmore
Columbia University

There are many current accounts of Arthur Danto’s intellectual itinerary and his celebrated place within the worlds of art criticism and philosophy. I wish to offer a sense, partial of course, of what he was like to those who knew him closely. When his friend and former colleague Richard Wollheim died, Danto told me of his vexation that, in his substantial autobiography Germs, Wollheim described only his personal development, largely within psychoanalytical parameters. But Danto wanted to know how Wollheim the philosopher, not Wollheim the man, came into being. Danto might have taken comfort in knowing that to distinguish these two dimensions in himself might not have been possible. Who he was as a philosopher was hardly distinguishable from who he was as a person.

His philosophical fame came from analyzing the transformation instantiated in works of art—those of Pop and Fluxus, the music of Cage, and the dance of Cunningham—that took as its substance everyday objects, sounds, actions, and the like. That began as early as 1964 in his essay “The Artworld” in which he quaintly referred to a certain “Mr. Andy Warhol,” a figure whom few among his philosophical audience would have heard of, or, had they heard of, would have taken seriously. With that essay, and the philosophical and critical writing that followed, Danto initiated a revolution in the theoretical reflection on the arts, a revolution in which philosophers once again began to ask the truly grand questions about art—about its essence and its history—themes that were foreworn by an earlier generation of philosophers allergic to metaphysical speculation and wary of attributing any great cognitive significance to “mere” aesthetic forms. His range and concreteness of examples gave vividness to his discussions—a kind of flesh to spirit—not often found in the anemic Anglo-American tradition in aesthetics. But, more significantly, in grounding his thought in the history of art and its contemporary manifestations he gave aesthetics a demonstration of the philosophical payoff that the philosophy of science came to enjoy after it recognized that expert knowledge of the sciences and their histories serves not just as coloration in developing idealized models, but in analyzing the very concepts—say, that of species—that are central to philosophical theories.

Danto’s major systematic work of aesthetics was The Transfiguration of the Commonplace, a title he borrowed from one appended to a non-existent book mentioned in a real book by Muriel Spark. But it might as well have been the name of a commonplace book in which he inscribed his principles for how to respond to others. For anyone who had Arthur as a teacher learned that his default approach was to excavate what might be even a minor part of one’s work if it had some value or depth, and show how that was what the work as a
whole was really about—transforming lead into gold, or at least a richer metal than what one started with. Responding to a paper I once wrote for him, he said that the first twenty-four pages amounted to no more than superficial philosophy of science, but after that, it was the best philosophy of art he had read in a long time. The paper was only twenty-nine pages! And anyone who went from being his student or admirer to his friend, as I did, learned that this is how he treated people as well—finding whatever was good in them, however implicit or accidental, and deciding that it was that which defined who they really were. This would remain a purely external redefinition if it weren’t that one wanted, when in Danto’s company, to be one’s best self, and sometimes found that one could.

But the ordinary things, of which he described the transfiguration into indiscernible artistic counterparts, were meaningful to Danto in their own right, and not, as to ironists, only as a form of slumming. In responding to my primitive Italian with his “soldier’s Italian” and an account of the trouble it caused him in polite society, he described with real passion how, when serving in Italy in the Second World War, he would avidly await each installment of a British comic strip about a young intelligence officer named Jane whose misadventures inexplicably but reliably left her partially disrobed (this was the 1940s). After I sent him a book with reproductions from the series, he described the reverie he was sent into while reading it, now more than a half a century later. But that sort of thing was never just one thing for Danto, the way it might be for someone who thought cultural ephemera couldn’t sustain any substantial reflection. We once shared a long train ride and discussed watching the nightly reruns of Seinfeld. I thought, at least in this art form, I’m as much of an expert as him—until, after a long pause in which he adopted a characteristic inward focus, he turned to me and said, “You know, it really is the closest thing our age has to the commedia dell’arte tradition.”

It was sometimes said of Danto, with admiration or consternation, that he saw the world as it should and could be, not as it was. It would imply too volunteerist a perspective to say that he chose to adopt this perspective, but he certainly recognized having it, blaming it on being born on January 1st, in which, he said, “Each year opens on a new page, for me as well as for the world.” In truth, Danto’s way of seeing the world was as essential a feature of his identity as any other might be. He suffered, and he suffered with you, and his optimism was not held blithely. Instead, it represented in some ways a moral stand, one no doubt a source of frustration to those who wanted him to share in their cynicism, however warranted that might be in academic locales. For me, and I’m sure for many others around him, his attitude, his exemplary being, was a source of strength: a goad to think, when possible, beyond what was currently a source of pain; and not to curse the world even if one was right to curse one small part of it. And his cosmopolitanism and earthiness, and his profundity as a philosopher, made that stance credible, when it might have seemed an artificial conceit in others. Although he engaged in the ruthless disputation required of professional philosophers, where expressing too much agreement with another’s argument is a form of discourtesy, Danto was contemptuous of the academic déformation professionnelle of taking pleasure in snide and cavalier criticism. False sophistications and too-clever-by-half arguments made him impatient. Yet he delighted in wit, even at his expense, as when he was told by a graduate student of a somewhat deconstructive bent that the indefinite article in the subtitle of his book—“a philosophy of art”—appeared to betray a false modesty.

Danto didn’t believe in an afterlife, and took some comfort in knowing, he said, that the end really was the end. But, of course, one keeps in one’s mind an image of those we lose. When turning older, he embraced the observation that he and Socrates shared a physiognomy, and he showed me from time to time pictures that friends sent him of busts of the ancient philosopher that made the comparison highly credible. But I continue to think of him through another set of images, those painted several years ago by his wife, the artist Barbara Westman. In these, she has represented the two of them as Adam and Eve in the Garden. And there he is, with grey beard and bald pate, dancing, kissing, and otherwise cavorting with his partner, while beasts of the kingdom somewhat quizzically look on. Danto beamed with pleasure when showing these images to visitors, a pleasure that declared in some ways the great happiness he found in his life with Barbara, and the happiness, I think, of the figure by which he is represented in that Eden.

“Its works differ from one another as personalities differ from personalities...greatness in works is like greatness in human beings...there are certain works, as certain persons, one likes or dislikes for reasons having nothing to do with their excellences or failures... Like persons, works of art are a great deal richer than philosophy can or should want to capture.”

-- Arthur Danto, Encounters and Reflections
Call for Papers: Printmaking and the Philosophy of Art

A special issue of the Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism.

Guest Editors: Christy Mag Uidhir and Cynthia Freeland

Submissions on any philosophical treatment of printmaking are welcome, but papers addressing these topics are especially welcome:

- Is printmaking an essential part of the art-historical narrative, Western or otherwise?
- What are the implications of the relationship between print artists and master printers for issues of authorship and artistry?
- What are the descriptive or evaluative implications of the practices of editioning, proofing, or plate striking?
- What are the implications of printmaking practices for print ontology—whether prints are best construed as repeatable works, single-instance works, or something else entirely?
- How do issues of originality or authenticity for printmaking compare to those for other forms of visual art?
- What are the implications qua art (if not also qua print) of digital prints (for example, laser C-prints or inkjet Giclée prints)?

Submissions should not exceed 7,000 words and must comply with the general guidelines for submissions (see “Submissions” on the JAAC page on the American Society for Aesthetics website: <www.aesthetics-online.org>). Upload submissions to the JAAC online submission website, <http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/jaac>, making sure they are identified as submissions for the special issue.

If you have questions please contact:

Christy Mag Uidhir, University of Houston, at <cmaguidhir@gmail.com>
Cynthia Freeland, University of Houston, at <cfreeland@uh.edu>

Deadline: 15 January 2014
News from the National Office

The recent meeting in San Diego went very well. Attendance was 176 registrants. Special thanks should go to Jennifer Judkins from UCLA who handled local arrangements and her graduate assistant, Russell Veirs, who worked registration. The hotel had changed management; without them, I would have been overwhelmed. Next year, the meeting will be in San Antonio at the Hotel Contessa on the San Antonio Riverwalk. The meeting will be from 29 October through 1 November. Unfortunately (or fortunately, if you like to party), that is over Halloween, but there was a significant difference in the available rates. We will try to avoid those dates in the future, but next year, consider bringing the family; there is a lot for families to do. The 2015 meeting will be in Savannah, Georgia, on 12-15 November.

The election for three trustees to replace Andrew Kania, James Shelley, and Sondra Bacharach will be held as soon as the final ballot is ready. Thanks to Andrew, James, and Sondra for their service. This year we will be using electronic voting. Everyone should receive a notification. You will be able to vote by clicking on a link. Those without email will receive a mail ballot. Please vote.

The program chair for next year’s meeting is Derek Matravers. A call for papers appears elsewhere in this Newsletter.

I will be sending out membership renewal notices before the end of this year. Many have already renewed; thank you. If you have not, please do so. Our membership has been slowly declining. Your support is essential to the success of the Society. In addition to a subscription to The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, the ASA provides grants, support to students, and advocacy for the study of aesthetics and the humanities as well as this Newsletter and ASAGE, the graduate e-journal. If you have never visited the ASAGE web site, please do so.

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>

ASAGE News

ASAGE Seeks New Managing Editor and Book Review Editor

The American Society for Aesthetics Graduate E-journal (ASAGE) is a peer-reviewed, twice-yearly online publication dedicated to aesthetics and the philosophy of art. The term of the current editorial board will expire after the upcoming Fall/Winter issue. ASAGE is now accepting applications for the new editorial board consisting of the Managing Editor and the Book Review Editor. These positions require two outgoing and detail-oriented graduate students who would like to gain insight into the inner workings of academic journals, forge professional relationships with working and future aestheticians, earn valuable work experience in online publishing, and represent the journal at the ASA’s annual meeting. Interested graduate students are invited to apply.

The term of the new editors will last for two years, beginning with the Spring/Summer issue of academic year 2013/2014 and ending with the Fall/Winter issue of academic year 2015/2016. The current editors will train the incoming board and make themselves available in an advisory capacity as needed. Eligible candidates must be pursuing a graduate degree in the US or Canada. Compensation is in the form of an honorarium and reasonable travel expenses to the annual ASA meeting (hotel and flight). The Managing Editor honorarium totals $3,200 per year and the Book Review Editor honorarium totals $1,500 per year.

Applicants should send a cover letter, which includes any prior experience with editing, ASAGE and/or the ASA, an academic CV including details of past and current research and a writing sample of approximately 3000 words, in addition to the names and contact email addresses of two referees who can attest to their suitability for this position, one of which should be their supervisor.

All application materials and questions should be e-mailed to the current Managing Editor (Mike Gutierrez) at <mgutierrez123@yahoo.com>. Please indicate in the subject line if you are applying for the Managing Editor position, the Book Review Editor position, or both. More details are available at <http://asage.org/index.php/ASAGE/announcement/view/21>.

Deadline: 30 November 2013

ASAGE Issue 5.2

ASAGE is pleased to announce the publication of Issue 5.2. The current issue can be accessed at <http://www.asage.org>/The submission period for Issue 6.1 is now open. Issue 5.2 includes articles by Sarah L Snyder, A. J. Fritz, Matt Hartman, Tano S. Posteraro, a book review by Andrea Lynne Nolen, a dissertation abstract from Kasia Ozga, and an interview of Noël Carroll.

Your Paintings Website

The Your Paintings website is a joint initiative between the BBC, the Public Catalogue Foundation (a not-for-profit) and over 3,000 participating collections from across the United Kingdom. Your Paintings is the result of the PCF’s ten-year project to digitize the UK’s entire national collection of oil paintings. 80% of these paintings are typically in store whilst the vast majority had not been photographed before this project. These artworks are now free to view and on the BBC’s website.

A few years ago the BBC made a three minute film about the project that you might enjoy watching. This is the link: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_KpyPzMW4_I>. This is the only website anywhere in the world illustrating a nation’s entire painting collection. There are over 210,000 oil paintings in the UK’s national collection. These publicly owned oil paintings are held in institutions ranging from museums large and small to universities, town halls, hospitals and even fire stations. In total there are works by 36,000 artists on the site ranging from the world famous to the completely obscure. Your Paintings provides a major source of organized material for research into art history, British and international history, genealogy and topography.

Mellon Dance Studies Seminar 2014

Applications from advanced graduate students, recent Ph.D.s, and junior faculty are invited for an intensive summer seminar on interdisciplinary research and teaching in dance studies. Funded by the Mellon Foundation, the seminar will be held 22-28 June 2014 at Stanford University. Participants will engage with each other’s work as well as with the work of invited senior scholars. Accepted applicants will have their costs covered for tuition, room and board and, in addition, receive up to $500 to cover travel expenses. International applicants are welcome, as are applicants from all fields in the humanities and humanistic social sciences that border
Conference Reports

ASA Pacific Division Meeting
Pacific Grove, California
3-5 April 2013

The ASA Pacific Division meeting convened at the beautiful Asilomar Conference Grounds for the 39th consecutive year. The program consisted of two panels and fifteen papers with commentary. The Wednesday evening panel was entitled “The Performing Arts” and included papers by James Hamilton, Anna Pakes, and Jonathan Neufeld on theater, dance, and music, respectively. David Davies offered enthusiastic and insightful remarks on all three contributions, each of which addressed arguments presented by Davies in his 2011 monograph Philosophy of the Performing Arts (Wiley-Blackwell). On Thursday evening, attendees enjoyed a lively author-meets-critics panel on Stephen Davies’s 2012 book The Artful Species: Aesthetics, Art and Evolution (Oxford University Press) with top-notch commentary provided by Susan Feagin and Theodore Grayck. Papers were presented on a wide range of topics including the aesthetics of games, appreciating bad art, and the paradox of disgust. The papers were authored by: Peter Alward, Eva Dadlez, John Dyck and Matt Johnson, Maria Forsberg, Jennifer Judge, Jennifer Judkins, Justine Kingsbury, Peter Kivy, Ronald Moore, Christopher Nguyen, Jenifer Robinson, Stephanie Ross, Dustin Stokes, Dabney Townsend, and James Young. The comments were of uniformly excellent standard and prompted animated discussion in every session that continued late into the night at favorite local haunts such as the Fishwife and Carbones. There were 45 participants from all corners of the globe, including seven excellent graduate students.

The conference organizers were Renee Conroy and Graham McFee, who especially want to thank California residents Thomas Leddy and Donald Crawford for their helpful contributions. It was decided at the business meeting that the Pacific Division would adopt a policy of having conference organizers serve two year terms to improve continuity and preserve institutional knowledge: the 2014 organizers will be Renee Conroy and Anna Pakes. The Pacific Division meeting will convene again in Pacific Grove, CA at Asilomar on 9-11 April 2014 and will celebrate 40 wonderful years of doing rewarding philosophy in an aesthetically rich environment. We hope you will join us!

Respectfully submitted,
Renee Conroy and Graham McFee

2013 ASA Rocky Mountain Division Meeting
Santa Fe, New Mexico
12-14 July 2013

The Rocky Mountain Division held its 30th annual meeting this year. The Saturday evening reception was once again well attended, and folks seemed to continue to enjoy the surrounding rail yard district. This year, we were pleased to have Dr. Sarah Worth, of Furman University, delivering the Manual Davenport Keynote Address on Friday afternoon. In addition, we were honored to inaugurate the Michael Manson Artist Keynote Address which was delivered by Siegfried Halus on Saturday afternoon.

This year brought us another first: the offering of a field trip to the historic San Miguel Chapel, led by Robin Jones, Executive Director of Cornerstones Community Partnerships. Cornerstones Community Partnerships has worked the past three years on San Miguel chapel, one of the oldest churches in the U.S. Compromised by a coating of cement, the church was in disrepair. Through community volunteerism, the church has been cleared of cement stucco, repaired, and re-coated with mud stucco. Those interested gathered at the Chapel after Friday’s keynote and enjoyed a leisurely and exclusive tour of the restored chapel and learned about the work still to be done on the interior. We appreciate Robin’s generosity in offering this tour to ASA/RMD conference attendees free of charge. The dropping away of those whose papers were accepted but whose travel funds were cut was a bit less of a problem this year than last year. One last-minute cancellation was attributed to illness. This year 26 papers were presented, down 1 from last year.

This summer marked the second year in the terms of Division President James W. Mock and Division Vice-President Allison Hagerman. This year’s business meeting was brief and not well attended though we did make quorum. Of special significance were the replacement of Secretary/Treasurer Elizabeth Graham by Allison Hagerman, and the replacement of Vice President Hagerman by Reuben Ellis. The modification of the description of the role of the secretary/treasurer was approved and shall be posted on the web site. Repayment of the cost for the official supper for the Davenport keynote speaker for last year and this year, plus the cost of labels and supplies ($140.00) owed President Mock was approved, as was $50.00 to Vice
President Hagerman for the cost of the website for two years.

The twenty-six presentations reflect the long-standing interdisciplinary focus of the division. To see the program, please visit <http://asarmd.com/conference-program-2/>.

The session chairs managed the timing of presentations and discussions with uniform excellence and grace. We offer sincere thanks to all of them: Elizabeth Graham, Arthur Stewart, Lawrence Rhu, Spencer Wertz, John Samson, Allison Hagerman, Eva M. Dadlez, Jeffrey Scholes, Raphael Sassower, Elizabeth Graham, James Mock, Arthur Stewart, and Spencer K. Wertz.

The 2014 meeting arrangements and the call for papers will be announced according to the normal schedule on both the ASA and division websites.

Respectfully Submitted,
Allison Hagerman

ASA Annual Meeting
San Diego, California
30 October-2 November 2013

The 71st Annual Meeting of the American Society for Aesthetics was held at The Declan Suites in San Diego, California from 30 October-2 November 2013.

The 2013 program committee decided to put out a general call for papers rather than suggesting a theme or range of themes. We received 79 papers and 16 panel proposals and accepted 35 papers and 8 panels. (For comparison: In 2011, 59 papers and 3 panels were submitted—40 papers and all 3 panels were accepted. In 2012, 57 papers and 8 panels were submitted—36 papers and 4 panels were accepted.) The program committee organized an additional 7 panels. We were able to fit all of this in because we scheduled four break-out sessions per time slot on Thursday and Friday. Although there were worries that four concurrent sessions might generate attendee frustration, the overall effect was to create a lively and diverse program. I recommend continuing this policy in the future.

One of the most exciting aspects of this year’s conference was the high level of student involvement. 16 graduate students presented papers, and a number of the commentators and session chairs were also students. The ASA’s very generous student travel grant policy helps make this level of student participation possible. I am glad that the Trustees have agreed to fund an annual prize for the best student paper at the conference—hopefully this will encourage even more student participation.

So submissions and refereeing standards were both up significantly this year, student participation was high, and overall participation also appears to have increased. 182 people registered to attend the conference! Although there are some concerns about membership numbers, this year’s conference suggests that we ought to be quite positive about the future of aesthetics and the ASA.

Conference panels focused on the following topics: aesthetics and implicit bias, the aesthetics of wine, Friday Night Lights, the art of portraiture, artworks and place, aesthetics and the senses, the law and aesthetics, smell in art and everyday aesthetics, contemporary Chinese art, the aesthetics of videogames, risk in musical performance, and fraudulent fictions. There were also three author-meets-critics sessions: on Stephen Davies’ The Artful Species, Christy Mag Uidhir’s Art and Abstract Objects, and ‘Tzachi Zamir’s Acts: Theater, Philosophy, and the Performing Self. Colloquium papers focused on both traditionally popular topics (Hume and Kant, the nature of depiction, aesthetic judgment, the institutional theory, fiction) and topics that have not often been addressed at past ASA meetings (the aesthetics of street art, the aesthetics of sport, museums, architectural theory, James Turrell).


Many fish tacos, American and Mexican breakfasts, bowls of pho, plates of chicken mole, and pints of IPA were enjoyed. Some productive and stimulating time was spent at the beach. Attendees also enjoyed Joan Pearlman’s exhibit of photographs from past ASA meetings.

I would like to thank the program committee: Diarmuid Costello, David Davies, Cynthia Freeland, Ivan Gaskell, Karen Gover, Sheila Lintott, Nick Stang, and Grant Tavinor. They were a creative, efficient and responsible team. I also owe thanks to Jennifer Judkins and Dabney Townsend who made huge contributions to the planning and organization of the conference. Two past program chairs, Rachel Zuckert and James Shelley, provided me with useful advice.

I am very pleased that the Board of Trustees has agreed to provide future conference committees with $5000 per year to enhance the Annual conference.

Next year in Texas!
Aaron Meskin

Calls for Papers

ASA Pacific Division Meeting
Pacific Grove, California
9 – 11 April 2014

Paper and panel submissions from persons in all arts-related disciplines, including graduate students, are welcome. Papers and panels may treat any area of interest within aesthetics and the philosophy of art. Suggested topics include, but are not limited to: reflections on humor and/or comedy; the philosophy of literature and/or poetry; philosophical discussions of nature and environment; everyday aesthetics; issues in the philosophy of film and/or photography; issues in the performing arts; the intersection between art and other values; and reflections on the state of the discipline, including the relationship between aesthetics and other philosophical domains and modes of enquiry.

Paper submissions must not exceed 3,000 words in length (20 minutes in presentation time), and should be accompanied by 100-word abstracts. Panel proposals should include a general description of the topic or theme, along with the names and affiliations of all proposed participants and brief abstracts of all papers. Essays written by graduate students will be considered for a

“Much of contemporary art is hardly aesthetic at all, but it has in its stead the power of meaning and the possibility of truth, and depends upon interpretation that brings these into play.”

--Arthur Danto, What Art Is
$200 award, and all graduate student submissions should be clearly marked as such. Volunteers to serve as commentators and/or chairs are welcome.

All papers or proposals should be submitted electronically to <asapacific2014@gmail.com>. You may also forward any inquiries to Renee Conroy at <rconroy@comcast.net> or to Anna Pakes at <A.Pakes@roehampton.ac.uk>.

As 2014 marks the 40th year the American Society for Aesthetics Pacific Division Meeting will convene at the beautiful Asilomar Conference Grounds in Pacific Grove, CA, the organizers would be delighted to receive any available copies of past programs from previous attendees. If you have old programs you would be willing to share to help us honor this anniversary, please forward electronic versions to <asapacific2014@gmail.com>. Thank you in advance for your help.

Deadline: 7 December 2013

ASA Eastern Division Meeting
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
28-29 March 2014

Papers on any topic in aesthetics are invited, as well as proposals for panels, author-meeets-critics, or other special sessions. We welcome volunteers to serve as session chairs and commentators. All participants must be members of the American Society for Aesthetics and must register for the conference. Papers should not exceed 3,000 words, should be accompanied by a 100-word abstract, and must be prepared for blind review.

Please send submissions in PDF, Word, or RTF format to <easa.submissions@gmail.com>.

Please feel free to direct questions to the Program Co-Chairs: John Gibson (University of Louisville) <john.gibson@louisville.edu>; Kristin Gjesdal (Temple University) <kgesdal@temple.edu>; or Kristin Boyce (Johns Hopkins) <kboyce2@jhu.edu>.

Deadline: 27 December 2013

21st Century Theories of Literature: Essence, Fiction and Value
University of Warwick, UK
27-29 March 2014

This conference aims to explore a series of theoretical themes that are relevant both for the philosophy of art and for literary criticism and theory. The aim is to bridge the gap between “philosophical” and “literary” approaches to the theory of literary interpretation, and to prompt participants coming from different backgrounds (Continental, Analytical…) to engage with one another.

500-word abstracts for 20-minute presentations should be sent to the organizers at <eveconference@live.warwick.ac.uk>. We welcome contributions on the following themes: (1) Essence; (2) Fiction; (3) Value. We would particularly appreciate an engagement both with philosophical and literary-critical literature, but this is not a requirement. We welcome case studies and historical analyses, as long as there is an explicit theoretical dimension to the discussion.

Further information can be found on the website: <http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/philosophy/research/activities/21stcenturytheoriesofliterature>.

Deadline: 30 November 2013

The Representational Art Conference
Ventura, California
2-5 March 2014

The Representational Art Conference 2014 (TRAC2014) invites you to join us in exploring the direction of representational art in the 21st century. Keynote speakers are Roger Scruton and Juliette Aristides. Odd Nerdrum and Roger Scruton will share a moderated conversation about kitsch, beauty and representational art in the 21st Century. TRAC2014 will focus on the aesthetic principles and values implicit in the representational art of the 21st century. Having established at TRAC2012 that the representational art community has an important voice, it is timely to explore and articulate its distinctive aesthetic values, vision and philosophical outlook. Our purpose is not to establish a single monolithic aesthetic for representational art, but to identify commonalities, understand the unique possibilities of representational art, and perhaps provide some illumination about future directions. What relationship to the world is the artist striving for? What values guide the hand?

The conference is planned as a focused but non-doctrinaire event of serious academic standards. Papers of high quality on a variety of topics in the aesthetics of contemporary representational art are invited and welcomed. Submit your paper online at <http://TRAC2014.org/academic_papers>.

Deadline: 31 November 2013

The Aesthetics of Design
Ascea, Italy
16-18 May 2014

It is well-known, that aesthetics is expected to tell what we do know or we can know about beauty, the dainty and the dumpy, the ugly, and so on. The world is replete with designs, designers, and designed things, sounds, texts, etc. So what do aestheticians find is true to say about all this? E.g., about what is designing as an activity, and how if at all does it differ from other activities and makings like art- and craft-making, production, fashioning, fabrication, manufacture? Are designed objects distinct kinds of things from those of mere things, arts and crafts? In what does the aesthetic excellence or beauty of a designed object consist? Do judgments of design excellence differ from judgments of natural beauty or art? What role does the function of designed things play in design excellence? Can one have purely aesthetic experiences of design, free from cognitive or moral other implications?

Wassard Elea (wassardelea.blogspot.com) invites philosophers, design critics and theorists, and design practitioners to submit papers on any area of design aesthetics for this conference. Sessions of 90 minutes include speaker, commentator, and discussion (40/20/30). Participants whose papers are accepted will be expected to also provide commentary on another presentation during the conference. All suitable contributions are published either simultaneously or subsequently in Wassard Elea Rivista.

Full papers (in English, prepared for blind review) are to be submitted to Professor Lars Aagaard-Mogensen, Via La Chiazzetta 27, I-84046 Ascea (Sa), Italy. Emailed submissions welcome to <wassard@tiscali.it> or see <http://wassardelea.blogspot.com> for more details.

Deadline: 1 December 2013

Workshop on Beauty and Explanation in Mathematics
Umeå, Sweden
10-12 March 2014

The purpose of this workshop is to bring together philosophers, mathematicians, and mathematics educators to study a question which is both relevant and timely for all three groups, namely whether mathematical beauty and mathematical explanation are related. Our approach is largely empirical— we will develop a set of examples that will help us make necessary distinctions and connections. The central questions of the workshop...
fall into three classes. One class concerns relations between beauty and visualization in mathematics; the other class concerns relations between explanation and visualization in mathematics. The third, perhaps most intriguing, class deals with the question whether visualization is an essential link between explanation and beauty in mathematics, that is: When some mathematics is both beautiful and explanatory, does the conjunction depend on the presence of a visual element? In addition to the scientific aims of the workshop, an important goal is to reach across normally rigid disciplinary domains to work on an area of common interest. We have invited top people from respective fields, some of whom know each other, but others (even within the same field) have never read each other’s work.

If you are interested to contribute a paper to the workshop please submit an abstract, no more than 2 pages, describing with some detail what you would like to present. Limited funding is available. Please indicate if you would like to present a short (20 minute) or long (40 minute) presentation. Mail your submissions to Manya Sundstrom and Lars-Daniel (both), at <manya.sundstrom@umu.se> and <lars-daniel.ohman@math.umu.se>.

Deadline: 1 December 2013

The Hungarian Philosophical Association
Budapest, Hungary
2-6 June 2014

The Hungarian Philosophical Association is organizing an international conference on “Aesthetic Experience and Somaesthetics.” Experts, teachers and researchers in the field of aesthetics, arts, philosophy and life sciences are invited to submit papers for this international conference. Standard papers as well as poster and electronic presentations are possible. The official language of the conference is English. An ISBN publication with all accepted papers will be produced. For submission of abstracts and for further information, please write to the leader of the Organizing Committee: Dr. Alexander Kremer, at <kremeralexander5@gmail.com>.

Deadline: 31 December 2013

The 6th Biennial Philosophy and Literature Conference
Purdue University
28-29 March 2014

Lately humor has been enjoying a moment of philosophical interest. The Lighthearted Philosophers’ Society was founded in 2006, for example, and philosophers from Simon Critchley and Bernard Feyrberg to John Morreall and Daniel Dennett have all published books on humor or comedy since the turn of the century. It would not be an overstatement, furthermore, to call this interest unprecedented. While philosophers throughout the western tradition have addressed humor in various manners before, these treatments were most often marginal or asides in the course of other pursuits. Recent discussion has agreed, broadly, that humor trades on incongruities and points, in some sense, to limits. It has also agreed that humor is fully worthy of philosophical investigation and integral to a range of philosophical topics. Ray Monk tells us that Wittgenstein, recognizing humor’s richness, once said, “A serious and good philosophical work could be written consisting entirely of jokes.”

In the spirit of this appreciation for humor’s centrality to philosophy, the Purdue Philosophy and Literature program proposes a conference to investigate humor’s relation to philosophy. If philosophy is understood as a way of life, how might humor help articulate a philosophical ethos? What role might humor have in the development of practices of the self? Or consider Gilles Deleuze’ claim that humor is transgressive by nature. How can such transgressiveness reveal the limits of current practices, be they philosophical, literary, social, or political? How can humor so understood point to new methods and new practices?

Submissions in the form of abstracts not exceeding 500 words, or papers not exceeding 3,000 words, should be prepared for blind review and sent to <purdue.humor@yahoo.com>.

Deadline: 1 January 2014

UHM Graduate Conference in Aesthetics
Mānoa, Hawaii
14-16 March 2014

The Uehiro Cross Currents Philosophy Conference showcases exceptional work by graduate and advanced undergraduate students in comparative philosophy (though not limited to East-West comparisons). Given this year’s speakers, we invite high-quality papers dealing with topics in Aesthetics, broadly construed. What might the reemergence of interest in the field of aesthetics mean for comparative philosophy? What is the importance of art, literature, music, and film for philosophy more generally? What does the interdisciplinary analysis of art objects have to contribute to the theorization of art? How is ‘art’ understood, interpreted, and valued differently by different cultures? How does aesthetics relate to other areas of philosophical study, such as metaphysics, epistemology, ethics, and politics? In what ways do ethical and political concerns affect the production and reception of works of art? Papers dealing with (though not limited to) such questions will be most welcome.

Email full papers or abstracts to <psa@hawaii.edu>. Papers should be suitable for a 20-minute presentation. In the body of the email include: 1) Your name, 2) Title of the paper, 3) Institutional affiliation, 4) Contact information (email, phone number, mailing address), and 5) Whether you would like to be considered for a travel award. Send documents in word format with no identifying information for blind review. The Uehiro Student Essay Award will be presented to the best student presentation. Competitive partial travel subsidies will be available this year for both international and domestic travel. For more information, see <https://sites.google.com/a/hawaii.edu/2014-uehiro-graduate-student-conference/>.

Deadline: 1 January 2014

Annual International Conference on Humanities & Arts in a Global World
Athens, Greece
3-6 January 2014

Academic Member Responsible for the Conference: Dr. Gregory A. Katsas, Head, Sociology Research Unit, ATINER & Associate Professor of Sociology, The American College of Greece-Deree College, Greece. Conference Website: <http://www.atiner.gr/social.htm>.

Deadline to submit abstracts: 6 January 2014

European Society for Aesthetics Conference
Amsterdam, Netherlands
29 – 31 May 2014

The European Society for Aesthetics would like to invite you to submit a paper for presentation at the ESA Conference 2014. The conference will be co-organized by the ESA and the Department of Philosophy, University of Amsterdam. We are inviting papers from all traditions and on any topic in philosophical aesthetics, and both systematic and historical presentations are acceptable. This year we also welcome submissions addressing “The Age of Aesthetics”, i.e. the period between 1750, the publication of Baumgarten’s...
“In my twenty-five years as art critic for The Nation magazine, my effort was to describe the art differently from that of the conservative taste of most of the New York critics. From my perspective, aesthetics mostly was not part of the art scene. That is to say, my role as art critic was to say what the work was about—what it meant—and then how it was worth it to explain this to my readers. That, incidentally, was something I learned from Hegel in his discussion of the end of art.”

--Arthur Danto, What Art Is
abstracts of all papers. Symposia will last two hours, including discussion time, and should normally have three participants (at most four). Students may not submit proposals for symposia, though symposia may include students as participants, in which case their status should be specified.

Papers are invited in all areas of philosophical aesthetics. All submissions should include a 200-word abstract and must be prepared for blind review. There are two categories of submission: 1. Regular submissions may not exceed 3500 words excluding abstract. Students may not submit in this category. 2. Student submissions by students enrolled in MA or doctoral degree programs are to be marked as such at the time of submission and may not exceed 2500 words excluding abstract. Students whose papers are accepted will receive a stipend to defray conference fees, accommodation and travel costs. The winner of the prize for the best paper by a student will also receive a cash prize.

Abstracts without full papers, papers that are not prepared for blind review and papers that exceed the maximum length will not be considered. You may either submit a paper or be a member of a proposed panel, but not both.

Submissions should be sent by email attachment in Word format to <admin@british-aesthetics.org> with the author’s name, affiliation, status (student or not) and contact details in the body of the email. Please also direct any questions to this address.

Deadline: 15 February 2013

Paul Ricoeur: Thinker of the Margins? International Conference
Amsterdam, Netherlands
18-20 September 2014

The conference will address topical philosophical, socio-political and religious issues, from a Ricoeurian perspective, but in conversation with other, more ‘radical’ thinkers. The organizing committee welcomes submissions that address any aspects of Ricoeur’s work. Nevertheless, we especially invite proposals on the conference’s theme Ricoeur: Thinker of the Margins.

Please submit an abstract of approximately 300-500 words (including the paper’s title, the author’s name, institutional affiliation, mailing address, and email address. Times New Roman typeface size 12, interspaced 1.5, justified paragraphs). Abstracts and papers may be in English or in French. There will be parallel sessions giving each speaker about 20 minutes to present and 15 minutes for discussion. Please mail to <geoffrey.dierckxsens@uantwerpen.be>.

Deadline for submission: 15 February 2014

Canadian Society for Aesthetics Annual Meeting
Ontario, Canada
24-26 May 2014

The 2014 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 83rd Congress of the Humanities and Social Sciences. Submissions on any topic in aesthetics are invited. But special interest is expressed for papers in the following areas: 1) Aesthetics of food and wine (in view of our location in Ontario’s wine district); 2) Artistic performance: Cognitive and aesthetic issues; 3) Assessing borderline and outlier cases in art; 4) The logic of narrative; 3) Ethical issues in any of the arts.

In the initial stage of consideration, preference will be given to completed papers of 10-12 standard pages, accompanied by a 150-word abstract and suitable for presentation in fewer than 25 minutes. Abstracts, if submitted alone, will be assessed later and only if vacancies occur in the program. Proposals for panels on special topics or recent publications are also invited, and should include names and affiliations of all participants plus an abstract of the subject matter. Participants selected for inclusion on the program are required to pay CSA membership and conference registration fees. For graduate submissions included on the program, there is the possibility of some funding to help support travel. Submissions must be sent as e-mail attachments (MS Word or .RTF files). Inquiries or submissions in English may be sent to Ira Newman; 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 de la Gappe, Gatineau, (Québec) CANADA J8T 7I7 <francois.chalifour@cegep-outaouais.qc.ca>.

Deadline: 17 February 2014

British Society of Aesthetics 2014 Essay Prize

The British Society of Aesthetics is running an essay prize competition, open to early-career researchers in aesthetics. The winning author will receive £1,500 and an opportunity to present the paper at the Society’s annual conference. The winning essay will normally be published in the British Journal of Aesthetics. The amount of the Prize is £1,500.

The Prize is intended to foster the development of the field 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. Entrants must include with their entry a statement indicating how they qualify. 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 essay should be a maximum of 7,500 words (about 25 double-spaced typed pages). The winning author will have the opportunity to present the paper at the 2014 annual conference of the Society. If the author is an enrolled student, they will be automatically eligible for a BSA postgraduate conference subsidy. The winner’s name will be announced in the British Journal of Aesthetics.

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>. Entries should be in English, and should not exceed 7,500 words in length (including footnotes and bibliography). Each entry should include 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. The file name should be the title of the essay. The covering email should include the name, institution and address of the author. Candidates should supply evidence that they are eligible for the prize. Essays will not be considered for the prize if they are currently under consideration by another journal or competition. No non-winning essay will be considered for publication in the BJA unless it has been separately submitted to that journal. The winning author will have a chance to revise the paper for publication after the annual conference.

The deadline: 24 February 2014
The conference runs along similar lines to the Dubrovnik Philosophy of Science Conference held earlier in April each year. This means that we shall not be asking those wishing to attend for copies of their papers in advance, but we do ask for a title and a brief abstract by 20 March. We'll notify all those who provide abstracts as to whether their proposals have been accepted within a couple of days of that deadline at the latest, and earlier where possible. We'll then circulate a draft of that deadline at the latest, and earlier where possible. We’ll then circulate a draft of the program to participants prior to the opening session, making adjustments if necessary to accommodate the schedules of those arriving late or departing early. There will be six hour-long sessions each day, with a lengthy lunch break (3 hours) to allow participants to continue their discussions at a restaurant or other place of hostelry in the Old Town, or to explore the city. Presentations in regular sessions should be no longer than 40 minutes. Graduate students and those wishing to attend for copies of their papers in advance, but we do ask for a title and a brief abstract by 20 March. We'll notify all those who provide abstracts as to whether their proposals have been accepted within a couple of days of that deadline at the latest, and earlier where possible. We’ll then circulate a draft of the program to participants prior to the opening session, making adjustments if necessary to accommodate the schedules of those arriving late or departing early. There will be six hour-long sessions each day, with a lengthy lunch break (3 hours) to allow participants to continue their discussions at a restaurant or other place of hostelry in the Old Town, or to explore the city. Presentations in regular sessions should be no longer than 40 minutes. Graduate students and those wishing to present shorter papers can give 20 minute presentations, with two such events taking up a single one-hour slot in the program.

If you are interested in participating in the conference, please send a title and a brief abstract to David Davies at <david.davies@mcgill.ca>. For further information, or if you are interested in attending, but not presenting at, the conference, please also contact David Davies at the same e-address.

Deadline: 20 March 2014
Wittgenstein and Wollheim: Seeing-As and Seeing-In
Vienna, Austria
12-14 December 2013

Program details will be made available by the end of November at <http://www.wu.ac.at/geschichte/philo/conwandl/dezember_2013>.

The Society for the Philosopphic Study of the Contemporary Visual Arts (SPSCVA) will have its divisional meeting held in conjuction with the Eastern divisional meeting of the American Philosophical Association. For more information, contact the Eastern Division coordinator, Christopher Grau, at <grau@clemson.edu>.

Melbourne School of Continental Philosophy
Melbourne, Australia
20 January-24 February 2014

The Melbourne School of Continental Philosophy presents a number of lectures from 20 January-24 February. There will also be a summer school offering in 2014. For details and enrolment information, please visit <http://mscp.org.au/courses/mscp-summer-school-2014>.

Kent Postgraduate Conference in Aesthetics
Kent, UK
25-26 January 2014

The aim of this conference is to provide a platform for postgraduate students and early career academics with an interest in aesthetics to present their research and share ideas. Drawing on the unique academic identity of the History and Philosophy of Art department at the University of Kent, there will be a special panel session held on the intersection of art history and philosophy of art. Confirmed keynote speakers include Bence Nanay (University of Antwerp, University of Cambridge) and Margaret Iversen (University of Essex). This conference is supported by the British Society of Aesthetics and the University of Kent and is organised in association with the Aesthetics Research Centre: see <http://www.aesthetics-research.org/>.

Visual Activism
San Francisco, California
14-16 March 2014

The International Association of Visual Culture (IAVC) presents its third conference. How can we better understand the relationships between visual culture and activist practices? There are ways in which art can take the form of political/social activism and there are also ways in which activism takes specific, and sometimes surprising, visual forms that are not always aligned with or recognizable by art-world frameworks. How can we engage in conversations about abstract or oblique visual activism, for instance as is demanded in conditions of extreme censorship? How can we approach the complexity of governmental or commercial ‘visual activism’ to better address hegemonies of visual culture (for example, in advertising and the mass media)? What becomes of the temporal lag that attends such images, when the politics of visual production are only made legible in retrospect, with historical distance? How does the past become a form of ‘visual activism’ in the present? To what degree do forms of visual activism travel, and in what ways are they necessarily grounded in locally specific knowledge and geographically specific spaces?

Please contact <edu@sfmoma.org> for more information.

Annual AAH Conference
London, England
10-12 April 2014

Session: Sense as a Ratio: Early Modern Proportional Analogies in Visual Art. This session addresses early modern uses of proportional analogies, theories and systems for representations of sensory information or ideas. With the rise in art treatises, along with technical assessments, of the body and its sensory judgments, there was a shift away from traditional Neo-Platonic and Neo-Pythagorean concepts of universal truth in quadrivium and humanistic studies. Increasing interests in the ‘beauty’ of phenomena or ideas (analogia, αναλογια) expanded the discourse on the predominantly sense-oriented beauty of proportio, symmetria, pulchritude, and harmonia. Often addressing the human condition, this period of work involved clever developments of visceral and intellectual contrasts, paradoxes, and concettismi. An opportunity to discuss this history of ideas, analogies and contrasts, this session considers differences between systematic and intuitive applications of proportional sensory content in visual art, with particular interest in correspondences between technical and demonstrative/suggestive aspects of an object. Generally at issue is the role of proportional methodologies for technical and sensory assessments of the human condition. Topics could cover, for example, approaches to proportional systems and analogies in landscape, figural arrangements, printmaking, still-lifes, grotesques, mechanical drawings, architectural representations, anatomical studies, visual rhetoric, botanical collections, natural philosophy, cabinets of curiosities, draughting mechanisms, art treatises, paint chemistry, pietra dura, intarsia, design, hybridity, rhythms, rilievo, colour theory, fragrance, taste, festivals, religious reform, European expansion, political discourses, etc.

The conference website is at <http://trac2014.org>, or contact Matthew Landrus (convenor) at <matthew.landrus@history.ox.ac.uk> for details.

Jaspers and Heidegger on the Art of Vincent Van Gogh
San Diego, California
14-19 April 2014

Papers in this conference compare Jaspers and Heidegger with respect to their analyses of Vincent van Gogh. Special priority is given to proposals pertaining to the “world” of the artist or his work.

For more information, contact David Nichols at <dpnichol@svsu.edu>.

Society for the Philosophic Study of the Contemporary Visual Arts
San Diego, California
16-20 April

The Society for the Philosophic Study of the Contemporary Visual Arts (SPSCVA) will hold a divisional meeting in conjunction with the Pacific Division Meeting of the American Philosophical Association. Please contact Richard Nunan (College of Charleston) at <nunanr@cofc.edu> for more information.
Film: Thinking Reality and Time through Film
Lisbon, Portugal
7-10 May 2014

During the last two decades film has been increasingly recognized as a medium of philosophical reflection, in an ontological and epistemological perspective. But what does it mean to understand film as philosophizing? Can we access specific, reliable knowledge of the world and our relation to it through the aesthetic form of moving images? Considering film’s claim of continuity with the world - what is the essence of film and what is exactly its connection with reality? Within the growing canon of the attempts to relate film and philosophy, we therefore invite reflection on reality and time by asking for the ontology and essence of film. In this context the double-questions of time and space, motion and matter, life and death, finitude and infinity, multiplicity and authenticity are proposed to be the centre of the conference themes. For information, please contact <filmtimereality@gmail.com> or visit the conference’s website at <https://sites.google.com/site/philosophy-andfilmlisbon2014>.

Culture, Values and Justice
University of Vaasa, Finland
21-23 May 2014

Subtopics: Ethnic identity and culture, Personal identity in society, Society, culture and consumption, Social identification, Dynamics of group culture, Ethnic boundaries, Constructing and deconstructing ethnic identity, Evolution of society, Encountering different cultures, Indian civilization and society, Cultural shock, Society and effect of colonization, Media and society, Morality and society, Taoist view on morality, Enlightened anarchy, Values in Confucius ethics, Perfectionist and situational ethics, Spirituality and modern age, Humanism and positivism, Reductionist approach to moral responsibility, Archaeological approaches to society, Asian society and culture, Globalization’s effects on culture and values, Hybrid cultural systems, Hybrid ethical theory, Cultural meaning, Secularization of religion, Culture and postmodernity, Buddhist ethics, Buddhism and philosophy of deconstruction, Culture and values of modernity, Cultural roots of environmental problems, Uneven income distribution as a social ethical issue, The point of view of justice, Core values, traditions and justice etc.

See <http://legacy.lclark.edu/~sipr/SIPR2.html> for further details. or contact Dr. Chandana Chakrabarti at <chandanachak@gmail.com>.

Critical Perspectives on Music, Education, and Religion
Helsinki, Finland
20-22 August 2014

In recent years, professional and academic discourses in Western music education have been increasingly secularized, distancing policies and practices from religion. A renewed consciousness of cultural diversity in music education, however, has revitalized discussion regarding the nexus of music, education and religion. The presence of religion in music education contexts is a situation fraught with political, cultural, social, legal, educational, aesthetic, ethical, and religious tensions. This conference will bring together scholars from different disciplines for a critical examination of these complex issues in both theory and practice.

For further information, please visit the website <http://sites.siba.fi/web/cpmr> or contact Alexis Kallio at <alexis.kallio@siba.fi>.

Active Aestheticians

ALESSANDRO GIOVANNELLI has edited Aesthetics: The Key Thinkers (London and New York: Continuum, 2012).

DAVID LAROCCA’S book Emerson’s English Traits and the Natural History of Metaphor has been published by Bloomsbury in paperback, hardback, and eBook.


ANNA CHRISTINA RIBEIRO is in a fellowship year at the National Humanities Center, working on a book on the philosophy of poetry. The book is tentatively titled A Philosophy of Poetry: New Thoughts on an Ancient Practice.


TOM WARTENBERG received the 2013 Merritt Prize for Distinguished Service to Philosophy of Education from the College of Education at Northern Illinois University. He will also be offering an NEH Summer Seminar for School Teachers on Existentialism in July 2014. Full-time graduate students who intend to pursue K-12 teaching are encouraged to apply. Details at <existentialismseminar.com>.

Send news of your significant scholarly and professional achievements to <goldblatt@denison.edu> or <henry.pratt@marist.edu>.

“In art, every new interpretation is a Copernican revolution, in the sense that each interpretation is a new work, even if the object differently interpreted remains, as the skies, invariant under transformation….One may be a realist about objects and an idealist about artworks: this is the germ of truth in saying without the artworld there is no art.”

--Arthur Danto, Transfiguration of the Commonplace