



THE AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR AESTHETICS:  
AN ASSOCIATION FOR AESTHETICS,  
CRITICISM, AND THEORY OF THE ARTS

VOLUME 39 NUMBER 1

SPRING 2019

- 1 *On Quality, Art Historically Considered*  
by Patricia Emison
- 5 *Memorial Notice: Anita Silvers*  
by Ásta Sveinsdóttir
- 6 News from the National Office
- 8 Conference Reports
- 8 Aesthetics News
- 10 JAAC Special Issue: CFP
- 14 Calls for Papers
- 15 Active Aestheticians

[aesthetics-online.org](http://aesthetics-online.org)

## *On Quality, Art Historically Considered*

Patricia Emison

University of New Hampshire

Judging contemporary art is a particularly tricky business. Ruskin, Diderot, and Goethe, all aesthetically aware men, were, however, particularly unreliable guides to the art of their own times. John Ruskin could unreservedly admire a meticulously illusionistic painting of a loyal dog. The sophisticated Denis Diderot was deeply touched by paintings of remorseful long-haired girls. Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, who opined that “visual art has the great advantage [over poetry] that it is objective and attracts us without exciting our feelings too violently,”<sup>1</sup> never really fathomed Romanticism in visual art. Their patterns of seeing remained distinctly literary, a bias that has long been ingrained in western criticism. As men of letters they either never fully learned to relish the pure sense of sight, or at least their acute verbal skill remained largely detached from the experience of looking at pictures. Even when Ruskin championed the work of Turner, he may have been admiring the artist more than the art, and within the oeuvre, he admired the more conservative work.

Nevertheless, Ruskin’s admiration for Tintoretto, Diderot’s for Barocci, and Goethe’s for Rogier van der Weyden (even if he thought he was looking at Jan van Eyck), remain persuasive and were not utterly commonplace opinions. In literature and music, too, time tends to sift out some of the chaff, to erase some of the favors worked by chance or idle fashion, the distortions of the period lens. In his 1528 book, *il Cortegiano*, Baldassare Castiglione already commented on how the passage of time serves to filter out poor judgment. He even suggests that the respect paid to the ancients is due to that very filtering process more than to the inherent excellence of ancient culture.

One of the pleasures of art history is discovering works which have long been overlooked, works worth special attention now even if they didn’t meet with particular acclaim in their own time or seal their bargain with posterity by operating as beacons for successive generations. They can be rescued now either by appearing unexpectedly to exemplify their time when we set about remolding our period concepts or, more intriguingly, by becoming visible to us as little islands of excellence off the mainland of period style, as verifications of how isolated individuals can accomplish extraordinary feats which their contemporaries fail to heed properly. Jean-Étienne Liotard belongs to his time without exemplifying it. Joseph Wright of Derby, Lorenzo Lotto, and Piero della Francesca likewise look more stellar now than they did to their contemporaries, and they do so because they have acquired legitimacy as outliers. On the other hand, many are the nameless craftsmen whose carvings and embroideries now look precious to our machine-age eyes, but were once taken utterly for granted as the chores expected of illiterate members of the working class. They made what was expected, and it has taken the passage of time for those old standards of expectation themselves to seem admirable. One of civilization’s best conversations is with its own past, registering the fading authority of what once seemed obviously deserving as well as the dawning prominence of what has long been slighted. Much of what is new lies in our varying approach to the past: the history of creativity teaches this lesson over and over.

In a kind of reverse-conservatism, the history of art has long tended to take the easy way out by acclaiming influential artists, rather than by grappling directly with the question of excellence. It seems that with fame as with wealth, unto him that hath shall be given: no one need be ashamed of admiring Raphael or Picasso. On the other hand, the task of judging quality in the history of art is shortchanged if we settle for counting influence as the only, or even the primary, measure of greatness. In politics such an approach might leave us admiring Napoleon, for instance. There has been some corrective in the form of a general search for works by female artists (almost all artists used to come from disadvantaged backgrounds). Sometimes this is complicated: Rachael Ruysch became wealthy by painting marvelous still lifes in the years directly after the aging Rembrandt had struggled in poverty. Now she is treated as an overlooked artist. Still, the question remains of assessing which works are the best in their respective categories, whether the category is determined by period or nationality, by genre or by the artist's gender, sexual orientation, or race, or alternatively, simply by medium. The whole category of 'art' is too vast for ranking to be meaningful.

The question of quality, complicated before the twentieth century, became a conundrum afterwards. As defining the very category of art became a battleground, questions of judging quality came to seem unanswerable, possibly irrelevant. One objective of many twentieth-century artists was to make works incommensurate with that of the Old Masters and their predecessors, a tendency sometimes glossed as a sort of neo-medievalism. Artists since the Renaissance deliberately strove to make commensurable works, to compete against the best previous works of art and to surpass them.

Picasso redefined the basic project of art while retaining the idea of genius as developed during Romanticism; Duchamp challenged even the idea of genius, substituting pure intellect. Now the art museum has become a primary field of competition for contemporary work. It sells to the ticket-buying public works whose significance often includes their unsuitability for the traditional art market. Yet even Banksy manages to make appearances at auctions. In general the value of contemporary art is assessed by the reputation of the artist, as measured by exhibitions, auction records, and prestigious grants and residencies. Instead of quality we speak of price or reputation (the mask behind which lies price). It is all a bit like real estate, where bathrooms and fireplaces are counted rather than design.

Over the centuries, our vocabulary has hemmed us in. Classical and anti-classical, Realist, Mannerist, and, within recent memory, absorptive—how unwieldy these verbal tools have proven! The complex stuff of creativity resists being neatly sorted. When we speak of the value of a work of art, how do we distinguish between current market value and something less tangible but arguably more reliable? We need a verbal nuance analogous to the *sapere/conoscere, wissen/kennen* distinction: real value/market value. But what is "real" value? It cannot be found in the estimate provided by the auction house. The "real" or inherent value, the excellence, the many-people-thick judgment of a work of art (of which Kenneth Clark used to speak) ought to supersede the vagaries of the market, as well as personal taste, popular taste, period taste, and cultural biases. The skeptic will tell us that no such purity of apprehension is achievable, that there is no metre to measure the visual power of works of art apart from the social, economic, or intellectual power of those who notice and praise the work. When we speak of some criterion other than our personal taste, it is merely this that we salute, or so the argument goes. Either we defer to authority and adhere to a community of taste, or we stick to what we know we like, even if we recognize that our personal preferences need have no validity for others. The compromise position is to accept popular taste and

tinge it with some slight personal twist—a practice most of us follow in our mass-market, off-the-rack clothing, and which is easily adapted for the museum-attendance which constitutes the standard vehicle for the expression of one's personal artistic taste. If we want to avoid herd behavior without turning our backs on sharing cultural values, a better strategy is needed.

Romantic artists first toyed with our expectation that art ought to be beautiful by making, on occasion, ghastly or sublime works. By then, 'beautiful' had become a limiting word. Chafing under the constraining goal of beauty produced wonders such as Delacroix's *Death of Sardanapolis* (1827), gloriously, ravishingly decadent and luxurious, though scarcely beautiful. Similarly, revulsion against the criterion of "valuable" eventually inspired the conceptual parts of twentieth-century art. If the mid-nineteenth century taught us not to expect art to be beautiful, and the twentieth to associate the experience of art with incongruousness rather than *concinntas*, or with quirkiness in place of genius, the twenty-first century has required us to ask about the value of art as a whole, rather than of particular artworks.

The meta-question of the value of art wasn't asked until art became, in many instances, unsaleable, deliberately beyond the clutches of commerce, and, with paradoxical concurrence, super-saleable, astronomical in cost. We have seen a room in lower Manhattan filled—rather marvelously, if temporarily—with dirt, and a single drawing sold for \$48 million. The Renaissance public was impressed with a colossal statue; we are impressed with colossal auction results. Yet our being impressed raises at the same time the suspicion that we are acting like the Dutch with their tulips, that we lie in the grip of a mania. When Pliny wrote about works that were beyond price, he could not have imagined anything like a price in excess of \$90 million dollars for a work by a living and, moreover, a prolific artist. That is the consequence of a socio-economic structure that is out of whack. The middle class disappeared as a political force at roughly the same time as it stopped supporting artists and switched to supporting museums, the clubs of the super-rich. Art reflects society, regardless of whether it also comments on it.

One way to evaluate the relative success of works of visual art is to compare them to what they were at least indirectly modeled on: historically speaking, to nature, poetry, or to music. The prolonged dominance of classicizing style can be explained by its appealing to all three criteria. The Greeks weren't bothered about issues of aesthetic judgment: proportionality and symmetry were the principles derived from the human body, understood as the essence of nature, which yielded harmony and completeness, or what the Romans would term *concinntas*. Music, poetry, visual art, and architecture were all compatible with the beauty of the human body which, at its most ideal, was divine, for the gods were simply taller and more beautiful. The column, in its various orders, abstractly represented the human body, male for Doric and female for Ionic and Corinthian. The proportions underlying musical tonality similarly accorded with the idea of a finite and regular cosmos. The Greeks already intuited, as Goethe would later claim, that architecture was frozen music. The stage was set for a society that valued art without requiring its creation by geniuses.

If the seeds of aesthetic debate were there, they lay in issues such as the degree of ornament suitable for a people who disdained Persian levels of opulence. Aristotle had already squelched Plato's attempt to raise qualms about imitations of imitations by asserting that to imitate was essential to being human. And centuries before that, the Greeks had earned the admiration of future generations for the unpretentious beauty of their functional pots, glorying in their shapes

no less than their decoration. The technical innovation of the potter's wheel had been put to judicious use.

Imitating nature—more precisely, the most beautiful aspects of nature—seemed for centuries to offer a permanent solution to the basic problem of art theory, until practice was sufficiently perfected that the theory buckled. When Leonardo, Raphael, and Michelangelo were working simultaneously, no one could say which artist's work was most like nature; each seemed astonishingly so, in its own way. And so the idea of artistic genius began to take form, reaching its apogee during Romanticism (an apogee that coincided with the theme of the artist as a figure of suicidal despair — as Oscar Wilde would have Basil declare in *The Picture of Dorian Gray*, "It is better not to be different from one's fellows. The ugly and the stupid have the best of it in this world. They can sit at their ease and gape at the play... we shall all suffer for what the gods have given us, suffer terribly."

The problem of individual style was born from success in imitating nature in the sixteenth century; mere technical prowess became a matter for disdain ever after, long before photography reduced the value of recording appearances. The artist became poet rather than craftsman, and poets are often melancholy. Craftsmen succeed, slowly and painstakingly; artists take risks and fail spectacularly. Their defeat became part of the story of creativity, particularly when the defeat was twisted into triumph by a subsequent generation's recognition that the failure was valiant and offered new possibilities. Rodin died in 1917; Henry Moore started studying art two years later. Both artists contributed to the process by which Michelangelo came to be revered as a figure who signified both defeat and triumph. The *Rondanini Pietà* on which he was working when he died, aged 89, was seen in the twentieth century as poignant, as re-defining the parameters of what could be considered as like the beautiful, its imperfection the apogee of a tormented genius's life.

Nineteenth-century realists used their perception of blemished nature as their norm, having been discouraged from their traditional rivalry with poetry, most notably by G.E. Lessing. In the sixteenth century, the artist's relationship to nature had been described like a goldsmith's to a gem, as the agent who framed nature flatteringly. Baroque artists raised questions about whether regularity was really the object of art at all. Modernists (Whistler, but more influentially Kandinsky) increasingly turned to music for a model. Tonality in music, as in painting, ultimately depended on sensory judgment rather than pure measurement. Aldous Huxley was prompted to think of music rather than the Bible when he looked at Piero della Francesca's *Resurrection* in 1925 and deemed it "the best picture in the world: It is as though Bach had written the 1812 Overture." Huxley supposed that artistic quality lay in genuineness, in the maker's honesty toward himself, and he mistrusted public opinion except as sifted over the long run.

One of the oldest and most recalcitrant confusions in evaluating art has to do with the inference that the art expresses the artist's self and therefore if we admire the art we must admire the artist (though the converse holds no water at all). Always a fallacy, it nevertheless cloaked a truth: namely, that it can be easier to form an opinion about excellence in art than it is in life. When we meet someone we seldom trust our first impressions, strong as they may be. We hold that first impression in escrow while we wait for more evidence. Even the clever among us can overlook the worthiness of people around us, who may only shine in extremity. But meeting a great work of art for the first time, under conditions that do not undermine concentration, is likely to elicit a respectful response. Although notbacked by experimental data, this premise neverthe-

less underlies our culture's devotion to fine art, i.e., the idea that fine art provides something deeply wide-ranging, deeply universal, provided that popular taste has not been utterly debased and that a basic open-mindedness prevails. Many aristocrats or well-born democrats of Enlightenment training have given generously to public collections in the belief that the art they loved would also benefit and be loved by their less-educated social underlings. Sometimes they stipulated free admission; they did not think of art as a leisure activity. In the words of Henry James in his essay, *The Art of Fiction*: "As people feel life, so they will feel the art that is most closely related to it." As in literature, sometimes with art. We may not all be in touch with reality, but we are all immersed in life. Like religion, art has been thought to reach across class lines, and indeed, to be justified partly because of that power. The problem is that works that are less than great may also elicit feelings of respect upon first meeting. That first reaction requires some tempering, whether by learning more about the work's art historical context or by letting gel some aggregate response from repeated viewings and by auxiliary viewers, a variety of people, spanning more than any one time and place. Fashions come and go, popular opinion may decry what later seems to have been worth revering; it takes more than one set of aesthetic approvals to validate excellence. Even dismissal of a work of art is more reliable if it is a judgment that can be repeated, both by ourselves and others. In this, art is like experimental science; the results should be repeatable.

We need to retain some doubt, some degree of discretion, about excellence only recently apprehended. That first flush of aesthetic enthusiasm has value, more so if the viewer has wide experience of looking at art. But even then it is a beginning rather than an end to the assessment of real value. The greatness of a work of art is paradoxically both obvious and easy to be mistaken about. No one should spend \$90 million dollars on a work of contemporary art, or \$450 million dollars on a work only recently hailed as important. As a child, my daughter had a strong preference for portraits that included small white dogs, and adults can be equally over-enthusiastic and in need of a cooling-down time. Although we are unlikely to fail to admire a great work of art to which we give our attention, we are likely to admire at first blush works that won't wear well. It takes time to be sure.

Not every significant work will affect every viewer, but the works of what we might call mighty or even majestic achievement will tend to command admiration from a great variety of viewers—whether chronologically, ethnically, or geopolitically various. One reason it is easier to recognize excellence in art is precisely because we do have the opportunity to expose the work to differing viewers, to read what people long dead had to say, whereas we often have to make up our minds about people much more abruptly—as is also the case with contemporary art. In both cases we have no more than a lifetime and often considerably less. The otium prized in antiquity is related to the breathing time we need for aesthetic judgment; Kant's theory of disinterest similarly implies a certain unrushed quality to the thought associated with judging works of art. Aesthetic judgment, being a kind of judgment that operates somewhere in the lee behind language, is particularly strained in a culture that never has the time to value time.

Does the work help us to think more clearly or more generously, or with more compassion and less sentimentality? Does it do so by freeing our minds rather than restricting them? Therein lies the value, rather than on the auction block. During the Middle Ages, art was treasure and was supposed to gleam; now our art need not gleam (popular as Anish Kapoor's *Cloud Gate* is), but it should offer serious play for adults. As in the case of children and their toys, the slight-

est materials can yield most impressive results; complex works constructed by teams of laborers can be stiflingly overbearing. Whether the work does free our minds will depend in part on the significance assigned to it by the viewer. Because they were allied with various smallmindednesses which once passed for truth, some works lose value as the decades and centuries pass. Our history is littered with these. We need, both individually and collectively, to give ourselves time to become tired of a work, and then ask ourselves whether that tiredness derives from our own limitations, the work's, or possibly from the bloodletting of aesthetic experience in the modern world caused by reproductions. Josiah Wedgwood's mass-reproduced *Am I not a man and a brother?* medallion, praised for its political efficacy by Benjamin Franklin, was admirable when made and continues to be an image that evokes sympathy and sorrow—perhaps slightly complicated by the supplicant pose of the chained man. We would make it differently today, but it is those very differences that make history palpable to us. Although judgments about the quality of a work of art may prove mercurial, the work itself persists and its real value does too, if only we can manage to ascertain it. Some works of art offer as close as we can get to a steady beacon of something that is like our best experiences of nature, call it beauty or pure beingness; it is something that makes us content with our existence.

The value of a work lies in its shared intensity and its profundity. When the Ghost intones to Hamlet, "I could a tale unfold whose lightest word/Would harrow up thy soul, freeze thy young blood,/ Make thy two eyes like stars start from their spheres....," he speaks to his son, to the theater audience, and to myriad future audiences and readers. He speaks to us all concerning the horrors we imagine lie ahead as we head toward death. The commonality of the experience correlated with the singularity of the stimulus makes for artistic excellence. An excellent work of art unites us as humans and makes us aware of our individuality, both; it helps us to feel kinship with the past and with the future, both, rather than marooned on the island of the present. A good critic is not one with better taste, but one whose balance of the communal to the personal is tipped slightly in favor of the communal, so that many people can agree with what that critic sees, and yet still see for themselves. A collector is one whose bent is in the opposite direction, stronger on the personal component. And a connoisseur is anyone who has a zeal for attentive looking. As another might have a sensitivity to words, so the connoisseur relishes and analyzes images. And what verbal memory is to the person of letters, so is visual memory to the connoisseur—necessary but not sufficient. The zest is primary.

Alberti analyzed a painting in terms of the drawn outline, the overall arrangement of parts or composition, and the reception of light, i.e., formally. William Morris thought mostly about the quality of life the maker had while working, i.e., efficiently. Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer argued, materially, that our post-War culture was warped by the intervention of mass media. Already, though, Aristotle had understood that sharing deeply-felt emotion with a community of others was a basic human desideratum, and that doing so together, including under artificial or virtual conditions, was purifying.

Ever since we defined an artist as someone who works outside of norms, i.e., since Michelangelo, it has been difficult to agree on how to judge works of art. For centuries, academies of art held Raphael up as the paragon rather than Michelangelo, precisely because Raphael's art told expressive stories according to widely recognized narrative criteria (e.g., variety, decorousness, naturalism, beauty, clarity). He satisfied critics of a literary bent. Didn't they try to improve their style as Raphael had his, by studying the best preceding works and assimilating lessons from those examples? When

Joshua Reynolds announced his preference for Michelangelo, and Beethoven became the contemporary model of artistic genius, wildness became the new norm; we might even say anormality became the new norm. The cult of the avant-garde had its origins there, and it ended in the '60s, by which time the Establishment didn't command enough respect to make defying it worthwhile.

Popular theory now tells us that artists succeed when they develop a style to express their unique selves. Yet self often seems to morph into a shared identity, and pursuing one's own style can become a species of conformity over time. We grant celebrity status to just a few artists and then expect that they perform consistently, according to their branding. We then spread their works widely and thinly with the help of giclées and jpegs. The descendants of Pop Art supply our taste for conformity, an opposite to the sentimentality of the basically Romantic notion of autographic self-expression. We are trying both to have our cake and eat it. The mass media conditions a mass public to accept what the public institutions provide, and then measures in unassailable statistics the reactions of that public. This turns the art world into what is effectively a corporation, selling us a product approved by its board of trustees, themselves no doubt elite collectors.

We have made artists into the saints of secularism, and their works serve as relics. The point, however, is not to worship, nor to feel awe at prices, but thoroughly to feel (this may include laughter, of the wild kind). We must have emotions, not mere sniggers or adulation. We must have art that we don't merely walk by as the public files past the bier of an admired ruler, for the sake of having been there; an art before which we commune like Quakers, after which we are different, having been for a brief respite outside of our own little minds with their tried and true synapse habits.

The ultimate test of a good art is the people who have benefitted from living with it, and given the state of our society, we might well wonder whether we are not now badly in need of a better art tonic. Works of art, old and new, act as our spiritual parents and although our faults cannot all be laid at their feet, some of our dignity, as well as some of our modesty (provided we have either), can probably depend on our having some sense about art. We shape the world of art in which we live and it, in turn, molds us. The art need not be itself idealizing for its effect on us to be salubrious; merely reaching outside of ourselves in trying to grasp what works of art offer (for they should be challenging even if they are not meant to be confrontational) is to achieve a kind of ideal—the ideal of superseding one's own personal and cultural limitations.

If we succeed in adopting suitable art-parents, we can, like Socrates pursuing Beauty and Truth, recognize the result in our happiness. For good art has the potential to make us better people—more curious, thoughtful, observant, imaginative, knowledgeable, more conscious of our own limitations, or simply happier to be human. Judging art objectively requires not a set of rules but considerable forbearance. It requires exploring outside of our sticky selves, beyond the web of habitude. It is vital that we do so. Like nature, art now crucially needs our help.

© Patricia Emison 2019

---

1 Goethe on Art, ed. John Gage (Berkeley, 1980), 74, letter of 1827.

# Memorial Notice: Anita Silvers (1940-2019)

Ásta Sveinsdóttir

San Francisco State University



*Photo Courtesy of Department of Philosophy,  
San Francisco State University*

Professor Anita Silvers was an institution in professional philosophy. She was Professor and former Chair of the Philosophy Department at San Francisco State University and a nationally recognized advocate for disability rights. Disabled by polio as a child, Silvers was a leading advocate for equality for persons with disabilities. On the faculty at SF State since 1967, Silvers worked to make access and disability services available on California college campuses. In 1980, she was appointed by President Jimmy Carter to serve on the National Council on the Humanities, the governing board of the National Endowment for the Humanities.

She served for 26 years as Secretary-Treasurer of the American Philosophical Association (Pacific Division). Silvers received the inaugural California Faculty Association Human Rights Award in 1989 and served as a Senior Fulbright Scholar in New Zealand in 2005. In 2009 she was awarded the Quinn Prize for service to the profession by the APA, in 2013 the Lebowitz Prize for Philosophical Achievement and Contribution by Phi Beta Kappa and the APA, and in 2017 she received the Wang Family Excellence Award for extraordinary achievements in the California State University system.

Silvers's groundbreaking scholarship helped to establish disability rights as an important subfield of philosophy; she is regarded as an authority on medical ethics, bioethics, disability theory, social philosophy, aesthetics, and feminism. As a teacher and mentor she changed the lives of countless students, scholars, and activists. She will be deeply missed by her students, colleagues, and the many people she inspired. A memorial will be announced at a later date.

The ASA Newsletter welcomes memorial statements from members for publication in the August 2019 issue. These should be submitted no later than August 1.

## Planning Ahead? ASA Meetings and Co-Sponsored Conferences

### *ASA Divisional Meetings*

ASA Rocky Mountain Division: Drury Plaza  
Hotel, Santa Fe, NM, July 12-14, 2019; July 10-12,  
2020

ASA Pacific Division: Berkeley City Club,  
Berkeley, CA, March 20-21, 2020

ASA Eastern Division: Courtyard Marriott,  
Philadelphia, PA, April 17-18, 2020

### *ASA Annual Meetings*

2019: Sheraton Grand, Phoenix, AZ, October 9-12,  
2019

2020: Hilton Crystal City, Washington, DC,  
November 11-14, 2020

2021: Hyatt Regency, Montreal, November 17-20,  
2021

2022: Embassy Suites by Hilton, Portland, OR,  
November 16-19, 2022

### *ASA Co-Sponsored Conferences and Workshops* *All are free and open to the public*

Salish Sea Aesthetics Workshop: Vancouver, BC,  
May 10-11, 2019

Aesthetic Normativity Workshop: Cambridge,  
MA, May 10-11, 2019

Southern Aesthetics Workshop: Auburn, AL,  
August 30-31, 2019

Conference on Food, Art, and Philosophy: Mexico  
City, October 3-4, 2019

For the complete schedule and more information  
for all ASA Meetings and co-sponsored confer-  
ences, see the ASA website. At the bottom of each  
page, look for 'meetings' and click 'more'.

# News from the National Office

2019 is off to a great start for the American Society for Aesthetics. We are seeing continued strength in our four annual and divisional meetings, membership, grant-funded activities, and outreach to other organizations with shared interests.

**Divisional meetings:** All three divisional meetings continue to grow and thrive. They are a great opportunity for ASA members to present their work and receive feedback at locations that are often closer and more economical than the fall annual meeting.

*Pacific* held their first meeting at the Berkeley City Club, a beautiful historic property designed by Julia Morgan, who also designed Asilomar, the former meeting location. Participants were nearly unanimous in praising the facility and asking that we meet there again. Meeting rooms have been booked for March 20-21, 2020, dates the participants thought were best for them. We hope to draw excellent attendance again next year, especially from the many students and junior scholars who hadn't previously attended the meetings in Asilomar. Elisabeth Camp (Rutgers) was the keynote speaker; *Pacific* was able to share expenses for her visit with Berkeley's Philosophy Department, where she also spoke. We hope this kind of arrangement can be worked out for 2020 to help cover costs. Many thanks to Tony Cross and Shelby Moser for a great job organizing the 2019 meeting. We are grateful that Emine Hande Tuna and Shelby will be organizing the 2020 meeting.

*Eastern* met again at the Courtyard Marriott in Philadelphia. Submissions surged to an all-time high and only 50% of the papers could be accepted. At the 2018 meeting, participants agreed that registration fees needed to go up a bit to cover costs, but that did not seem to hurt attendance. Amie Thomasson (Dartmouth) was the keynote speaker. Our thanks to John Dyck, Laura Di Summa, and Michel Xhignesse, with help from David Clowney, for organizing the 2019 meeting. We are grateful that Javier Lavin-Gomez will join Laura and Michel in organizing the 2020 meeting. Thanks also to the Barnes Foundation for once again hosting the Friday night Monroe Beardsley lecture sponsored by Temple University.

*Rocky Mountain* is planning for another successful meeting in Santa Fe, NM, in July.

Dom Lopes (UBC) and artist Pamela Knoll will be the keynoters. We expect to post the preliminary schedule on the website soon. RMD organizers for this meeting: Sheryl Tuttle Ross, Julianne Chung, Jeremy Killian, and Arthur Stewart, with help from James Mock.

**Southern Division?** A group of active ASA members is sponsoring a Southern Aesthetics Workshop August 30-31, 2019, with help from an ASA grant. They will explore whether a separate Southern Division is viable. Approval from the Board of Trustees would be required to establish a new Division.

We do note a very unfortunate trend in recent years in the volunteer organizers for the meetings, especially at Eastern and Pacific. This task has been falling on doctoral students and very junior faculty members, instead of the mid-career faculty who could better absorb these responsibilities. If you've attended these meetings regularly in the past and have not yet volunteered to help organize them, please step forward to pitch in. I organized the 1999 Pacific meeting at Asilomar, so I am well aware of all the work that goes into this. All three divisions now use teams of two-four members to do the hard work of organizing, so the responsibilities no longer fall on one person. I also try to help the divisions, including the web site for their meetings and all financial and legal matters. We manage their budgets so the travel of organizers can be at least partially reimbursed from meeting revenues if their home institution isn't covering travel. If all the mid- and later-career members who have never organized a divisional meeting would step forward to volunteer, it would be a huge help to everyone.

**Membership:** We are very pleased that membership has increased by 50% in the past four years and we'd like to keep growing. As our membership year is the calendar year, December 31 is our "high-water mark." We ended 2018 with 656 members, the highest number since 2010. Although records indicate that we had 1042 members in 1999, the world has changed considerably since then. Most members have ready access to JAAC at their University on-line databases, even though there is a one-year delay with JStor. Almost everybody uses the Internet, e-mail, and cell phones enabling easy communication about work in aesthetics without joining ASA and attending our meetings. The job market has been tough since the 1970s, and the trends against aesthetics have accelerated. We also are seeing rapid growth in online degrees from accredited universities, which is challenging traditional educational institutions even more. We continue

to be very distressed that this online growth rarely includes coursework in aesthetics and hope our members find ways to address this serious gap. We continue to look for ways to make ASA membership attractive to the increasingly fragmented world of academics, artists, and art lovers, and always welcome your ideas.

A very unscientific survey is on the ASA web page to determine why people are currently members of ASA. Here's what you've told us so far about why you are an ASA member:

1. Eligibility for presentations at the ASA Annual Meeting: 80%
2. Subscription to the Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism: 73%
3. Professional support for the specialty of aesthetics: 60%
4. Eligibility for ASA Prizes and Fellowships: 53%
5. Eligibility for presentations at the ASA Divisional Meetings: 47%
6. Eligibility for application for an ASA grant: 27%
7. Subscription to the ASA Newsletter: 13%
8. Eligibility to vote on ASA Officers and Trustees: 13%
9. Eligibility for serving as an officer, trustee, or editor of the ASA: 7%
10. Discounts for books and journals at Oxford University Press: 7%

If you would like to take the survey:  
<[https://aesthetics-online.org/surveys/Default.asp?id=Aesthetics\\_Priorities](https://aesthetics-online.org/surveys/Default.asp?id=Aesthetics_Priorities)>

**Outreach to other organizations:** We continue to seek connections with other organizations with shared interests.

*American Philosophical Association:* For many years, ASA has sponsored a society meeting at each of the three divisional meetings. Thanks to David Friedell (Eastern), Tim Gould (Central), and Jonathan Weinberg (Pacific) for their work in 2019. David and Jonathan will be organizing sessions again in 2020. Sandy Shapshay will take over organizing duties for Central for 2020.

*College Art Association:* ASA has been an affiliate member of CAA for many years and has occasionally submitted news items for their newsletter. In 2019, for the first time, we took advantage of a membership perk, namely, a guaranteed 90-minute session on the CAA Annual Meeting program in New York. Thanks to Andrea Baldini for organizing this. (Details on the session were included in the December 2018 ASA Newsletter.) Andrea also has organized a session on "Embodied Beauties: The Politics and Aesthetics of the

Moving Body" for the 2020 CAA meeting in Chicago, with Aili Bresnahan, Eva Man, and Peg Brand Weiser. If you are interested in working with him for the 2021 meeting in New York, please let him know. <baldini\_and@hotmail.com>

*American Musicological Society:* Eligibility for the Peter Kivy Prize does not require membership in ASA and we hope we will attract submissions from a broad range of scholars. We have worked with the leadership of the AMS and related organizations to publicize the prize with their membership. Although the AMS meets in the fall, our conversations with the AMS leadership led all of us to conclude that a joint meeting was not feasible.

*North American Kant Society:* We awarded a grant to the NAMS to hold an aesthetics day at their 2020 conference and hope this will encourage more interaction between aestheticians and other Kant scholars.

*Dance Studies Association:* We have had preliminary conversations with the DSA leadership about an aesthetics day at their annual meeting in 2021 at Rutgers.

Your ideas for additional collaborations are always welcome. We are eager to show other organizations what aesthetics has to offer.

**Annual Meeting - Separation of Powers:** I want to clarify apparent misunderstandings about the relationship between the Program Committee for our annual meeting and the Officers and Board of Trustees. Each summer the Board invites someone to be the program chair of the annual meeting two years hence. So, in summer 2019, the Board will be inviting someone to be the program chair for the 2021 Annual Meeting in Montreal. The program committee is selected by the program chair, with very few restrictions from the Board on that membership. All must be current members of the ASA. No members of the Board should be invited to the program committee except under extraordinary circumstances when needed expertise cannot be found elsewhere in the ASA membership. The trustees, as well as the leadership of the Feminist Caucus and the Diversity Committee, are encouraged to make suggestions for committee membership to the program chair. The chair is provided with a 10-year history of the program committee chairs and membership to encourage broad involvement of the ASA membership. Because of the obvious conflict of interest, members of the program committee may not submit papers, but may chair sessions and in some cases organize panels. As most are then unable to get travel money from their home institutions, ASA

(since 2014) helps subsidize their travel to the meeting.

The Board also has set requirements for participation on the program. Everyone (including paper presenters, panelists, commentators, and chairs) must be a member of ASA and must register for the meeting. These are long-standing policies and are the same as those of the APA and most other members of the American Council of Learned Societies. In 2016 we instituted a system that encourages newcomers to submit papers. Specifically, non-members are encouraged to submit their work for review, but once notified that their paper has been accepted, they must join within 30 days or be replaced on the program. This is a much more lenient policy than APA, which requires APA membership when a paper is submitted. The same 30-day rule applies to panelists, commentators, and chairs who accept a place on the program. We do make exceptions for hardship situations on a case-by-case basis. ASA also pays the annual licensing fee for an on-line submission system called Submittable, which we began using in 2018 at the request of the program chair for that meeting. This system provides for anonymous review by the committee, so the only person who knows the identities of submitters is the program chair.

The Officers and Board play no role whatsoever in the actual selection of papers or panels for the program. We know nothing about the selections until they have been made. We never dictate to the program committee that they must accept papers from certain people or on certain topics. We know nothing about who has even submitted while the process is on-going. The Secretary-Treasurer does gather data on ASA membership once the program committee has completed its work, mainly to measure the impact of the 30-day rule, but nothing more.

Under the policy adopted by the board in 2018, unexcused cancellations under certain circumstances can result in being barred from the program the following year. If this occurs, the next program chair is notified. Also, under the new policy on Harassment, Discrimination, and Respectful Behavior (adopted July 23, 2018), it is possible that a remedy could result from the review process that someone should be barred from the program in the future. But no particular remedy is automatic under the current policy, nor the proposed revisions to the policy (which have been distributed to the ASA membership for comment).

All of these measures mean that getting a paper selected for the program is academi-

cally significant, which can be very important for junior faculty seeking retention, promotion or tenure. The selection is based, to the maximum extent possible, on anonymous review by the program committee. We have all heard of meetings of some groups where political or personal connections put someone on a program, regardless of merit, which detracts from the significance of being selected. We also know of meetings where close to 100% of the submissions are accepted, because they need the registration money. We typically accept about 50% of submissions.

Finally, here is some clarification on travel awards and prizes. For full-time students whose paper or panel presentation is selected for the annual meeting, a travel grant of \$1250 is automatic. We have no upper-limit on the number of these student awards. For the six Irene H. Chayes Travel grants for the annual meeting, the Board of Trustees set the main eligibility rule limiting these to people with no institutional access to travel funds. The program committee awards the grants from those eligible with papers or panel presentations selected for the program. If there are more than six, then the program committee makes the final decision based on merit, programmatic, and diversity priorities. The Outstanding Student Prize (\$250 plus travel) is selected by the program committee. The Irene H. Chayes New Voices Award (\$1000 prize plus travel) is selected jointly by the program chair and the chair of the diversity committee, with up to two Awards each year. For all of these awards, the papers first are reviewed anonymously by the program committee along with all the other submissions; they are not told anything about status as a student or as someone eligible for one of these travel grants.

For the divisional meetings, each division receives \$1000 a year for Irene H. Chayes Travel grants. The organizing committee for each division decides how to award the sum to individuals presenting work on the program. As with the annual meeting, these are restricted to people with no other institutional access to travel funds.

If anyone has additional questions about our review process or suggestions for further improvements, please contact <secretary-treasurer@aesthetics-online.org>.

Julie Van Camp  
Secretary-Treasurer & Executive Director  
American Society for Aesthetics  
1550 Larimer St. #644  
Denver, CO 80202-1602  
<secretary-treasurer@aesthetics-online.org>  
website: <www.aesthetics-online.org>

# Conference Reports

## ASA at the College Art Association Meeting

This year, for the first time, the College Art Association Meeting included an ASA-sponsored panel in its program. Organized by Prof. Andrea Baldini, the panel was entitled "Thou Shalt Not Copy – Or Should You? Copyright and Its Enemies in Contemporary Visual Arts." The panel attracted much attention among CAA attendees. More than forty people attended the presentations of the ASA members involved in the program, which included Prof. Gianmaria Ajani, Dr. Angela Condello, Prof. Maurizio Ferraris, Dr. Darren Hudson Hick, and Prof. Brian Soucek. Prof. Tiziana Andina chaired the session, which was enriched by a lively conversation with the audience. The positive response the panel received indicates that those outside of philosophy recognize aesthetics' significant contributions to discussions about the arts.

As an Affiliate member of the CAA, ASA is entitled to a 90-minute session at each annual meeting. Persons interested in joining me in organizing a session for the 2020 meeting in Chicago or the 2021 in New York City meeting are encouraged to contact Andrea Baldini at <andrea.baldini@nju.edu.cn>.

## Aesthetics News

### ASA Announces new Vice-President and Trustees

The American Society for Aesthetics is pleased to announce the election of a new Vice-President, **David Davies**. He assumed office on February 1, 2019, and will become the ASA President for a two-year term on February 1, 2021. The ASA also is pleased to announce the election of two new trustees, **Keren Gorodeisky** and **Monique Roelofs**. They assumed office on February 1, 2019, and will serve three-year terms through January 31, 2022.

#### New Vice-President

**David Davies** is Professor (and former Chair) of Philosophy at McGill University, and a Fellow of the Royal Society of Canada. He is the author of *Art as Performance* (2004), *Aesthetics and Literature* (2007), and *Philosophy of the Performing Arts* (2011),

edited *The Thin Red Line* (2008), and co-edited *Blade Runner* (2015). He has published on a wide range of metaphysical and epistemological issues concerning the arts, on issues relating specifically to film, photography, literature, music, theatre, dance, and visual art, and on general philosophical issues in metaphysics, mind, and language (please see 'Research cv' at <www.mcgill.ca/philosophy/david-davies>). He has participated annually at the ASA General meetings since 2002, serving twice on the Programme Committee (2006, 2013), and regularly attends the Pacific Division meetings (Programme Chair, 2010). An ASA Trustee from 2009-12, he has been a BSA Trustee since 2013, and was co-Programme Chair for the 2016/17 BSA meetings. He also founded and organizes the annual Dubrovnik Conference on the Philosophy of Art.

#### New Trustees

**Keren Gorodeisky** is an Associate Professor at Auburn University. Her work on Kant, aesthetic pleasure, aesthetic value, aesthetic rationality and romantic aesthetics has been published in the *Journal of Philosophy*, *BJA*, *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* and others. Gorodeisky was the 2012-13 Philip Quinn Fellow at the National Humanities Center, and a participant at the ASA-UBC 2018 Summer Seminar, "Beauty and Why it Matters." Gorodeisky has been attending the annual meeting of the ASA regularly since 2007, and has served on the program committee of this meeting in 2012 and 2014. She organized conferences on Aristotle and Kant and on Moral and Aesthetic Testimony. Gorodeisky is a regular reviewer of papers in aesthetics for both specialized and general journals, and is currently serving as the vice-president of the Society for German Idealism and Romanticism.

**Monique Roelofs** is Professor of Philosophy at Hampshire College, where she teaches aesthetics and feminist, critical race, post-colonial, and political theory. Her book *The Cultural Promise of the Aesthetic* was published in 2014. Her articles have appeared in journals such as *Hypatia*, *Confluencia*, *differences*, *M/m-Print-Plus-Platform*, and *Texte zur Kunst*, and anthologies such as *The Routledge Companion to the Philosophy of Race* (2018). She recently completed two new book manuscripts, titled "Arts of Address: How We Relate to Language, People, Things, and Places" and "Aesthetics, Address, and the Making of Culture." The guest editor of *Aesthetics and Race*, a special volume of *Contemporary Aesthetics* (2009), she currently is coauthoring a book on aesthetics and temporality in Latin America.

A recipient of a curriculum diversification grant (2015) and co-organizer of a symposium on Black Aesthetics (2017), she has served on several ASA committees, including the diversity committee (2009-2013) and three program committees.

We are very grateful for the service of two trustees, Eva Kit Wah Man and Katherine Thomson-Jones, who completed their terms on January 31, 2019. We are also grateful for the six years of service of Cynthia Freeland, who steps down as Past President.

In December 2019, the ASA will elect three new trustees. Persons interested in standing for election next year should contact the <secretary-treasurer@aesthetics-online.org> In the summer of 2019, the Board of Trustees will assemble a slate of six nominees for these positions. The three trustees elected will serve for three-year terms (February 1, 2020 – January 31, 2023). The bios of all six nominees will be available in the December 2019 ASA Newsletter.

Additional nominations can be made by any eight members of the Society. All such additional nominations, with the signatures of eight supporting members, must be filed with the Secretary-Treasurer no later than the two weeks following the annual meeting (October 26, 2019). These can be sent by e-mail (<secretary-treasurer@aesthetics-online.org>) or through the US Mail (American Society for Aesthetics, 1550 Larimer Street #644, Denver, CO 80202-1602), or delivered in person to the Secretary-Treasurer at the Phoenix annual meeting in October.

Voting will be conducted on the ASA web site from December 1-31, 2019, with an announcement in early January. All members of ASA in 2019 will be eligible to vote.

### John Fisher Memorial Prize Winner

The winner of the John Fisher Memorial Prize for 2019 is Dr. Nemesio García-Carril Puy, Department of Philosophy, Granada University, Spain, for his paper entitled "The Ontology of Musical Versions: Introducing the Hypothesis of Nested Types."

Dr. Puy will present the paper at the ASA Annual Meeting in Phoenix October 9-12. His paper will later be published in the *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*.

The Fisher prize, awarded in alternate years to an original essay in aesthetics, was created in memory of the late John Fisher, editor of *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*

from 1973 to 1988. The Prize is offered to foster the development of new voices and talent in the field of aesthetics.

The next Fisher Prize will be awarded in 2021. The deadline for submission is January 15, 2021. Guidelines are posted at the American Society for Aesthetics website.

### **Moonyoung Song named first ASA Post-Doctoral Fellow**

The American Society for Aesthetics announces that Moonyoung Song is the first-ever ASA Postdoctoral Fellow. Song, who received her Ph.D. in Philosophy from the University of Maryland, will be in residence at the University of Michigan, working with Professor Peter Railton.

Dr. Song's project on artistic explanation connects a key topic in aesthetics—artistic value—to research in other areas of philosophy, especially philosophy of science and metaethics. Her doctoral dissertation, *Art, Fiction, and Explanation*, was directed by Jerrold Levinson. Her article on "The Notion of the Interaction between Moral and Artistic Value" was published in the *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 76 (3): 285-295 (2018). Song received her B.A. and M.A. in Aesthetics from Seoul National University.

She was selected from thirteen applications for the fellowship by the Postdoctoral Fellowships Committee, consisting of five senior members of the American Society for Aesthetics. The two-year fellowship, tenable at any doctoral-level philosophy department in the United States, was established to free a promising early career scholar to dedicate time to intensive research in aesthetics and to cultivate connections to philosophical research outside the field. The stipend is \$50,000 per year. In addition, up to \$10,000 has been allocated for reimbursement of medical insurance, relocation expenses, and/or travel to professional meetings to present work in aesthetics. The recipient of the fellowship may teach one or two classes for the host institution per year, but no more than one class per term (quarter or semester). The second year of funding is subject to adequate progress, as determined by the Postdoctoral Fellowships Committee. The goals of the fellowship are to connect research in aesthetics to research outside the field, broaden the applicant's expertise and the audience for their work, and enrich the host department by bringing aesthetics into the philosophical discussion. Applicants were asked to include a plan for working with a host faculty member who

does not have aesthetics/philosophy of art as a current area of specialization in a strong research-oriented department selected by the applicant.

### **Kathryn Wojtkiewicz wins the ASA Dissertation Fellowship for 2019-20**

The American Society for Aesthetics is pleased to announce that Kathryn Wojtkiewicz (City University of New York-Graduate Center) has won the ASA Dissertation Fellowship for 2019-20. She was selected from among seven applicants by a review committee of senior ASA members. Her dissertation, "The Social Responsibility of Creation: Fiction Creators and their Hermeneutical Responsibilities," explores the ways in which narrative fiction is well-placed to combat and deconstruct harmful stereotypes, whether by gender, race, sexuality, religion, and so on. She aims to develop a positive ethical idea of creative responsibility connected to both aesthetics and virtue theory. Wojtkiewicz received her B.A. from Manhattan College.

This is the fifth year for the ASA Dissertation Fellowship. The previous winners were:

2018-19: Caitlin Dolan, University of California, Berkeley  
2017-18: Madeleine Ransom, University of British Columbia  
2016-17: Marilyn Johnson, Graduate Center, City University of New York  
2015-16: David Johnson, Northwestern University

The deadline for application for the 2020-2021 fellowship will be January 1, 2020. Guidelines are on the ASA website: News > Grants and Prizes > Dissertation Fellowships

### **Salish Sea Aesthetics Workshop**

University of British Columbia  
Vancouver, BC  
May 10-11, 2019

You are cordially invited to attend the Salish Sea Aesthetics Workshop, which will be held at the University of British Columbia from May 10-11, 2019. The aim of the workshop is to connect scholars working in aesthetics, art history, and the philosophy of art in the Salish Sea region. Anyone is welcome to attend, and attendance is free.

Ten participants will present their papers, followed by a keynote address by Haida artist Michael Nicoll Yahgulanaas, titled *The*

*Seriousness of Play*. Yahgulanaas is a contemporary artist whose wide-ranging artistic practice explores themes of identity, environmentalism and the human condition. Influenced by both Haida iconography and contemporary Asian visual culture, he has created an artistic practice that crosses diverse cultures, generations, and disciplines in search of accessibility and engagement as a counterpoint to stratification and isolation

All are welcome to attend, and attendance is free. If you'd like to attend, please contact David Friedell, Ian Heckman, and Michel-Antoine Xhignesse at <SalishSeaAesthetics@gmail.com>.

### **Harvard-NYU Aesthetic Normativity Workshop**

Harvard University  
Cambridge, Massachusetts  
May 10-11, 2019

Our goal at this workshop is to explore the different normative dimensions of the aesthetic domain. We will discuss questions, like:

- What sort of norms, if any, does the aesthetic domain involve? Are these norms obligations, duties, or norms of some other sort?
- What are aesthetic norms directed toward? Toward the object? Toward oneself? Toward others?
- What is the source of aesthetic normativity? Pleasure? Morality? Cognition? Community? Culture?
- How does aesthetic normativity relate to cognitive or moral normativity?
- How should we understand the relationship between aesthetic normativity and aesthetic value?
- How should we understand the relationship between aesthetic norms and aesthetic reasons?
- What is the nature of the normativity involved in artistic creation? How, if at all, does this intersect with that of aesthetic appreciation?

Participants include:

Caitlin Dolan (UC Berkeley), Hannah Ginsborg (UC Berkeley), Robert Hopkins (NYU), Jenny Judge (NYU), Erin Kelly (Tufts), Alex King (SUNY Buffalo), Robbie Kubala (Columbia), Errol Lord (University of Pennsylvania), Samantha Matherne (Harvard), Alva Noë (UC Berkeley), Antonia Peacocke (NYU), Nick Riddle (University of San Diego), Rebecca Rothfeld (Harvard), Francey Russell (Yale), Nico Sillins (Cornell), Brad Skow (MIT), Brian Soucek (UC Davis)

## Stand-Up Comedy and Philosophy:

A Special Issue of *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*  
(Publication date: November 2020)

Guest Editor: Sheila Lintott

Deadline: November 15, 2019

Submissions on any philosophical topics or themes related to stand-up comedy are welcome, including, but not limited to:

- Stand-up comedy's relations to other arts (e.g., to other performing arts such as music and dance, to other comedic arts such as sketch comedy and improv, to other text-based arts such as poetry and storytelling)
- How stand-up comedy confronts cultural issues and anxieties
- Analyses of joke-structure and style
- Stand-up and emotion, including self-conscious emotions (e.g., shame, guilt, pride)
- Stand-up and audience reception theory
- Public persona and comic identity
- Stand-up and identity (e.g., race, gender, ability, age, class)
- Stand-up comedy, political correctness, offensiveness, and freedom of speech
- Truth and authenticity in stand-up comedy
- Stereotypes and tropes (questioned) in stand-up comedy
- The status of stand-up in philosophy of art and aesthetics
- Implications of new technologies for stand-up comedy as art and practice
- Stand-up comedy and/as popular art or avant-garde art
- Ethics of stand-up comedy
- Stand-up comedy and traditional theories of humor

Submissions should not exceed 7,500 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](http://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: Sheila Lintott, <[sheila.lintott@bucknell.edu](mailto:sheila.lintott@bucknell.edu)>

Deadline for Submissions: November 15, 2019

For the program and practical information, please see: <<https://sites.google.com/view/aestheticnormativityws>>.

The event is free and open to the public. Registration is not required.

For further information, please contact Samantha Matherne <[smatherne@fas.harvard.edu](mailto:smatherne@fas.harvard.edu)>.

This event is being generously supported by the American Society of Aesthetics, the Harvard Philosophy Department, and the New York Institute of Philosophy.

### ASA Announces Speakers at 2019 Diversity Institutes

The American Society for Aesthetics is pleased to sponsor speakers on aesthetics at three summer diversity institutes in summer 2019. **James B. Haile, III**, Assistant Professor of Philosophy at the University of Rhode Island, will speak at the Summer Immersion Program in Philosophy at Brown University and the 22nd Annual Rutgers Summer Institute for Diversity in Philosophy. Professor Haile received his PhD from Duquesne University. He will analyze Kendrick Lamar's hip hop music from the perspective of Richard Wright's *Black Boy*. **Julianne Chung**, Assistant Professor of Philosophy at University of Louisville, will speak at the Summer Program for Women in Philosophy at UC San Diego. Professor Chung received her PhD from Yale University. She will present on "WWMRD? Art, Exemplars, and Personal Ideals."

2019 is the fifth year that the ASA has sponsored aesthetics speakers at summer diversity institutes. ASA covers all costs for the speakers and is pleased to help support these important diversity programs. All ASA members were eligible to apply for these appointments. The speakers were selected by institute directors from recommendations made by a review committee of senior ASA members. In previous years, many ASA members have been sponsored by ASA to make presentations on aesthetics at these institutes: Sondra Bacharach, A.W. Eaton, Jane Forsey, Shen-Li Liao, Anna Ribeiro, Mary Beth Willard, Sarah Worth.

### MA Philosophy And The Arts at the University of Warwick

We are currently considering applications for October 2019 entry: <<https://warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/philosophy/studywithus/>

<[pgtstudy/ma-philosophy-and-arts/](https://warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/philosophy/studywithus/pgtstudy/ma-philosophy-and-arts/)>

#### 1. Overview:

The MA Philosophy and the Arts allows you to combine study in Philosophy with modules from Film & TV, Art History, English & Comp Lit. The MA can be taken in dissertation and non-dissertation variants comprising either 4 x 30 CAT modules plus dissertation, or 6 x 30 CAT modules. Depending on which route you opt for you can study Philosophy in combination with one to three other subjects, taking between a minimum two and a maximum of four Philosophy modules. Students on the dissertation route can arrange supervision in Philosophy, one of the external depts. or joint supervision depending on the nature of their project.

#### 2. Who is the MA is for:

The MA is targeted at anyone seriously interested in both Philosophy and the Arts. It can be taken by students coming from straight Philosophy, combined Honours degrees, or any of the relevant arts disciplines if they can demonstrate significant philosophical or theoretical study at an UG level. All applications are assessed, individually, on their merits. All students take an MA-specific core module in term 1: Topics in Philosophy and the Arts, which introduces a range of foundational issues in the Philosophy of Art then a series of case studies of philosophers writing about particular artists or works, before choosing 3-5 modules (depending on route) from across the contributing Departments.

#### 3. MA Structure:

The flexible and customizable structure allows a wide variety of combinations/specializations, depending on whether one takes the dissertation or non-dissertation route:

1. Philosophy & Literature;
2. Philosophy & Art History;
3. Philosophy & Film
4. Philosophy, Literature & Art History;
5. Philosophy, Art History & Film
6. Philosophy, Film and Literature
7. Philosophy, Film, Art History and Literature\*

\* Non-dissertation route only

#### 4. MA Philosophy & the Arts Conference

Each year the student body has the opportunity to organize a Philosophy & the Arts Graduate conference, with a keynote and selection of papers and formatting of their choice. This is student led but supported by the degree conveners.

#### 5. Centre for Research in Philosophy, Literature

& the Arts (CRPLA)

The degree is supported by the Centre for Research in Philosophy, Literature & the Arts. And is designed to be as flexible and customizable to students needs within the fields served by the CRPLA as possible. It gives students access to a very wide range of Graduate modules across four Depts, allowing them to tailor the course to their specific interests.

#### 6. MA Module Choice

Below is an indicative list of the kind of modules that have been available to students on the MA in recent years:

##### Philosophy

<<https://warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/philosophy/postgraduate/modules/>>

Topics in Philosophy and the Arts

Kant's Aesthetics

Hegel's Aesthetics

Revolutionary Aesthetics (Benjamin, Brecht, Lukács, Adorno)

Philosophy of Photography

Philosophy through Film

Problems of Modernity

Critiques of Enlightenment in post-Kantian

German Philosophy

English & Comparative Literature

<<https://warwick.ac.uk/fac/arts/english/currentstudents/postgraduate/masters2018-19>>

Feminist Literary Theory

Poetics of Urban Modernism

World Literature and the Anthropocene

Petrofiction: Studies in World Literature

Drama & Performance Theory

Fundamentals of World Literature

Queer Theory & Praxis

##### Film & TV

<<https://warwick.ac.uk/fac/arts/film/prospective/ma>>

Screen Cultures & Methods

Film Criticism/Film Style

Film-Philosophy

Irony in Film

History & Memory in Italian Cinema

##### Art History

<<https://warwick.ac.uk/fac/arts/arthistory/applying/postgraduate/macourses/modules/>>

Globalisation and Contemporary Art

The Lure of the Object

Colour & Meaning

Art & Poetry

#### 7. Contact and Queries about the MA Philosophy & the Arts

The degree is jointly convened by Prof Diarmuid Costello <[d.costello@warwick.ac.uk](mailto:d.costello@warwick.ac.uk)> and Dr Eileen John <[eileen.john@warwick.ac.uk](mailto:eileen.john@warwick.ac.uk)>

ac.uk>. For queries about 2019/20 entry, please contact Diarmuid Costello in the first instance. Interested students are encouraged to visit the Dept to meet faculty teaching on the MA, where possible, and are generally invited to sit in on a seminar if they visit during the eaching term.

### **Peter Kivy Prize**

Deadline: February 1, 2020

The American Society for Aesthetics is pleased to announce that the Board of Trustees has unanimously approved the establishment of the Peter Kivy Prize. The prize will be awarded to up to three people in 2020 to encourage new, unpublished work on Peter Kivy's (1934-2017) philosophy of music.

The submission deadline is February 1, 2020, with announcement of the winning essays no later than June 2020. The papers will be presented at a special session at the ASA Annual Meeting in Washington DC in November 2020. The session is tentatively scheduled for Saturday, November 14, 2020 and will be open to the public.

The top three essays will each receive a prize of \$1000, plus travel support to the meeting of up to \$1250.

It is expected that the papers will be the basis for possible print publication, such as a print symposium in the Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism. Winning papers will be selected by an ad hoc committee of three ASA members, appointed by the ASA President in consultation with the Board of Trustees and the Kivy family.

The regulations for the competition are as follows:

*Amount:* The amount of the Prize is \$1,000 plus travel support up to \$1250. Up to three winners will be named.

*Deadline:* The deadline for submission is February 1, 2020.

*Eligibility:* In order to encourage interdisciplinary consideration of the topic, ASA membership is not required. Persons from related disciplines are encouraged to submit their work.

*Essay Content and Length:* The essay should be new, unpublished work on the philosophy of music of Peter Kivy. The essay should be a maximum of 7,500 words.

*Judging:* The judges for the Prize will be ap-

pointed by the ASA President.

*Presentation:* Winning papers will be presented at the 2020 ASA Annual Meeting in Washington, DC.

*Submission Requirements:* Submissions may not have been previously published or under consideration for publication elsewhere.

*Questions:* Contact <secretary-treasurer@aesthetics-online.org>.

### **Somaesthetics Research Prize**

To recognize and encourage continued research in somaesthetics, the American Society for Aesthetics announces the Somaesthetics Research Prize.

The 2021 Prize winner will be selected by a committee of three members appointed by the President of the ASA and notified by August 2021. The award will be announced publicly during the annual meeting of the ASA in 2021. The winner will be encouraged but not required to attend the meeting, and travel expenses to the meeting will be provided. The \$1000 prize may not be awarded if, in the opinion of the judges, no nomination is appropriate or of sufficient merit.

The ASA selection committee welcomes published work of distinction published between May 1, 2018 – April 30, 2021. Eligible works are articles or chapters/sections of books published in English. Chapters/sections of books should be of length comparable to a journal article. Publication is understood to mean publication in venues with peer review recognized by the scholarly community and that are permanently available to the interested scholarly community of students and researchers. Eligible publication includes reputable on-line journals. Nominations will be judged based on adherence to scholarly standards of writing. Self-nominations are welcome. Only one nomination per competition should be submitted. Nominees must be ASA members at the time of nomination.

The interdisciplinary field of somaesthetics is understood broadly as the critical study and meliorative cultivation of the experience and performance of the living body (or *soma*) as a site of sensory appreciation (*aesthesis*) and creative self-stylization. Contributions exploring the field of somaesthetics through one—or more—of the many disciplines that already inform this field are welcome: philosophy, aesthetics, arts and design research, technology studies, somatic, health, sports,

and social sciences, history, physiology, psychology and pedagogy.

Submissions should be directed c/o Julie Van Camp, ASA Secretary-Treasurer at 1550 Larimer St #644, Denver, CO 80202-1602, or <secretary-treasurer@aesthetics-online.org>. The nominated article or book chapter/section must be submitted in full. Electronic submissions are strongly preferred, in PDF format replicating the original publication. If PDF submission is not possible, then three copies of articles or book chapter/section must be submitted to the Denver address, above. The deadline for receipt of nominations is May 1, 2021.

The funding for this prize is being provided by revenue from a generous gift from a private foundation.

Additional gifts in support of the Somaesthetics Research Prize are welcome at any time and may be made online at the ASA's Donations portal.

### **ASA Pacific Division announces 2020 dates and locations**

The ASA's Pacific Division is pleased to announce that its 2020 meeting will be held March 20-21, 2020, at the Berkeley City Club, where the 2019 meeting was held. Shelby Moser and Emine Hande Tuna will co-organize the meeting. For more information, as it becomes available, including the CFP, submission deadline, keynoter, and schedule: <<https://aesthetics-online.org/events/EventDetails.aspx?id=1225774&group=>>

As before, the Division will have \$1000 in Irene H. Chayes Travel Funds for presenters without access to institutional travel funds.

### **ASA Rocky Mountain Division meeting dates announced**

The American Society for Aesthetics is pleased to announce that the Rocky Mountain Division has finalized dates for future meetings. After three successful meetings at the Drury Plaza Hotel in Santa Fe, NM, contracts have been signed for these future meetings:

- July 12-14, 2019
- July 10-12, 2020
- July 16-18, 2021
- July 15-17, 2022
- July 7-9, 2023

As more information becomes available for

each meeting, including CFPs, check the meetings pages on the ASA web site.

For a list of all future ASA meetings: <[https://aesthetics-online.site-ym.com/events/event\\_list.asp](https://aesthetics-online.site-ym.com/events/event_list.asp)>

### ASA Funds Southern Aesthetics Workshop

The American Society for Aesthetics Board of Trustees has approved a grant of \$3,640 in support of a Southern Aesthetics Workshop, to be held August 30-31, 2019, at Auburn University in Auburn, Alabama.

The conference is organized by Aaron Me-skin, Professor of Philosophical Aesthetics at the University of Leeds, and James Shelley, Professor of Philosophy and Chair of the Philosophy Department at Auburn University. Substantial cost-sharing for the Workshop is being provided by Auburn's Philosophy Department.

The workshop will be comprised of three activities: (a) a series of 7-8 pre-read sessions focused on submitted work by junior scholar and commentary by senior figures in the field, (b) a keynote address by Professor Paul C. Taylor, Vanderbilt University, and (c) planning meetings about the future of the Southern Division of the ASA.

The goals of the project include:

- Exploring the possibilities and potential of a new Southern Division of the ASA;
- Promoting research in aesthetics and philosophy of art by junior members of the ASA working in the southern region of the U.S. (broadly construed);
- Forging connections and initiating dialogue between aestheticians working in the South; and
- Allowing students a first opportunity to participate in a professional workshop.

For up-to-date information on the Workshop, including the schedule when announced, check the meetings page on the ASA web site:

<<https://aesthetics-online.site-ym.com/events/EventDetails.aspx?id=1167896&group=>>.

### Online Aesthetics Courses

We would like to encourage attention to the

potential of on-line aesthetics courses. We hear from many people that aesthetics is not taught at their own campus and they wonder how they could find a course. Although face-to-face teaching is irreplaceable, on-line courses offer a substitute for those students who do not have access to such teaching. As on-line education rapidly evolves, we hope aesthetics will be included in more campus offerings. If you have an on-line course, please let us know so we can add you to our on-line catalog: <[secretary-treasurer@aesthetics-online.org](mailto:secretary-treasurer@aesthetics-online.org)>.

**Philosophy and the Arts**, Art/Phil 320, 3 semester credits, Minnesota State University Moorhead, Theodore Gracyk

A consideration of philosophical questions relating to the fine arts. Topics include the nature of art, aesthetic experience, criticism in the arts, representation, symbolism, and evaluation. This course is writing intensive. Video lectures are provided.

Cost to people who are not matriculated at MSU-Moorhead: Approximately \$1700 (including fees); less for MN residents

Who to contact to register: <<https://www.mnstate.edu/admissions/online/>>

Deadline for registration: 5th day of classes for each session (approximately late May, late August, early January)

**Philosophy and Film, PHI 4150**, 3 semester credits, Villanova University, Summer Session, John Carvalho  
Bringing a philosophical perspective to bear on the appreciation of films

Text: Leo Braudy and Marshall Cohen, *Film Theory and Criticism* 8th (Oxford 2016)

This is a popular course that usually has a waiting list.

For more information: <<https://www1.villanova.edu/villanova/professionalstudies/summer.html>>.

**Design Theory Online Course**, Design Theory, Shenkar College of Art, Engineering and Design.

Instructors: Michalle Gal, Jonathan Ventura, Lee Weinberg, Emanuel Greengard, Pablo Utin.

<<https://www.edx.org/course/design-theory>>

**edX Online Courses**, MOOC provider created by Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Harvard University.

The first of its kind, this course is a pioneering exploration of theories of design. Much of the way we interact as a society springs from design and is influenced by it. Design specialists around the world are continually redefining what design is and how it should be positioned within social, political, and economic dynamics. You'll gain a better understanding of the scope of design and the role it plays in our day-to-day lives.

Cost: Free. Add a Verified Certificate for \$49 USD

Registration contact: <<https://www.edx.org/course/design-theory>>

Deadline for registration: the course opens every semester. Registration up to a week before the beginning of the semester.

### Proposed revisions in ASA policies on discrimination, harassment, and respectful behavior

The American Society for Aesthetics' new Respectful Behavior Committee has proposed revisions in the ASA Policies on Discrimination, Harassment, and Respectful Behavior. The Board of Trustees has reviewed these and now invites comments and suggestions from the membership.

Please send your comments to <[ASACommentsSuggestions@gmail.com](mailto:ASACommentsSuggestions@gmail.com)> (a special e-mail account administered by three trustees) no later than **May 11, 2019**. The trustees will compile responses and share with the entire board, including the comments in their entirety and the names of submitters. The Board of Trustees will determine whether to make further revisions in the Policy based on your suggestions and then will vote on whether to adopt this policy.

The proposed revised policy can be found here:

<[https://aesthetics-online.org/resource/resmgr/files/Proposed\\_Revised\\_Policy\\_Mar.docx](https://aesthetics-online.org/resource/resmgr/files/Proposed_Revised_Policy_Mar.docx)>

The current policy (adopted July 23, 2018) is on the ASA web site under ASA==>ASA Policies:

<[https://cdn.ymaws.com/aesthetics-online.org/resource/resmgr/files/ASA\\_policies\\_on\\_discriminati.pdf](https://cdn.ymaws.com/aesthetics-online.org/resource/resmgr/files/ASA_policies_on_discriminati.pdf)>

The current policy remains in effect until such time as the proposed revised policy is approved by the Board of Trustees. ASA members will be notified at that time.

# Calls for Papers

## Conference on Food, Art and Philosophy

Institute of Philosophical Research  
National Autonomous University of Mexico  
(UNAM)  
October 3-4, 2019

Deadline: May 31, 2019

Co-sponsor: American Society for Aesthetics

Submissions are invited on any issue related to the topic of the conference (especially the specific research areas mentioned above). Extended abstracts should be no longer than 1500 words and should be accompanied by a 100-word abstract and a separate page with your contact details. Please prepare your submission for anonymous review. You can send the extended abstracts to <foodartandphilosophy@gmail.com>.

Note that, if accepted, your paper must be prepared for a 35 minute presentation and should not exceed 4000 words.

A selection of the papers presented at the conference will be collected in a special issue of *Critica: Revista Hispanoamericana de Filosofía*, edited by the conference organizers.

Graduate student travel grants: We encourage graduate students to submit a paper. The winning graduate submission will be awarded a travel and accommodation grant to cover her/his expenses. Students do not need to be a member of the American Society for Aesthetics to submit a paper. However, the winner will be required to join ASA within 30 days after notification.

We encourage submissions from women, Latin American scholars and other historically underrepresented groups.

## JCLA announces Special Volumes on Somaesthetics and Indian Aesthetics

**Deadlines:** August 31, 2019 (Somaesthetics), December 31, 2019 (Indian Aesthetics).

The Autumn 2019 Issue (Vol. 42, No. 2) of the Journal of Comparative Literature and Aesthetics (JCLA) is bringing out a 'Special Volume on Somaesthetics', coinciding with the 70th Birth Anniversary of the Foreign Editor of the Journal, Prof. Richard Shusterman.

Renowned scholars like Thomas W. Leddy, Roger T. Ames, James Miller, Charles Altieri, Kristina Höök, Leszek Koczanowicz,

Wojciech Malecki, Yanping Gao, Dorota Koczanowicz, Sean Bowden, Alexander Nehamas, Stefan Valdemar Snævarr, Alexander Kremer, Max Rynnänen, Tanehisa Otabe, Stephane Madelrieux, David Zerbib, Barbara Formis, Jerold J. Abrams, Vinod Balakrishnan, Laura Di Summa, Swathi Elizabeth Kurian, Jasmine Fernandes and others are contributing to the volume.

The subsequent Spring 2020 Issue (Vol. 43, No. 1) of the Journal will be a 'Special Volume on Indian Aesthetics' to commemorate the Birth Centenary of legendary Indian philosopher and aesthetician, the late Prof. P.S. Sastri (1920-1985), who was a founding and editorial board member of the Journal and had contributed some of his finest essays like "East and West in Coomaraswamy's Theory of Art" to the Journal in the 70s and 80s.

Scholars working in Somaesthetics and Indian Aesthetics are invited to send in their papers to the founding editor, Prof. A.C. Sukla at [anantasukla@hotmail.com](mailto:anantasukla@hotmail.com) or [jclaindia@gmail.com](mailto:jclaindia@gmail.com).

## Forms of Aesthetics:

### Tomas Kulka's Philosophy of Art

Deadline: September 15, 2019

#### Editors

Lisa Giombini (Università degli studi Roma Tre, Italy), Ondřej Dadejčík (Charles University, Czech Republic), Adrián Kverka (University of Prešov, Slovakia)

The editorial board of the ESPES journal continues its commitment to focus on thematic issues dedicated to scholars who have shaped contemporary aesthetic thinking. After the positively received 'Berleantian' issue (2/2017) we now aim to concentrate on the philosophy of Tomáš Kulka (1948), which has gained major attention not only within Slovak and Czech aesthetics but also in the wider European and world contexts.

A graduate in philosophy and economics at the London School of Economics as a student of Karl R. Popper, and a PhD at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Kulka taught for some years at the University of Jerusalem. After founding the Philosophy of Arts Department at the University of Tel Aviv, since 1992 he has been a guest lecturer at the Central European University and since 1996 a Professor at the Department of Aesthetics of the Charles University in Prague. His scholarly profile is complemented by his engagement in many international journals like the *British Journal for Philosophy of*

*Science, Philosophy and Social Sciences, Poetics Today, Journal of Aesthetic Education, Organon F, Filosofický časopis and Estetika: The Central European Journal of Aesthetics.*

Kulka's seminal book, *Art and Kitsch*, translated in Czech, Hebrew, Finnish and Spanish, is perhaps his most famous work, but many of his publications resonate as well in the Slovak aesthetic discourse: he is well known as an author (*Umění a falzum/ Art and forgery*), as a co-editor (*Co je umění? Texty angloamerické estetiky 20. století/What is Art? Texts of Anglo-American Aesthetics of the 20th Century*), and as a translator and editor of translations (*Umění, krása, šeredno/ Art, Beauty, Ugliness; Jazyky umění/ Languages of art*). Working within the frame of the analytic philosophy of art, Kulka's philosophy elaborates the foundations of Popper's thinking by importing his falsifiability theory within the field of aesthetics; it pursues the problem of aesthetic and artistic values in the context of the forgery-original relation and shows a long-term interest in value theory (his new book *Art and its Values* is announced for 2019 by the ARGO publishing house).

Given Kulka's contributions to Slovak and Czech aesthetics, the editorial board of ESPES is pleased to launch a thematic call aimed to provide a retrospective on some central thematic areas of his work in the field of aesthetics and the philosophy of art. We welcome contributions that re-evaluate and reflect on Kulka's relevance to current aesthetic discourse. Submissions may focus on all aspects of his reflections in aesthetics and the arts, including, but not limited to, the following areas:

- Art and kitsch: a mandatory starting point for future studies of kitsch (Dutton, 1997)?
- Forgeries: the relevance of Kulka's dualistic model of appraisal of a work of art as a response to the problem of (artistic) forgeries.
- Problems of value. Aesthetic and artistic values in the world of art.
- 30 years after Art and science: an outline of Popperian aesthetics.
- Kulka and Goodman on metaphor.

**Online submission deadline using [espes.ff.unipo.sk](mailto:espes.ff.unipo.sk):** September 15, 2019

**Decision and comments:** October 30, 2019

**Final drafts due:** December 1, 2019

**Publication date:** end of December 2019

If you have any questions, please contact the editors at: <[espes@ff.unipo.sk](mailto:espes@ff.unipo.sk)>.

**North American Kant Society Biennial**  
Binghamton University, Binghamton, NY  
Kant and the Value of Humanity  
June 5-7, 2020

Deadline: January 1, 2020 (11:59 pm EST)

Keynote speakers: Karin de Boer, Katrin Flikschuh, Paul Guyer

Saturday, June 6 will feature "Aesthetics Day at NAKS," sponsored by the American Society for Aesthetics, which will include several talks on Kant and Aesthetics.

We aim to announce which papers have been accepted by February 7, 2020.

Papers in any area of Kantian philosophy are welcome, from analytic, continental, and historical approaches. We also encourage submissions on the conference theme, "Kant and the Value of Humanity."

Please identify two areas under which you wish your paper to be considered:

1. Kant's Pre-critical Philosophy
2. Metaphysics
3. Epistemology and Logic
4. Philosophy of Science and Nature
5. Teleology
6. Ethics and Moral Philosophy
7. Philosophy of Law and Justice
8. Philosophy of Politics, History, and Culture
9. Religion and Theology
10. Aesthetics
11. Kant and German Idealism
12. Kant and Phenomenology
13. Kant in the Present
14. Kant and the Value of Humanity

We are also accepting submissions for papers for the following two panels, sponsored by the American Society for Aesthetics.

1. *"Kant's Methodology of Taste: the role of Humaniora"*

For this panel we invite papers on the much overlooked final section of Kant's Critique of the Aesthetic Power of Judgment where Kant discusses the role of preparation and study for training taste and also the social nature of taste and its role in cultivating humanity.

2. *"The Aesthetics of the Sublime and Human Dignity"*

For this panel we invite papers on the relationship between the moral and aesthetic dimensions of the sublime in Kant.

To submit a proposal, please submit (in .doc, .docx, or .pdf form):

1. A cover page, including the title of the paper, word count, author's name, brief bio, and contact information;
2. A 3000-word paper, not including notes, prepared for blind review, accompanied by a 200-word abstract.

Please email all documents to <naksbiennial2020@gmail.com>.

- All papers should be suitable for presentation in 20 minutes.
- Submissions will be anonymously reviewed; identifying information should be included only on the cover page.

We especially encourage graduate student submissions. Students should identify themselves as such on the cover page, which is a required component of the submission.

NAKS will provide \$200 travel award for the best graduate student paper and the author will be considered as a candidate for the annual Markus Herz Prize.

The American Society for Aesthetics will provide a \$500 student travel grant for the best student paper on Kant and aesthetics. Members of the ASA will receive a reduced registration fee for the events on Kant and Aesthetics on Saturday June 6, 2020.

## Active Aestheticians

**DOMINIC MCIVER LOPES** (University of British Columbia) was the recipient of the 2018 Philip L. Quinn Prize, the APA's highest honor for service to the profession.

**ERICH HATALA MATTHES** (Wellesley College) won the APA's Public Philosophy OpEd Contest prizes for his article, "Palmyra's ruins can rebuild our relationship with history", available at <<https://aeon.co/ideas/palmyras-ruins-can-rebuild-our-relationship-with-history>>.

**JENNIFER MCMAHON** (University of Adelaide) has edited a special issue on "Philosophical Intervention" in the latest issue of Curator: The Museum Journal 62/1 (January 2019). The publishers have made our issue the free online issue for this year: <<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/toc/21516952/2019/62/1>>

Details are:

The articles are based on a Symposium held in Sydney at the Art Gallery of New South Wales in 2017 (the writers had attended workshops together prior to this in Melbourne, Adelaide and San Francisco on the Arts and Imagination). Philosophers were asked to provide a commentary on a work of their choice from the collection.

Articles by:

Joseph Kassman-Tod (Berkeley)  
Cynthia Freeland (Houston)  
Paul Guyer (Brown)  
David Macarthur (Sydney)  
Ian McLean (Melbourne)  
Mohan Matthen (Toronto)  
Jennifer A. McMahon (Adelaide)  
Michael Newall (Kent)  
Robert Sinnerbrink (Macquarie)

### TOP JAAC DOWNLOADS IN 2018

JSTOR: Top downloads from JSTOR of articles in the *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* in 2018. (JSTOR publication is delayed by one year from the Journal's publication dates.)

1. Carroll, N., "The Nature of Horror" 46:1
2. Young, J., "Profound Offense and Cultural Appropriation" 63:2
3. Riggall, N., "Street Art: The Transfiguration of the Commonplaces" 68:3
4. Weitz, M., "The Role of Theory in Aesthetics" 15:1
5. Carroll, N., "Horror and Humor" 57:2
6. Brand, Peg Zeglin, "Beauty Matters" 57:1
7. Lessing, A., "What Is Wrong with a Forgery?" 23:4
8. Diehl, N., "Satire, Analogy, and Moral Philosophy" 71:4
9. Carroll, N., "Hume's Standard of Taste" 43:2
10. Shiner, L., "'Primitive Fakes,' 'Tourist Art,' and the Ideology of Authenticity" 52:2

WILEY ONLINE LIBRARY: Top downloads from the Wiley Online Library of articles in JAAC in 2018.

1. Simoniti, V., "Assessing Socially Engaged Art" 76:1
2. Meskin, A., "Defining Comics?" 65:4
3. Mills, C., "Artistic Integrity" 76:1
4. Wilson, D., "The Japanese Tea Ceremony and Pancultural Definitions of Art" 76:1
5. Riggall, N., "Street Art: The Transfiguration of the Commonplaces" 68:3
6. Lintott, S., "Superiority in Humor Theory" 74:4
7. Leon, M., "Aesthetics Makes Nothing Happen? The Role of Aesthetic Properties in the Constitution of Non-aesthetic Value" 76:1
8. Young, J., "Profound Offense and Cultural Appropriation" 63:2
9. Bicknell, J., "Excess in Art: The Case of Oversteering" 76:1
10. Eaton, A., "Robust Immoralism" 70:3

American Society for Aesthetics  
c/o Julie Van Camp  
1550 Larimer St. #644  
Denver, CO  
80202-1602

Non-Profit  
Organization  
U.S. POSTAGE  
PAID  
SAVANNAH GA  
Permit No. 1565

## ASA Newsletter

EDITED BY  
Shelby Moser  
&  
Michel-Antoine Xhignesse  
ISSN 1089-1668

The *Newsletter* is published three times a year by the American Society for Aesthetics. Subscriptions are available to non-members for \$15 per year plus postage. For subscription or membership information:

ASA, c/o Julie Van Camp, 1550 Larimer St. #644, Denver, CO 80202-1602 Tel. 562-331-4424; email: <asa@aesthetics-online.org> or <secretary-treasurer@aesthetics-online.org>.

Send calls for papers, event announcements, conference reports, and other items of interest to:

Shelby Moser, Department of Art & Design, Azusa Pacific University, 901 E Alosta Ave, Azusa, CA 91702. <shelby.moser@gmail.com>  
or

Michel-Antoine Xhignesse, Department of Philosophy, University of British Columbia, 1866 Main Mall, Buchanan E370, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada V6T 1Z1. <michel.xhignesse@ubc.ca>

**Deadlines: December 1, April 15, August 1**