



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

VOLUME 39 NUMBER 2

SUMMER 2019

- 1 *Dana Schutz's Painting of Emmett Till*
by Jay Miller
- 5 News from the National Office
- 6 JAAC Special Issue: CFP
- 7 Conference Reports
- 9 Aesthetics News
- 12 Calls for Papers
- 14 Upcoming Events
- 14 Active Aestheticians

Dana Schutz's Painting of Emmett Till

Jay Miller

Warren Wilson College

One of the most exciting things about working in aesthetics and philosophy of art is that the pursuit of questions about art and beauty allows us, and sometimes forces us, into other fields of inquiry – to the ethical, the political, the metaphysical, the scientific, and so on. We are, by nature if not necessity, interdisciplinary. We enjoy a special kind of intellectual freedom to talk about nearly anything. That doesn't always mean, however, that we we should.

I've recently been thinking about the Dana Schutz painting of Emmett Till, titled *Open Casket*. Like many of us, I was drawn to the complex interrelation of aesthetics, politics, and ethics that gave rise to the now infamous controversy that erupted when the painting was featured at the 2017 Whitney Biennial. The painting, a medium-large,¹ semi-abstract depiction of Till's disfigured visage facing upward in an open funeral casket, is based on documentary photographs taken after the gruesome 1955 lynching of the 14 year-old boy in rural Mississippi, wrongly accused of flirting with a white woman in a grocery store. The unavoidable question that this high-profile case raises has to do with a certain kind of normative relation between the image, the painting, and the artist. And this question – call it *The Question* – struck me as a profoundly philosophical question, one especially well suited for the philosophy of art.

Certainly, there are plenty of straightforward aesthetic critiques that can be made about the painting. We might say, for example, that the playfulness of its gestural brushstrokes belie the gravity of its subject matter. Likewise, we might question the scale of the work, or whether abstraction is an appropriate stylistic choice for depicting such a difficult image. In "The Case Against Dana Schutz," critics Josephine Livingstone and Lovia Gyarkye argue along these lines, pointing out that, among other things, "the colors are pretty."² We might even take a stronger stance and claim that the mere attempt to render the image artistically inevitably results in the aestheticization of suffering.

Overwhelmingly, however, criticism of *Open Casket* has to do, not with the artwork, but with the artist, a white female American painter. More precisely, the controversy concerns, not how the image of Till is treated artistically, but *that* it is treated by a white artist. Leading the protest was African-American artist Parker Bright, who picketed daily in front of the painting at the Whitney wearing a shirt with "Black Death Spectacle" scrawled in permanent marker on the back. Soon after, another artist, Hannah Black, penned a scathing open letter to the curators of the biennial calling for the removal and destruction of the work, which in turn garnered a number of supporting signatures.³ Among several critical points she makes in the letter, the one that most poignantly summarizes the objection to *Open Casket* is that "the subject matter is not Schutz's."⁴

Now, for those of us eager to go beyond the familiar terrain of aesthetics – ontology, aesthetic judgment, Kant's Third *Critique*, etc. – the Dana Schutz case poses a new and interesting question, and indeed, one with both interdisciplinarity and broad public interest built into it from the outset. Stated more precisely, The Question

aesthetics-online.org

is this: *What does it mean to say that certain subject matter is off-limits to certain artists? What are the normative constraints around representation that make *Open Casket* problematic? I for one find such questions philosophically interesting and intellectually motivating, all the more so because they emerge within the context a broader, timely, and more familiar public debate. It's exciting, and sometimes rare in philosophy, to talk about the things people are talking about. So, with *The Question* in hand, the task of philosophers is then to explain, analyze, argue, articulate fine-grained conceptual distinctions, stake out positional terrain, defend, counter, tweak, and so on, until we settle upon *The Answer*.*

Thus far, however, every attempt to get at what goes wrong in the Dana Schutz case comes up short. This is not because the critique isn't warranted; in fact, as I explain below, the one thing that seems clear about the Dana Schutz case is that it lacks a solid defense. Rather, it is because the attempt to articulate the moral force behind the claim "the subject matter is not Schutz's" ultimately leads to a question of what we might call (for lack of a better term) *cultural authority*, a question which goes so far beyond the aesthetic that I think maybe I couldn't, or shouldn't, attempt to go there. Every course of inquiry through the controversy, it seems, says less philosophically about the controversy itself and more about my own attempt to grasp it philosophically.

One way to defend Schutz would be to say simply that *nothing* is off limits when it comes to artistic expression. Call this the *artistic freedom* defense. There is a reason, of course, that Romantic appeals to the unfettered freedom of the artistic "genius" no longer hold up: we no longer regard the artist as the bearer of unique and infallible imaginative insight into all things human and divine. Yet, versions of this defense still appear today, typically deployed as a well-intended bulwark against equally untenable attempts to censor artists (think of the "culture wars"). One of the more robust defenses of Schutz out there, made by contemporary artist Coco Fusco, takes exactly this anti-censorship line.⁵ But almost never does this modern (and more moderate) form of defense imply total freedom from extra-aesthetic constraints. We wouldn't give images of, say, child abuse a moral pass simply by virtue of their artistic status. So unless we're willing to bite the Nietzschean bullet and say that the aesthetic always trumps all other sorts of value, the Schutz case is not a matter of whether there are limits, but where the limits are.

The defense offered in response to the mounting criticism by the Biennial's curators, Christopher Y. Lew and Mia Locks, doesn't fare much better. Acknowledging that the exhibition takes on themes which "are painful or difficult to confront," they defend their decision to include *Open Casket* on the grounds that the exhibition aims to forge "empathetic connections," arguing further that the image of Emmett Till "has tremendous emotional resonance" for many African-Americans.⁶ Call this the *raising awareness* defense. It is a clever formula for taking stock in the social capital of art without assuming risk or responsibility for its fallout. It's no surprise, then, that this rings hollow for Schutz's critics, as the generalized appeal to the virtue of raising awareness of suffering artfully dodges the relevant question of who gets to be the spokesperson of the specific kind of suffering at stake in the image of Emmett Till's funeral. And as I explain below, acknowledging this specificity is key.

Meanwhile, Schutz's own defense of *Open Casket* has been a bit scattershot, and not wholly consistent.⁷ But by far the defense Schutz has leaned into most heavily in response to the criticism of *Open*

Casket is what we might call the *empathetic identification* defense:

I don't know what it is like to be black in America, but I do know what it is like to be a mother. Emmett was Mamie Till's only son. The thought of anything happening to your child is beyond comprehension.⁸

The claim is that in fact there is a substantive point of connection between the image and the artist, and that point is a shared maternal identity. Schutz relates empathetically to the image from a mother's perspective, through an imaginative identification with Till's mother, Mamie Till. In contrast to the *raising awareness* defense from the Whitney curators, which defends the artists as third-party facilitators of "empathetic connections," the *empathetic identification* defense positions Schutz as an insider to the pain and suffering conveyed in the image of Emmett Till through the first-person perspective shared among mothers. In making this identification, she is in effect saying in response to critics that, as a mother, the subject matter is *hers*.

There is, it seems to me, something partly compelling about Schutz's appeal to maternal identity, if only because it's hard *not* to see the mother's perspective in the image. Much of the significance behind these images is certainly bound up with Mamie Till's brave decision to hold an open-casket funeral for her son in hopes of making public the ugly image of racial violence in America, and to allow the photographic images to testify to the broader racial injustice that her son's death represents.⁹ And indeed, we might even say that some of this significance is lost if we somehow fail to read the image through the empathetic lens of a mother suffering the loss of her child. Surely part of what makes the image so powerful is that it does solicit a response from its viewers. Assuming that Schutz's defense is sincere (as I take it to be), she is to this extent not wrong in making an empathetic connection with the photograph of Emmett Till's coffin on the basis of a mother's perspective.

But that doesn't mean she's right to paint the image. Because, of course, the perspective in question isn't simply a mother's perspective, but a *black* mother's perspective. What Schutz's defense has in common with other defenses of *Open Casket* is that it *generalizes the particular*: it abstracts from the uniqueness and specificity of the thing in order to make something common, shared, and more broadly accessible. The *artistic freedom* defense is made on behalf of all art, regardless of subject matter. The *raising awareness* defense looks past the specific issues raised in art and how they are raised in praising art's role as catalyst to social progress. Likewise, the *empathetic identification* defense, despite its appeal, only works in the Dana Schutz case by pushing past the particular characteristics of the thing to claim an affinity with its more general characteristics. In this regard, it's sort of the artistic equivalent of classical liberalism: it abstracts individuality in the name of equality—and is therefore open to a similar set of objections.

But now how do we characterize this tendency—generalizing the particular—as a moral or aesthetic defect? Where does this line of inquiry take us? Let's start with the obvious candidates.

One way to diagnose the Dana Schutz case is through the moral language of authenticity. We might say, for example, that Schutz lacks an *authentic* relation to the subject matter of Emmett Till's death because she's not sufficiently rooted in the history and shared experiences that give it specific cultural relevance. Which is of course true.

But to call this “inauthentic” is at the same time to take on essentialist assumptions about what counts as an “authentic” culture, self, or identity. As Paul Taylor rightly points out, the language of cultural authenticity “often leads to arbitrarily truncated narratives of individual and collective origin, insulating the subject from the messy processes of subject formation and cultural transmission under conditions of historical change.”¹⁰ This is, in fact, precisely the concern that contemporary author Zadie Smith raises in response to the criticism of *Open Casket*: as soon as we ask “Who owns black pain?” we get into problematic questions about who counts as black.¹¹

But even if we allow for a more nuanced, fluid conception of *cultural authenticity* of the kind that Taylor recommends—one culled from the context and contingency of actual lives and experiences—it’s not clear that it would fully capture what goes wrong in the case of *Open Casket*. Allowing that Schutz’s connection to the maternal perspective present in the image of Emmett Till is authentic, the charge of cultural authenticity would then concern the authenticity of her connection to African-American culture, which, of course, she explicitly disavows (“I don’t know what it is like to be black in America”). The issue, then, is not the cultural authenticity of the artist, but the artist’s appeal to one form of cultural identification in place of another, and with it, questions of which counts, which doesn’t, or which counts more than the other, and so on. The issue, in other words, is a matter of *cultural authority*.

Another, perhaps more obvious, way to frame the objection that “the subject matter is not Schutz’s” is through the language of *cultural appropriation*. We might say, for example, that Schutz is guilty of cultural appropriation¹² in that she has taken a cultural product from a cultural context that is not her own. Of course, there are different ways of formulating this accusation. Perhaps most relevant to this case is James Young’s attempt to define cultural appropriation in terms of what he calls (using a moral category introduced by Joel Feinberg) “profound offense,” a particularly egregious form of offense which “strikes at a person’s core values or sense of self.”¹³ This gives us a standard by which to distinguish acceptable from illicit forms of cultural appropriation. The worry about framing cultural appropriation this way, as Thi Nguyen and Matthew Strohl have recently argued, is that it makes claims of cultural appropriation contingent upon independently grounded reasons, putting the burden of proof for the offense on the offended rather than the offender(s). Not all appropriation claims are backed by a clearly articulated rationale; sometimes they emerge from the mere fact that a cultural group expresses a shared desire not to have elements of their culture appropriated. In such cases, they argue, we might better understand the act of cultural appropriation as violating *group intimacy*, understood in terms of the intimate bonds formed through cultural practices which “embody or promote a sense of common identity and group connection among participants.”¹⁴

In the case of *Open Casket*, however, the status of “intimacy” is precisely what is at stake. She expressly disavows sharing in the group intimacy of African-Americans, but nevertheless appeals to the shared experiences and perspectives of motherhood as a different form of group intimacy that she thinks licenses artistic use of the subject matter in the image of Emmett Till. Rather than breaching the shared intimacy of African-Americans, Schutz seeks access to the subject matter by going around it, as it were, approaching it from a different form of intimacy. And the way she does this, as we’ve seen, is by generalizing the particular; that is, by abstracting from the historical and cultural specificity of the image of Emmett Till and foregrounding a far more common and shareable form of intimacy with which she does identify. We can—and I think *should*—call foul on this strategy. We might gauge the weight and

relevance of one form of group intimacy in relation to another. But notice that at this point the critique points to something more basic than cultural appropriation, namely, *cultural authority*. To speak “as a mother” is—at least in this case—to appeal to a position, perspective, or experience that warrants some degree of authority to speak. And if, in response, we appeal to the weightier, more relevant intimacy among African-Americans, we do so by appealing to the greater degree of cultural authority that such group intimacy carries with it. Whereas cultural appropriation (in the negative sense) implies some form of unwarranted entry into a cultural group or illicit displacements of a cultural object from its cultural context, Schutz’s transgression seems to be more a matter of placing herself in false proximity to the cultural object by generalizing its cultural significance. And if the right response is to say that the general does not have standing to speak on behalf of the particular, then again, the critique of *Open Casket* comes down to a matter of Schutz’s lacking *cultural authority* to make the subject matter of Emmett Till’s death her own.

Much like the language of cultural authenticity, the language of cultural appropriation gets close to capturing what goes wrong in the Schutz case, but leads us to a more basic question about who has cultural authority to claim some ownership in all that the image of Emmett Till entails. In whatever way we articulate the criticism that “the subject matter is not Schutz’s,” it seems inevitably to lead to a question of who does or does not have standing to speak to certain kinds of subject matter. This, however, in turn poses a very different, and far more difficult, question, or rather, *meta*-question, namely: What to do with this? What can I say about *cultural authority*? Call this *The Other Question*. If all avenues of inquiry in the Schutz case lead here, shouldn’t I attempt to give an account of cultural authority, however tentative or sketchy or suggestive?

Suppose I press on. I might try, for example, to link the notion of cultural authority in this case to the wishes of Mamie Till, pointing out that she did not hand over the images of her son’s funeral to just anyone, but entrusted them to *Jet Magazine* and *Chicago Defender*, both black publications. I might conclude from this, as cultural scholar Christina Sharpe does, that the images “were meant to speak to and to move a Black audience.”¹⁵ It turns out, however, that there are conflicting accounts even of this. Simeon Wright, Till’s cousin who was with him the night of his murder and attended the funeral, recounts in an interview that Mamie Till “wanted the world to see what those men had done to her son because no one would have believed it if they didn’t the picture or didn’t see the casket.”¹⁶ So what then? Should I then attempt to adjudicate? Should I try get to the bottom of things to see whether and to what extent specific intentions bear on the conditions of cultural authority?

Suppose, alternatively, I let it go. What have I learned? Perhaps less about the Dana Schutz controversy and more about my own attempt to access it intellectually. Perhaps the most philosophically salient point relevant to this inquiry is that not everything is fair game to philosophical pursuit. When the very attempt to articulate the concept of cultural authority itself presumes a degree of cultural authority that I myself lack, perhaps letting it go is the best way to acknowledge this. Indeed, to give an account of cultural authority in general is at the same time to say what constitutes cultural authority in the particular case of *Open Casket*, which itself is subject to the same accusation of generalizing the particular leveled at Schutz. Nor am I in a position to hypothesize conditions under which some white painter might, under some circumstances, have some cultural authority to paint this image of Emmett Till. Even if such conditions exist, that discussion is so bound up with a form of cultural, experiential, and identity-specific particularity that abstract philo-

sophical reasoning alone cannot carry it. Much of it is out of reach, inaccessible to many of us, myself included. So I have to let it go. I have to admit, as perhaps Schutz should have: the subject matter is not mine.

What could easily be said of philosophers could perhaps just as easily be said of privileged folks in general: we tend not to like the inaccessible. Because we feel intellectually compelled by something, we often assume a right to it. And, apart from a few notable exceptions in feminist theory and critical race theory, philosophy has been rather slow to acknowledge that the virtue of epistemic modesty is relative to social status. But I think it takes a good deal of intellectual honesty and humility to admit that I'm not just pursuing knowledge *as a philosopher*, but *as white person, as a male, as a Westerner*, etc. And for this reason, should I find myself in the fortunate position of being led to or compelled by The Question, this alone doesn't mean that I am in a position to furnish The Answer. This should be read, not as a nod to radical contextualism, but as a gesture toward a different way of doing philosophy; one that entails, among other things, an acknowledgment of limits, a willingness to listen, and the occasional deference to perspectives and experiences that may yield more insight about these tricky cases than just conceptual analysis. To this end, I invite any and all input relevant to any aspect of this inquiry from the ASA community and beyond.

1. 39" x 52"

2. Josephine Livingstone and Lovia Gyarkye, "The Case Against Dana Schutz," *The New Republic* (March 22, 2017). <<https://newrepublic.com/article/141506/case-dana-schutz>>

3. <<http://www.artnews.com/2017/03/21/the-painting-must-go-hannah-black-pens-open-letter-to-the-whitney-about-controversial-biennial-work/>>

4. Ibid.

5. She writes: "I suspect that many of those endorsing the call have either forgotten or are unfamiliar with the ways Republicans, Christian Evangelicals, and black conservatives exploit the argument that audience offense justifies censorship in order to terminate public funding for art altogether and to perpetuate heterosexist values in black communities." <<https://hyperallergic.com/368290/censorship-not-the-painting-must-go-on-dana-schutzs-image-of-emmett-till/>>

6. <<https://news.artnet.com/art-world/dana-schutz-painting-emmett-till-whitney-biennial-protest-897929>>

7. In the same breath, she both acknowledges norms of artistic content ("You think maybe it's off limits [Till's image], and then extra off limits") and invokes the artistic freedom to do it so long as it is done well: "I really feel any subject is O.K., it's just how it's done. You never know how something is going to be until it's done." At other times, she's appeals to the currency of the image in American political landscape: "I was interested because it's something that keeps on happening. I feel somehow that it's an American image." "Why Dana Schutz Painted Emmett Till," Calvin Tomkins. *The New Yorker* (April 3, 2017). <<https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2017/04/10/why-dana-schutz-painted-emmett-till>>

8. <<https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2017/mar/21/whitney-biennial-emmett-till-painting-dana-schutz>>

9. As she put it then: "I know that this life can't be returned but I hope that his death will certainly start a movement in these United States." <<https://newrepublic.com/article/141506/case-dana-schutz>>

10. Paul C. Taylor, *Black is Beautiful: A Philosophy of Black Aesthetics* (Wiley, 2016), p. 134.

11. She writes "[...] I turn from the painting to my children. Their beloved father is white, I am biracial, so, by the old racial classifications of America, they are "quadrooms." Could they take black suffering as a subject of their art, should they ever make any? Their grandmother is as black as the ace of spades, as the British used to say; their mother is what the French still call café au lait. They themselves are sort of yellowy. When exactly does black suffering cease to be their concern? Their grandmother — raised on a postcolonial island, in extreme poverty, descended from slaves — knew black suffering intimately. But her grandchildren look white. Are they? If they are, shouldn't white people like my children concern themselves with the suffering of Emmett Till?" Zadie Smith, "Getting In and Out: Who Owns Black Pain" *Harper's Magazine*, July 2017. <<https://harpers.org/archive/2017/07/getting-in-and-out/>>

12. Unlike some positive forms of cultural appropriation (e.g. music sampling), Schutz's is the bad kind in the sense that she is in some sense the beneficiary of something that does not belong to her

13. James Young, "Profound Offense and Cultural Appropriation," *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, Vol. 63, No. 2 (Spring 2005), p. 135.

14. C. Thi Nguyen and Matthew Strohl, "Cultural Appropriation and the Intimacy of Groups," *Philosophical Studies* Vo. 176, Issue 4 (2019), p. 989.

15. <<file:///localhost/Users/www/Zotero/storage/4QE3NVD3/what-does-it-mean-to-be-black-and-look-at-this-a-scholar-reflects-on-the-dana-schutz-controvers.html>>

16. <<https://hyperallergic.com/368290/censorship-not-the-painting-must-go-on-dana-schutzs-image-of-emmett-till/>>

© Jay Miller 2019

News from the National Office

Annual Meetings

This October, we will meet in Phoenix for our 77th annual meeting. John Kulviki and the program committee have planned several special events for us. We will hold the Friday evening Danto lecture at the Heard Museum of Native American Art. Natalie Diaz, winner of a MacArthur Award, will be the speaker, followed by a reception and private tours of the Museum. Eileen John will be the Richard Wollheim Lecturer on Thursday evening, followed by a reception.

Please note the special insert in this issue of the ASA Newsletter with the complete program, as it exists on July 31. We know that many of you like to have paper programs, so we urge you to bring this with you to Phoenix. One problem with printing programs (other than the cost) is the last-minute shuffling in program entries and other last-minute changes. The most up-to-date program is always available on our web site for the meeting. It is also on Grupio, the free app we are using for the fifth year for those of you with smart phones and tablets. Grupio has several new features this year, including the capability of including hand-outs for each session. To have yours uploaded, send it to <secretary-treasurer@aesthetics-online.org> at least a week before the meetings.

Please also note in the insert our newly revised policies on discrimination, harassment, and respectful behavior, adopted by the ASA Board of Trustees on July 13, 2019. The extensive revisions are the product of hard work by our Ombudsperson, Jeanette Bicknell, with our new Respectful Behavior Committee. This revision was sent to all current ASA members for a 30-day comment period. Sixteen members responded and most of their suggestions were incorporated into the final document approved by the Board.

In 2020 we will meet in Washington, DC, one week after the next Presidential election. In 2021, we will meet in Montreal and in 2022 in Portland, Oregon. By booking three-four years out for our annual meetings, we are on a par with other professional academic societies. With a good economy, it is increasingly difficult to find hotels that offer us reasonable lodging rates in attractive locations. We always ask for a good supply of doubles with two beds so members on tight travel budgets

can look for roommates and cut their costs. We also look for cities with reasonably competitive airfares.

Other popular choices include Chicago and Boston. We have repeatedly sought bids from hotels in those cities; nothing has been remotely affordable for our members, but we'll keep trying. Our "window" for meeting from mid-October to mid-November is also a popular time for meetings of business and other professional organizations. As we are a fairly small meeting, we don't have the bargaining power of much larger groups like the philosophers or the historians. If your institution is interested in hosting a future meeting, please let us know.

Divisional Meetings

All three of our divisional meetings in the spring and summer are thriving, and I encourage people to consider submitting their work to them. In this issue of the ASA Newsletter, we are announcing the CFPs for the 2020 Eastern and Pacific Division meetings.

- Pacific made a big move away from Asilomar last year to the Berkeley City Club. We were delighted by the attendance, especially for students and junior faculty who could not afford Asilomar. We were also charmed by the gorgeous historic property and will meet there again in 2020.

- Eastern will meet once more in 2020 in the middle of Center City at the Courtyard Marriott, which has given us very attractive lodging rates and is easy to visit for people on the east coast. Unfortunately, due to "rebranding" we can't afford this hotel after 2020 and will move to the Doubletree on Broad across from the Academy of Music for 2021. We think members will like the hotel and the central location.

- Rocky Mountain Division has been very successful at its new home at the Drury Plaza in Santa Fe, adjacent to the historic district, and will announce its CFP this fall.

- At the Southern Aesthetics Workshop August 30-31, 2019, discussions will be held to discuss whether to establish a fourth permanent division for the south. New divisions must be approved by the Board.

In 2020, for the third time, all four ASA meetings will have funds available from the Irene H. Chayes Travel Fund to support presenters with no other access to travel funds. We know this won't be enough money to meet everyone's needs, but it's a good start; we encourage everyone without institutional

support to submit their work and request consideration for these travel funds.

These divisional meetings are modest, but it still costs money to put them on (coffee service, AV, meeting rooms, etc.). We are pleased that we are close to 100% in registrations for all three meetings and are grateful to participants for understanding how important these registration fees are in covering costs for these meetings. ASA is providing significant financial support, including \$2,000 to each division for "program enhancement" that funds keynote speakers. Each division also receives from ASA \$1,000 in Chayes Travel funds for persons with no institutional access to travel funds.

We are very grateful to the volunteer organizers of these three meetings and hope you will support their efforts. We urge everyone who likes to attend the divisional meetings to seriously consider volunteering to help organize a future meeting. An unfortunate trend in recent years is the over-reliance on very junior members to handle these responsibilities. Mid-career and senior members are needed to help carry out these organizational duties.

CFPs are included on the ASA web site under "Meetings." We also send out bulk e-mail to all members with those CFPs, post on our Facebook pages, and send out notices by Twitter, along with this print newsletter. We hope we are communicating successfully with all our members in at least one venue.

Coming this fall

The Board is in the process of selecting a program chair for the 2021 annual meeting. ASA members interested in being considered as a program chair or program committee member for future meetings should contact me at <secretary-treasurer@aesthetics-online.org> and I will forward this to the Board. We are all eager to involve more ASA members in these important responsibilities.

Three members of the Board of Trustees will be completing their terms as of January 31, 2020: Robert Hopkins, Anna Christina Ribeiro, and Paul C. Taylor. The Board of Trustees is currently developing a slate of six nominees for those three openings on the Board, with terms commencing February 1, 2020. On-line elections will be held on the ASA web site in December. Members may nominate additional candidates by including the names of eight members with the nomination. The deadline for nomination is two weeks after the annual business meeting, October 27. Nominations should be sent

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). 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>

Deadline for Submissions: November 15, 2019

to <secretary-treasurer@aesthetics-online.org>. Please be sure to check with the nominee first to be sure that person agrees to the nomination.

We also are recruiting nominees for three vacancies on the Respectful Behavior committee. All nominations must be received by September 15, 2019, and should be sent to <secretary-treasurer@aesthetics-online.org>. The three selected by the Board will serve three-year terms from 2020-2022, joining the current members (Ted Gracyk, Andrew Kania, and Carolyn Korsmeyer) who are serving three-year terms from 2019-2021.

The complete policies are included in this Newsletter and are available on the ASA Web site under ASA Policies: <https://cdn.ymaws.com/aesthetics-online.org/resource/resmgr/files/ASA_policies_on_discriminati.pdf>.

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 Pacific Division Meeting March 22-23, 2019

After a great deal of deliberation, the Pacific Division's 2019 meeting was held March 22-23, 2019 in a new venue: the Berkeley City Club, in Berkeley, CA. The division relocated the conference from its longtime meeting place at the Asilomar Conference Grounds largely to make the meeting more accessible and affordable for participants—especially graduate students and faculty with limited travel funding. The organizers, Anthony Cross and Shelby Moser, also hoped that the relocation would allow the division to focus on what has made the Pacific Division meeting so great in the past: in-depth, long-form discussion of the best new work in aesthetics and the philosophy of art.

Fortunately, the meeting proved successful in all of these respects. Participants enjoyed meeting in the heart of Berkeley in the Julia Morgan-designed venue, and the program itself was generally excellent. Prof. Elisabeth

Camp (Rutgers) delivered a keynote entitled "Expressive Style as Perspectival Performance"; participants were treated to two panels—one on the philosophy of the television series *Black Mirror* and the other on aesthetic motivation; and authors and commenters discussed papers on topics ranging from the meaning of Black arts movements to "zombie formalism" and its implications for aesthetic theory. Participants especially enjoyed the pre-read format for accepted papers, which allowed for more extensive discussions during sessions.

Attendance was both robust and diverse. The organizers received 37 paper submissions and two submitted panels; 13 papers were accepted, as were both panels. 6 of the accepted papers were authored by women; 5 were authored by graduate students. Of the 41 individuals on the program—including chairs and commentators—22 identified as women or people of color. More than half of the participants were pre-tenure faculty, non-tenure-line faculty, or graduate students.

The division meeting relied on generous financial support from the ASA. The ASA provided program enhancement funding to support Prof. Camp's keynote. The organizers were also able to offer travel funding to four participants in the form of Irene H. Chayes Travel grants from the ASA.

Given the enthusiasm for the location and venue, the Pacific Division will be meeting at the Berkeley City Club again next year, March 20-21, 2020. The co-organizers, Shelby Moser and Emine Hande Tuna, can be contacted at <ASAPacific2020@gmail.com>.

ASA Eastern Division Meeting April 4-6, 2019

The Eastern Division's 2019 meeting was held from April 5-6 at the Courtyard Marriott in Philadelphia for the second year in a row.

Professor Amie L. Thomasson (Dartmouth) delivered the plenary address, entitled "The Ontology of Art: Keeping it Easy, Keeping it Real," tying her recent work in ontology and meta-ontology to her previous work on the ontology of art. Temple University's Beardsley Lecture was once again held in the Barnes Foundation's auditorium, and this year was delivered by Professor Fred Rush (Notre Dame), whose paper was entitled "Film in Time". Participants once again had the chance to tour the Barnes Foundation's collection of more than 4000 art objects, including more than 900 paintings by Impres-

sionist, Post-Impressionist, and Modernist masters.

Our attendance remains high, with 74 registered participants, 62 of which were presenters or commentators. Of these 62 presenters and commentators, 31 identified as women, many of them women of color. The organizers received 50 paper submissions, of which 28 were selected for presentation after double-anonymous review, along with an author-meets-critics session on Saam Trivedi's *Imagination, Music, and the Emotions: A Philosophical Study* (SUNY Press, 2017). The topics discussed ranged from aesthetic emotion, the relationship between music and dance, and between fiction and the world, to racebending in fiction, "atmosphere" in architecture and scenography, and Sartrean imagination.

The meeting relied on generous support from the ASA, which funded Prof. Thomasson's lecture along with ordinary event costs. The organizers were also able to offer travel funding to six participants in the form of Irene H. Chayes Travel grants from the ASA. Finally, Temple University funded Prof. Rush's Beardsley Lecture.

The 2020 meeting of the Eastern Division will once again be held at the Courtyard Marriott in Philadelphia, from April 17-18, 2020. The deadline for submissions is January 15, 2020. The co-organizers, Laura di Summa, Michel-Antoine Xhignesse, and Javier Gomez-Lavin, can be contacted at <easa.submissions@gmail.com>.

Salish Sea Aesthetics Workshop May 10-11, 2019

The first-ever Salish Sea Aesthetics Workshop was held at the University of British Columbia from May 10-11, 2019. The goal of the workshop was to bring together scholars working in aesthetics and art history in the Salish Sea region, which includes the Pacific Northwest and the coasts of southern British Columbia. The workshop also aimed to bring philosophers into closer contact with, and educate them about, the region's indigenous art history, which is very well-documented but nevertheless remains critically under-discussed.

Measured along these dimensions, the workshop was an unqualified success. We accepted ten submissions, nine of which were presented at the workshop; three of these were by women, and five of the presenters were graduate students. Although most

presenters were existing ASA members, the workshop drew several new faces as well, including two independent artists; among the non-presenting participants, several were local art historians and graduate students interested in aesthetics.

The papers presented covered a wide range of topics in aesthetics, from the historical, continental, and contemporary analytic traditions. The first day of the workshop was attended by 17 people, and 21 attended on the second. The majority of participants came from British Columbia, Washington, and Oregon, as expected, but we also had some attendees from as far afield as Rhode Island. Six of the participants identify as women, one of whom is indigenous.

At the end of the first day, participants went on a guided tour of UBC's Museum of Anthropology and its collection of indigenous art and artifacts, which it holds in consultation and partnership with the relevant First Nations. Participants learned about differences in depth of carving and use of pigment between the Haida, Kwakwaka'wakw, Musqueam, and Skwxwú7mesh peoples, and about the history of the museum's collection of indigenous artifacts and artworks. Participants were also invited to interact with Michael Nicoll Yahgulanaas's Bone Box (2007). The tour was followed by supper in downtown Vancouver, where the atmosphere was friendly and lively, and participants socialized readily.

The second day was capped with a keynote address by Michael Nicoll Yahgulanaas, an activist and Haida artist. Yahgulanaas gave moving accounts of his time on the frontlines of resistance to the non-consensual development of unceded indigenous land, of his efforts to protect Haida biocultural diversity, and of his artistic career, which has explored the themes of identity (especially indigenous identity), environmentalism, and the human condition.

The workshop was organized by David Friedell (UBC), Ian Heckman (UBC), and Michel-Antoine Xhignesse (UBC), with generous support from the ASA, which provided funds for childcare, catering, student travel, and the museum tour, Dominic McIver Lopes (UBC), who provided funds for the keynote, and UBC's Department of Philosophy, which supplied our meeting room. One participant took advantage of the daycare subsidy.

Several attendees volunteered to help organize another conference next year; stay tuned to find out more, and keep an eye out for our call for abstracts!

Harvard-NYU Aesthetic Normativity Workshop May 10-11, 2019

The ASA generously contributed funds to a two-day workshop on the topic of aesthetic normativity, hosted at Harvard University. The goal of this workshop was to bring together scholars in aesthetics with scholars working on normativity in other fields in order to discuss the topic of aesthetic normativity. After opening remarks mapping the problem space of aesthetic normativity by Samantha Matherne (Harvard University), there were five talks with five commentators: Alex King (SUNY Buffalo) with comments from Errol Lord (University of Pennsylvania), Brian Soucek (UC Davis) with comments from Erin Kelly (Tufts), Hannah Ginsborg (UC Berkeley) with comments from Francey Russell (Yale), Rob Hopkins (NYU) and Nick Riggle (University of San Diego) with comments from Caitlin Dolan (UC Berkeley), and Alva Noë (UC Berkeley) with comments from Becca Rothfeld (Harvard University). At the end of the second day, there was a panel whose task had been to listen to the various talks and point out the themes and questions that emerged. Members of this panel included Jenny Judge (NYU), Antonia Peacocke (NYU), Nico Sillins (Cornell), and Brad Skow (MIT), and it was moderated by Robbie Kubala (Columbia). This panel discussion then opened into a broader group discussion for all attendees.

Regarding the demographics, the speakers, commentators, and chairs were scholars working at different career stages (3 graduate students, 4 postdocs, 6 junior professors, and 9 senior professors). On the program, there were 12 women, 10 men, and 4 persons of color. As for attendance, over the course of the two days, there were roughly 50 attendees. Attendees included undergraduate students, graduate students, and faculty from universities and colleges in the Boston area, including Harvard, MIT, Boston University, and Boston College. Most attendees were from philosophy, but there were a few from Literature and Art History.

The funds from the ASA were used to cover lodging for members on the program. In addition to these funds, the workshop also received funds for travel and food from the Harvard Department of Philosophy, the Provostial Funds at Harvard, and the New York Institute for Philosophy.

The workshop was a success. The aim of the workshop was to have a sustained conversation about questions surrounding the topic of aesthetic normativity, and this is precisely

what happened. The speakers and commentators provided insight into aesthetic normativity from perspectives ranging from meta-ethics, philosophy of mind, epistemology, phenomenology, to Kantianism. And the wrap-up panel not only distilled out overarching themes and lingering questions, but also put pressure on certain guiding assumptions. As a result of these concentrated efforts, there was a sense that progress had, indeed, been made on thinking through the nature of aesthetic normativity.

Samantha Matherne, Assistant Professor, Philosophy, Harvard University

2019 Canadian Society for Aesthetics

About fifteen scholars traveled to Vancouver, British Columbia to attend the CSA's annual meeting, which was held at the University of British Columbia, June 1st - 3rd. The meeting had a truly international flavor, with participants attending from Canada, the U.S., Poland and Romania. The meeting was held along with seventy other societies under the auspices of Canada's Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences. Given the fine spring weather, and the natural and cultural attractions both in Vancouver and at the University, there was more than enough food for the soul to make the trip a rewarding one for all those in attendance.

In keeping with CSA tradition, the program avoided concurrent sessions, and allowed plenty of program time for discussing each participant's paper: this created a spirited and congenial atmosphere over the three days, and enabled participants both to learn from audience comments and to enjoy each other's company. The conversation and good cheer continued each evening in pre-arranged dinners at two of Vancouver's fine downtown restaurants.

The papers represented a variety of intriguing and sharply shaped interests. Day One began with Roger Seamon's "Two and a Half Cheers for New Criticism: A Chapter in the History of Literature in the Research University"; followed by Adam Andrzejewski's "Aesthetic Eating." Session two was devoted to David Conter's "Artworks Have Been Commodities for a Very long Time."

The afternoon began with John H. Brown's "Reinterpreting 'Beautiful for me'" and was followed by Tanya Whitehouse's "Assessing Architectural Function and the Ruin Category." The final session of the day was devoted to James M. Dow's "Appreciating Wildness:

Awareness of Agency in Nature Aesthetics." Day Two began with Vanda Bozicevic's "Purposelessness With a Purpose"; followed by Victor Yelverton Haines's "World-Based Make-Believe." Session two consisted of John E. MacKinnon's "Lionel Trilling and the Importance of Returning Serve." The afternoon began with Ancuta Mortu's "Psychological Framings of Art Appreciation"; followed by David Collins on "Collingwood and the Moralism / Autonomism / Immoralism Debate."

Day Three began with James O. Young on "Kant's Musical Anti-Formalism"; followed by Peter Alward's "Musical Persistence." In the final session of the conference Michel-Antoine Xhignesse presented "A Defence of Tourists"; followed by Ira Newman's "The Imprint of the Literary Text on Fictional Worlds."

Next year's meeting will be held at Western University, in London, Ontario, May 30-June 1, 2020. For further information check the CSA website <www.csa-sce.ca>, the Call for Papers in this ASA Newsletter, or contact me at <inewman@mansfield.edu>.

Ira Newman
Mansfield University

Aesthetics News

Call for Nominations: Respectful Behavior Committee

Deadline: September 15, 2019

The Respectful Behavior Committee currently has three vacancies. ASA now invites nominations (including self-nominations) for those positions. Complete information on the nomination procedure is included below and at the end of the policies. All nominations must be received by September 15, 2019, and should be sent to <secretary-treasurer@aesthetics-online.org>. The three selected by the board will serve three-year terms from 2020-2022, joining the current members (Ted Gracyk, Andrew Kania, and Carolyn Korsmeyer) who are serving three-year terms from 2019-2021.

The complete policies are included in this Newsletter and are available on the ASA Web site under ASA Policies:

<https://cdn.ymaws.com/aesthetics-online.org/resource/resmgr/files/ASA_policies_on_discriminati.pdf>.

Respectful Behavior Committee

The Committee shall consist of six persons, nominated (including self-nominated), with election by the ASA Board of Trustees. Nominations shall be solicited by bulk e-mail sent to all current ASA members, with additional announcements, as appropriate, on the ASA web site announcements, Facebook, Twitter, and the ASA Newsletter.

The nomination deadline for initial establishment of the committee shall be November 15, 2018, with submissions to be sent to <secretary-treasurer@aesthetics-online.org>. The nomination deadline commencing in 2019 shall be September 15 with submissions to be sent to <secretary-treasurer@aesthetics-online.org>.

Nomination shall include a short CV and cover letter addressing interest in and qualifications for membership on the Committee, including how they would contribute to the committee and its diversity.

Terms will extend from January 1 - December 31 for three years. Members may serve one additional term after initial appointment; after one year off the committee, previous members may again be considered for membership.

When applications are received on September 15, the Secretary-Treasurer will share them with the leadership (chairs and assistant chairs) of the Feminist Caucus Committee and Diversity Committee. Each Committee will be asked to identify preferred candidates, after appropriate consultation with the membership of the full committee of current ASA members. At least three preferred candidates should be recommended, listed either alphabetically or rank-ordered, by each committee. The Officers and Trustees will be required to give very serious consideration to these recommendations from each committee in making their final selections. The lists of preferred candidates by the committees must be sent to the Officers no later than December 1, so the Trustee balloting can be completed in December.

In making the selections, the Officers and Trustees should be mindful of the overall makeup of the Committee and aim for diversity in all its forms, including race, gender, sexual orientation, disability, seniority and security within the profession, and experience with comparable institutional committees.

Members must be members of the ASA throughout their term of service on the

committee.

Working with the Ombudsperson, the Committee shall review for possible revision the existing policy each biennium following its adoption or subsequent revision, taking into account recommendations received from ASA members and the Board of Trustees, and shall be responsible for making recommendations for future revisions, as appropriate, with final revisions approved by the Board of Trustees.

Members should be available to serve as Acting Ombudsperson when the Ombudsperson finds it necessary to recuse due to conflicts of interest or is unable for other reasons to attend an ASA meeting. Members should be available to assist in representing the Committee at ASA Annual Meetings and Divisional meetings, if the Ombudsperson is unable to attend, with appropriate travel support from the ASA.

Members shall assist in development and implementation of appropriate educational and training activities for members on Discrimination, Harassment, and Respectful Behavior.

The Ombudsperson shall be considered a voting member of the committee. A quorum for purposes of voting shall be 50% of the membership plus one. Members shall be subject to all ASA policies, including but not limited to the current policies on Conflict of Interest and on Privacy and Data. The Ombudsperson shall serve as chair of the committee.

As the membership of the Committee regularly rotates, the names shall be available on the ASA web site with this posting of the policy, once approved.

ASA Announces Election of New Trustees

The American Society for Aesthetics announces an election for three new trustees in December 2019. As provided in the ASA By-laws, Article VII, the current Board of Trustees will nominate six ASA members to stand for election as trustee. The three trustees elected will serve for three-year terms (February 1, 2020 - January 31, 2023). The nominations will be announced on the ASA Web site and via e-mail to all members as soon as available. Bios of the nominees will be available in the December 2019 ASA Newsletter.

Additional nominations can be made by any eight members of the Society. All such ad-

ditional 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 27, 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 are eligible to vote by logging into the web site, looking for the red "Members" button in the upper-right, and clicking the "Trustee elections" sub-menu. Members unable to vote on-line should notify the Secretary-Treasurer no later than December 1, 2019, and will be sent a mail-in ballot; notification should be sent to the ASA mailing address, above. Robert Hopkins, Anna Christina Ribeiro, and Paul C. Taylor will complete their terms as trustees on January 31, 2020. For more information on the current trustees and the ASA By-laws, see the ASA Web page (<http://aesthetics-online.org>). Look for the "ASA" red button in the upper-right and click the "About the ASA" sub-menu.

Two ASA members named fellows at the NYU Center for Ballet and the Arts

Two long-time ASA members, Kristin Boyce and Barbara Gail Montero, have been named residential fellows at the NYU Center for Ballet and the Arts for 2019-20. The CBA is an international research institute for scholars and artists of ballet and its related arts and sciences. It exists to inspire new ideas and new ballets, expanding the way we think about the art form's history, practice, and performance in the 21st century.

The Center is made possible by founding and ongoing support from The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation and New York University and additional support from The Charles H. Revson Foundation, Fishman Family Fund, an advised fund of the Brooklyn Community Foundation, Merce Cunningham Trust, Stavros Niarchos Foundation, and The Virginia B. Toulmin Foundation.

Kristin Boyce is Assistant Professor of Philosophy and Faculty Fellow in the Shackouls Honors College at Mississippi State University. She received a doctorate in Philosophy from The University of Chicago in 2010. She is the recipient of numerous awards and fel-

lowships including an ACLS New Faculty Fellowship, a postdoctoral fellowship from Stanford University, and a Josephine De Karmán Dissertation Fellowship. Her primary research interests are in Philosophy of Art, History of Early Analytic Philosophy, and Wittgenstein. She is the 2019 Mississippi State University Humanities Teacher of the Year.

At CBA, Boyce will develop a manuscript organized around a concept of "conversation" that is first articulated by Diotima, one of the only female figures in Plato's dialogues. In The Symposium, Diotima describes conversation not (as contemporary philosophers often think of it) as a vehicle for conveying information but instead as a medium for forming and transforming the soul of a citizen. The book argues that although contemporary philosophy and the arts find themselves in radically transformed circumstances, they should, and sometimes do, continue to answer to this time-honored Socratic aspiration and that the choreography of Alexei Ratmansky provides the best example of how this can be done.

Barbara Gail Montero is Professor of Philosophy at the City University of New York Graduate Center and the College of Staten Island. She has been awarded research fellowships from the National Endowment for the Humanities, the American Council of Learned Societies, and The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. Her research focuses on one or the other of two different notions of body: body as the physical or material basis of everything, and body as the moving, breathing, flesh and blood instrument that we use when we run, walk, or dance. Before entering academia, she was a professional ballet dancer.

How should we understand the "kinesthetic appeal" of movement? Philosophers have traditionally confined the aesthetic realm to the visual and aural: beauty may be seen, but it can't be felt. At CBA, Montero aims to provide a philosophical grounding for the kinesthetic experience and appeal of dance, as well as to investigate the relevance of such experiences for athletes.

ASA Announces 2019 Selma Jeanne Cohen Prize in Dance Aesthetics

The American Society for Aesthetics is pleased to announce the winner of the 2019 Selma Jeanne Cohen Prize in Dance Aesthetics, *Dancing in Blackness: A Memoir*, by Halifu Osumare, published by the University Press of Florida in 2018.

Dr. Halifu Osumare is Professor Emerita in the Department of African American and African Studies (AAS) at University of California, Davis, and was the Director of AAS from 2011-2014. She has been a dancer, choreographer, arts administrator, and scholar of black popular culture for over forty years. With a Ph.D. in American Studies from the University of Hawai'i at Manoa, and an MA in Dance Ethnology from S.F. State University, she is also a protégé of the late renowned dancer-anthropologist Katherine Dunham and a Certified Instructor of Dunham Dance Technique.

She has been recognized as one of the foremost scholars of global hip-hop, publishing *The Africanist Aesthetic in Global Hip-Hop: Power Moves* in 2007 and, *The Hiplife in Ghana: West African Indigenization of Hip-Hop* in 2012, after her 2008 Fulbright Fellowship at the University of Ghana, Legon. She has published numerous journal articles and book chapters on hip-hop, dance, and Katherine Dunham.

The prize was established in 2008 in memory of Selma Jeanne Cohen, and with enormous gratitude for her generous bequest to the ASA. The \$1000 prize is awarded every year, for critical articles or books of distinction in dance aesthetics, dance theory, or the history of dance published in English.

Dr. Osumare will be presented with the prize at the 77th Annual Meeting of the American Society for Aesthetics in Phoenix October 9-12, 2019. She also will be honored at the annual Dance Scholars Breakfast at the meeting.

A session on her book will be on the program at the Annual Meeting on Saturday from 11:15-1:15, with Dr. Osumare and commentators.

ASA Approves Grants to Update Diversity Curricula

The ASA Board of Trustees has approved the award of grants of \$500 each to the eight authors of the diversity curricula prepared in recent years to update their materials. The Trustees are pleased that so many teachers have been able to make use of the curricula to diversify their teaching in aesthetics and is eager to extend the life of this project with updated materials.

The current curricula are available to the public here: <https://aesthetics-online.org/page/CurriculumGrants>.

It is expected that each update will add 4-5 recent articles or book chapters (preferably with publication dates of 2018-2019), following the same format currently used for the published curricula. Completed updates will be posted to the ASA web site no later than January 1, 2020.

This fall, the Trustees will consider whether to invite a new round of perhaps two more curricula at \$5,000 each.

Food, Art & Philosophy

Mexico City, 3-4 October 2020

The philosophy of food is an emerging and distinctive area of philosophical enquiry, and much of the work in this area has been informed by philosophical aesthetics. In recent years, philosophers have found it especially productive to explore connections between aesthetics and the philosophy of mind. This conference aims to bring together these two developments to explore what can be learned about food by approaching it from philosophical perspectives that are richly informed by our best aesthetic theories and our best theories of the mind.

The conference will take place at the Institute of Philosophical Research, UNAM, it will be free and open to the public and is organized by Dr. Paloma Atencia Linares (UNAM) and Dr. Aaron Meskin (UGA).

Conference Program

Thursday 3rd October
Sala José Gaos (IIF, UNAM)
10:00-11:00

Welcome and brief overview on the research on the philosophy of food.
Aaron Meskin [University of Georgia] & Paloma Atencia [UNAM]
Chair: Moisés Vaca [UNAM]

11:00 - 12:30
Food is art because it looks good
Ophelia Derooy [Ludwig-Maximilians Universität München | Munich Center for Neuroscience]
Commentator: Miguel Ángel Sebastián [UNAM]
Chair: Ricardo Mena

12:45 - 14:15
Aesthetics of food porn
Uku Tooming [University of Tartu]
Commentator: Daniel Drucker TBC
Chair: David Fajardo [UNAM]

14:15 - 16:00 Lunch

16:00 - 17:30
What shall we hate to eat?
Axel Barceló [UNAM]
Commentator: Patrik Engisch (University of Freiburg) TBC
Chair: Aaron Meskin [University of Georgia]

17:45 - 19:15
Food Fraud, or Taste and Authenticity
Sarah Worth [Furman University]
Commentator: Sheila Lintott [Bucknell University]
Chair: Alessandro Torza

20:00 Conference dinner by Chef Juan Escalona

Friday 4th October
Sala José Gaos (IIF, UNAM)

10:00 - 12:00
Interdisciplinary Panel
Sarah Bak-Geller (History and Anthropology, UNAM) TBA
Miriam Bertrán (Dept. for Health Attention, UAM) "Taste, Food Culture and Politics in Mexico"
Juan Escalona (Chef | Sexto Colectivo) "Back to contingency: A critic to modern Mexican cuisine"
Discussion
Chair: Paloma Atencia

12:15 - 13:45
"Is Flavour Aesthetic? Is Food Art?"
Mohan Matthen [University of Toronto]
Commentator: Alessandro Torza [UNAM]
Chair: Daniel Drucker TBC

13:45 - 15:15 Lunch

15:15 - 16:45
Bittersweet Food
Shen-yi Liao [University of Puget Sound]
Commentator: Ricardo Mena [UNAM]
Chair: Axel Barceló [UNAM]

16:45 - 18:15
Meals and Meaning
Eileen John [University of Warwick]
Commentator: David Fajardo [UNAM]
Chair: Miguel Ángel Sebastián

This is the first event that ASA has funded in Mexico.

For more information please email the organizers: Paloma Atencia Linares <atenciap@filosoficas.unam.mx> or Aaron Meskin <aaron.meskin@uga.edu>.

ASA Funds BU Conference on Literature, Philosophy, and Aesthetics

The American Society for Aesthetics is pleased to announce a grant of \$1,900 for the Boston University Colloquium on Literature, Philosophy, and Aesthetics: Wittgenstein and Literary Studies on November 1-2, 2019. The Colloquium is organized by Professor Robert Chodat, Department of English at BU, and is co-sponsored with the BU Center for the Humanities. The Colloquium is free and open to the public. Participants will be presenting work in progress on Wittgenstein and Literature, for critique by the other participants.

The Working Schedule is as follows. As more information becomes available, it will be posted on the ASA website, Facebook, and Twitter:

Friday, November 1:

Karen Zumhagen-Yekplé (Associate Professor of English; Tulane) on Wittgenstein's literary background

Respondent: Kristin Boyce (Assistant Professor of Philosophy; Mississippi State)

Michael LeMahieu (Associate Professor of English; Clemson) on literature after/about Wittgenstein

Respondent: Espen Hammer (Professor of Philosophy; Temple)

Toril Moi (James B. Duke Professor of Literature; Duke) on Wittgenstein and literary criticism

Respondent: Richard Eldridge (Charles and Harriet Cox McDowell Professor of Philosophy; Swarthmore College)

Yi-Ping Ong (Associate Professor of Comparative Literature; Johns Hopkins) on Wittgenstein's styles and genres

Respondent: Juliet Floyd (Professor of Philosophy; BU)

Saturday, November 2:

Hannah Eldridge (Associate Professor of German; Wisconsin) on Wittgenstein and lyric poetry

Respondent: John Gibson (Professor of Philosophy; Louisville)

Magdalena Ostas (Assistant Professor of English; Rhode Island College) on Wittgenstein and narrative

Respondent: Nancy Bauer (Professor of Philosophy; Tufts)

Robert Chodat (Professor of English; BU) on Wittgenstein, science, and interpretation

Respondent: Avner Baz (Professor of Philosophy; Tufts)

Sarah Beckwith (Katherine Everett Gilbert Professor of English; Duke) on Wittgenstein, context, and history

Respondent: Naomi Scheman (Professor of Philosophy and Women & Gender Studies; Minnesota)

Ben Ware (Lecturer in Philosophy & Religion; University College London) on Wittgenstein and subjectivity

Respondent: Garry Hagberg (James H. Ottaway Professor of Aesthetics and Philosophy; Bard College)

Calls for Papers

ASA Pacific Division Meeting

Berkeley City Club
Berkeley, CA
March 20-21, 2020

Deadline: November 15, 2019

The 2020 meeting of the Pacific Division of the American Society of Aesthetics will be the division's second meeting at the Berkeley City Club in Berkeley, CA. Our new location helps to make the Pacific Division meeting more accessible and affordable for participants, while we continue to preserve what has made it great in the past: in-depth, long-form discussion of the best new work in aesthetics and the philosophy of art.

We are pleased to announce the keynote speaker for the 2020 meeting, Professor A.W. Eaton. Eaton is Associate Professor in the Philosophy Department at the University of Illinois at Chicago with affiliations in art history and gender studies. She works on topics in feminism, aesthetics and philosophy of art, value theory, the relationship between ethical and artistic value, feminist critiques of pornography, representations of

rape in the European artistic tradition, and artifact teleology. She is the editor of the Philosophy of Art section of Philosophy Compass and co-guest-editor, along with Charles Peterson, of a forthcoming (fall 2019) special issue of the Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism devoted to aesthetics and race.

We invite paper submissions on any topic in aesthetics, broadly construed. Papers from traditionally underrepresented groups (including women, racial minorities, and persons with disabilities, among others) are encouraged. We also welcome volunteers to serve as session chairs and commentators. If your paper is accepted you must become a member of the ASA and register for the conference.

Accepted papers will be presented and discussed in pre-read workshop format. All participants will commit to pre-read all accepted papers. (We do not run concurrent sessions, and the number of accepted papers will be manageable for pre-reading.) The author will have three to five minutes to introduce the paper, followed by a ten-minute presentation by the commentator, with the remaining session time allotted for question and answer. This format will be strictly followed to facilitate in-depth discussion. Paper submissions must not exceed 3,000 words in length and must be accompanied by 200 to 300-word abstracts. Submissions should be anonymized for review.

For the third year, \$1000 will be available for Irene H. Chayes Travel grants from the American Society for Aesthetics for presenters with no other access to travel funds. To apply, notify meeting organizers when you submit that you wish to be considered and include an estimate of your travel costs. Please do not include this in your paper.

Please send submissions in PDF, Word, or RTF format to <asapacific2020@gmail.com>. Please email the conference organizers, Shelby Moser & E. Hande Tuna, at this address if you have any questions or would like to volunteer to comment on a paper or chair a session.

ASA Policies: Papers presented at ASA Divisional meetings may not be presented at the ASA Annual Meeting. Everyone on an ASA program must be a member of ASA. Submissions from non-members are welcome, but if you are accepted for the program, you must join ASA within 30 days or risk being replaced on the program. Everyone must also register for the meeting. This applies to presenters, panelists, commentators, and chairs.

ASA Eastern Division Meeting

Courtyard Marriott (Center City)
Philadelphia, PA
Berkeley, CA
April 17-18, 2020

Deadline: January 15, 2020

Plenary Lecture: Sandra Lynn Shapshay, Professor of Philosophy at Hunter College (CUNY)

Temple University's Beardsley Lecture: Richard Eldridge, Charles and Harriett Cox McDowell Professor of Philosophy at Swarthmore College.

We are looking forward to a third year in our new venue, the Courtyard Marriott in Center City Philadelphia.

Papers on any topic in aesthetics are invited, as well as proposals for panels, author-meets-critics, or other special sessions. Papers and proposals from traditionally underrepresented groups (including women, racial minorities, and persons with disabilities, among others) are encouraged. We welcome volunteers to serve as session chairs and commentators.

To submit a paper or a panel proposal for consideration you **must** be a member of the American Society for Aesthetics, and if your paper is accepted you must register for the conference. You can join ASA online: <<http://aesthetics-online.org>>. **Papers** should not exceed 3,000 words, should be accompanied by a 100-word abstract, and must be prepared for anonymous review. **Panel proposals** must include a general description of the topic or theme, the names and affiliations of all proposed participants, and a long abstract (approximately 1000 words) for each of the presentations. The abstract should articulate the thesis and central argument(s) of the talk.

\$1000 will be available for Irene H. Chayes Travel grants, from the American Society for Aesthetics, for papers presenters with no other access to travel funds. To apply, notify the organizers that you wish to be considered, and estimate your travel costs. Do not include this in your paper.

Please send submission in PDF, Word, or RTF format to Laura Di Summa, Michel-Antoine Xhignesse, and Javier Gomez-Lavin at <easa.submissions@gmail.com>.

Please feel free to direct questions to the Program Co-Chairs: Michel-Antoine Xhignesse (Capilano) <michelxhignesse@capilano.ca>, or Laura Di Summa (William Pa-

terson) <eirenelaura@gmail.com>, or Javier Gomez-Lavin (University of Pennsylvania) <jglavin@sas.upenn.edu>.

ASA 78th Annual Meeting
Hilton Crystal City at National Airport
Washington, DC
November 11-14, 2020

Deadline: January 15, 2020

The ASA welcomes submissions on all aspects of aesthetics and the philosophy of art.

Papers are limited to 3000 words, must be accompanied by 100-word abstracts, and be formatted for anonymous review. These rules will be strictly enforced. Proposals for panels and author-meets-critics sessions must include a brief description of the topic, names and affiliations of all participants, and 500-word abstracts of all papers. Note that we plan to accept very few submitted panels.

Participants may submit a paper, or be part of a submitted panel, but not both. Papers may not be presented at both a regional ASA meeting and the Annual Meeting. All participants must be members of the ASA and register for the meeting. Non-members may submit papers or panel proposals, but must join the ASA within thirty days of acceptance of their contribution, or be removed from the program.

The ASA supports the Gendered Conference Campaign. In evaluating submitted panels and author-meets-critics sessions, the Program Committee will consider whether steps have been taken to include women and members of historically underrepresented and excluded groups.

Six Irene H. Chayes Travel Grants will be awarded for those presenting papers, but who do not have access to travel funds. Two outstanding papers that "nourish and sustain an ethos of inclusivity in all aspects of the Society's activities" will receive Irene H. Chayes New Voices Awards. Full time students who present papers will receive a travel stipend. These stipends are also available to those who complete the PhD in 2020 but remain unemployed at the time of the meeting. Please indicate whether you would like to be considered for these grants when submitting your paper, but do not include that in the paper itself.

Submissions will be made through the same platform, Submittable, that was used last year. For further details, please consult the 2020 Annual Meeting website at <https://

aesthetics-online.org/events/EventDetails.aspx?id=830690&group=>.

Please address all correspondence to the Program Chair, Thi Nguyen, at <asa2020washington@gmail.com>.

NAKS Biennial: Kant and the Value of Humanity
June 5-7, 2020

Deadline: January 1, 2020 at 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, and will include several talks on Kant and Aesthetics.

Papers in any area of Kant's and Kantian philosophy, from analytic, continental, or historical approaches, are welcome. We encourage as well submissions on the conference theme, "Kant and the Value of Humanity." We aim to announce which papers have been accepted by February 7, 2020.

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. Also, please indicate whether the paper should be considered for one of the two the panels sponsored by the ASA.
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.
- All submissions will be anonymously reviewed; identifying information should be included only on the cover page.

We especially encourage graduate student submissions. Graduate 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 American Society for Aesthetics will receive a reduced registration fee for the events on Kant and Aesthetics on Saturday, June 6, 2020.

2020 Canadian Society for Aesthetics

Western University
London, Ontario, Canada
May 30 - June 1, 2020

Deadline: 17 February 2020

The 2020 annual meeting of the Canadian Society for Aesthetics will take place in company with 70 other Canadian associations, as part of the 89th Congress of the Humanities and Social Sciences (<www.congress2020.ca>). Submissions on any topic in aesthetics are invited. But special interest is expressed for papers in the following areas:

1. Urban, natural and environmental aesthetics
2. Fiction, metafiction and narrative
3. Ethical and political issues in any of the arts
4. Scientific framing of problems in aesthetics and the arts
5. Aesthetic and art education
6. Philosophy of music
7. Truth and Truthfulness in the Arts.

In the initial stage of consideration, preference will be given to completed papers of 10-12 standard pages, accompanied by a 150-word abstract and suitable for presentation in fewer than 25 minutes. Abstracts, if submitted alone, will be assessed later and only if vacancies occur in the programme. Submissions should be prepared for anonymous review. Proposals for panels on special topics or recent publications are also invited, and should include names and affiliations of all participants plus an abstract of the subject matter. Participants selected for inclusion in the programme are required to pay CSA membership and conference registration fees. Submissions must be sent as e-mail attachments (PDF, Word or RTF formats).

Inquiries or submissions may be sent to Ira Newman; Philosophy; Mansfield University; Mansfield PA 16933 (USA); <inewman@mansfield.edu>.

Upcoming Events

Planning Ahead? ASA Meetings and Cosponsored Conferences

ASA Divisional Meetings

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

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

ASA Rocky Mountain Division: Drury Plaza Hotel, Santa Fe, NM, July 10-12, 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 Cosponsored Conferences and Workshops

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

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

Boston University Colloquium on Literature, Philosophy, and Aesthetics, November 1-2, 2019

Aesthetics Day: North American Kant Society, Binghamton, NY, June 6, 2020

Symposium: Conserving Active Matter: Philosophy – Degradation

As part of “Conserving Active Matter: A Cultures of Conservation Research Project,” a collaboration between Bard Graduate Center (New York), Humboldt University (Berlin), and the Rijksmuseum (Amsterdam), generously supported by The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, Bard Graduate Center (38 West 86th Street, New York City) is holding a symposium titled “Conserving Active Matter: Philosophy – Degradation as an Aesthetic Value,” 9.00 a.m. – 5.15 p.m., Friday, November 8, 2019. Convened by Ivan Gaskell and A.W. Eaton, speakers include Francesca Esmay, Rumiko Handa, Sherri Irvin, Carolyn Korsmeyer, Erich Hatala Matthes, Alva Noë, Yuriko Saito, Elisabeth Schellekens, and Jeffrey Weiss. The symposium is free and open to all interested persons, though registration via the Bard Graduate Center is necessary: <<https://www.bgc.bard.edu/events/1029/08-nov-2019-symposium-conserving>>.

For the complete schedule and more information for all ASA Meetings and cosponsored conferences, see the ASA Web site. At the bottom of each page, look for “meetings” and click “more.”

Active Aestheticians

ROBERT R. CLEWIS (Professor, Philosophy, Gwynedd Mercy University) received a \$5,000 Project Development Grant from the American Council of Learned Societies for his research, *Before 1790: The Origins of Kant's Aesthetics*.

NICK RIGGLE (Assistant Professor, Philosophy, University of San Diego) was named the *Philosophy Compass* Section Editor for the section on Aesthetics and Philosophy of Art.

JANE FORSEY & LARS AAGAARD-MOGENSEN (eds.) have just released *On the Ugly: Aesthetic Exchanges*, a set of international papers investigating the concept of ugliness. (Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2019). Contributors include Bart Verschaffel, Herman Parret, Meng-Shi Chen, Jonathan Johnson, Erin Bradfield, Jane Forsey, Rachel Silverbloom and Bertrand Naivin.

Be sure to check the ASA website for the most up to date conference program!

The benefits of ASA membership

- Members get print copies of JAAC (four per year) and the ASA Newsletter (three per year).
- Members get immediate access to the latest issues of JAAC via the publisher's website (Wiley). (Databases such as JStor have a one-year delay in availability.)
- Members have the option of a green membership, with no print mailings, at a substantial cost savings, especially for international members.
- ASA members have on-line access for one-year to the new Oxford Encyclopedia of Aesthetics, 2d ed. and a 40% discount on purchase of the hard-copy edition.
- ASA members receive a 20% discount on all Oxford University Press hardcover titles.
- Student members receive travel support to the annual meeting if they have a paper accepted.
- Student members are eligible for travel support to attend certain ASA-sponsored conferences.
- Only ASA members are eligible for the new Chayes Travel grants to the annual meeting and divisional meetings for people with no institutional access to travel to present their work.
- Only ASA members can apply for the Dissertation Fellowship, the Monograph Prize, the John Fisher Prize, the Ted Cohen Prize, the new Arthur Danto/ASA Prize, the Post-doctoral Fellowship, Major Grants, and other opportunities.
- Only ASA members can serve as editors, trustees, or officers of the Society.
- Only ASA members may present papers or commentaries at the annual meeting.
- All divisional meetings now require that program participants be ASA members.
- Only members can access the Members section of the new website, which includes current and historic records of the ASA, annual meeting programs, Divisional meeting programs, and past newsletters.
- Only members can vote in elections for trustees and officers.

New members: If you have never been an ASA member, you can join in the last three-months of the calendar year and your membership will be extended through December of the following year.

Current members: Renew your membership in December for the following year so you don't miss any issues of JAAC or the ASA Newsletter.

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, Capilano University, 2055 Purcell Way, FIR 404, North Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada V7J 3H5. <michelxhignesse@capilanou.ca>

Deadlines: December 1, April 15, August 1