

*Total Report of the First International
Entretien of Aesthetics in Tokyo*

—“Art and Technique” and “Problem of Value”—

Tomonobu IMAMICHI

Horizon of Entretien

Why do I propose to you the word “Liberation” as the Common Place of our Entretien International d’Esthétique of this year? The common themes of our Entretien are “Art and Technique” and “Problem of Aesthetic Value”. There is no word which directly signifies liberation, libération, Befreiung in our title.

Moreover Professor Paik characterizes the crisis of our technological society as “the tendencies towards the bereavement of humanity and the destruction of nature”. So the negative side of technique is emphasized. And the three tasks of aesthetics in our time which professor Paik enumerates and exposes on the standpoint of Confucius do not have any internal relation with the concrete situation evoked by technology. They are according to Professor Paik the ideal model for ever. So in his paper there is no space for the discussion about liberation and therefore my proposal seems to be wrong.

But the stimulating paper of Professor Paik evoked many interesting questions which developed itself to the discussion where liberation became a principal topic. Professor Tertulian and I myself have emphasized the positive side of technique; according to Tertulian, it has delivered the people from their toilsome labour and according to Imamichi, it has enlarged the limited human sense and widened the historical provincialism to the humanism. Through the technique we can provide and prepare the “scholē” for human culture. Is it not a kind of human liberation from the savage wildness? Indeed Professor Paik also aims at the liberation of the humanity from the crisis of technology. The reason why professor Paik takes beauty as an ideal is that “an ideal is something without which there can be no happy and worthwhile life”. According to Professor Paik aesthetics is the way of human liberation from the bereavement of humanity which is caused by technique, because the aesthetics seeks after the beauty as an ideal.

Therefore we have two meanings of liberation, that is to say, as the first the social-material liberation of the human condition from the toilsome poverty

and as the second the personal-spiritual liberation of humanity for the beauty from the miserable interior. For the second liberation the beauty must have an internal relation with the morality. The medium between the beauty and the morality is in the case of Professor Paik his interpretation of Souriau's "Art is labour". However the axiomatic relation between the moral value and the aesthetic value is not clear enough in our discussion. Mr. Kasahara asked the real meaning of morality and Mr. Kubo put the question about the priority between goodness and beauty in the realm of the art. Professor Paik replied that under the word "moral" he understands "ethical namely purely moral and not mental" and that the work of art must be good before being beautiful, the ethical priority over the aesthetic value. Professor Armbruster, asked if such an axiological assertion is derived from Confucianism, and asked further "If yes, how is it possible for us to find out a clue to accept Confucianism in our technological circumstance which is entirely different from the time of Lun-Yu?" Professor Paik suggests that the work of art has its content which comes in contact with the meaning of life and that the life itself demands the moral perspective where the Confucian theory "Without benevolence art is in vain" always fits.

The most interesting discussion in the case of Professor Paik was the confrontation between Professor Paik and Professor Tertulian in the respect of the proposition "Art is labour". Professor Tertulian said that the classical tradition defines "The art is contemplation", and that the essence of the aesthetic experience is not labour but contemplation of something which can not be experienced otherwise. Professor Paik rebutted saying that the contemplation is the state of the aesthetic experience of appreciation and that he emphasized in his paper not the side of appreciation but the effort of the creation. Professor Tertulian replied that the process or course of the creation is not only the work of hand but the cause or the beginning of the essential substance, or that the creation is the contemplation of something original. Professor Imamichi intervened saying that the creation is renovation in various senses and that without new image there is no renovation or revolution. The new image must be invented. The invention has the side of contemplation. In this respect Imamichi recommends to come in contact with the theory of Ernesto Grassi who accentuated the inventive faculty of "bildhaftes Denken". Professor Tertulian gave comment that the art may be the synthetic activity of the tension between contemplation and labour. Concerning the modern chance operation of the new sort of art Mr. Kasahara asked if the labour-theory fits for such process of creation. Professor Paik replied that he wished to designate the necessity of thinking of the side of labour in the art and that in this respect it is necessary to have something like labour even in the chance-operation-art, because one must prepare the horizon of chance movement which sometimes demands something like labour. Professor Shibata who has been

invited to the conference of Professor Tertulian, hearing my short report in the dinner on thursday, gave comment that there is a new problem of labour in the domain of artistic activity. Namely one can make now secretly many copies of the activity of artist through the effective technological machine. It menaces the right of the labour of artists. Although this is the speaking outside the public programme and although this is entirely another scope of our discussion, it is necessary to write here the comment of Professor Shibata who shows us the relation between aesthetics and economico-politico-sociological problem-circle. Professor Minguet who wished to partake in our Entretien has also designated the problem of reproduction concerning technology and value in his paper in the VII International Congress of Aesthetics. Coming back to the discussion caused by Professor Paik, we must ask why the beauty can be the ideal for us, which enables us to make the second liberation. It is because the beauty brings about the feeling of admiration in us. With this word we can now pass to the second report, that is to say, "Puissance du beau, Impuissance de l'esthétique" of Professor Sasaki.

Professor Sasaki has shown the character of the beauty of Nature through his precise thinking in confrontation with Ohnishi, Dufrenne, Heimann and Imamichi. Through the critical and logical interpretation of the theories thought by above-mentioned scholars Professor Sasaki presents us his own theory. In general the beauty of Nature is not form, because for example the landscape itself is not a form as *eidos*, but the entire is not composed but organised by various forms. In this respect the natural object is entirely different from the manufactured object (in the terminologie of Professor Sasaki l'objet fabriqué) which has the form for the certain limited function, which is decided from outside of itself. On the contrary, according to Professor Sasaki the character of the finality of the natural object is the blooming or efflorescing of its vital force. Naturally there is "form" also in the case of the natural object. But Professor Sasaki designates "Dans la nature les formes sont à découvrir par notre curiosité scientifique ou esthétique". Therefore the form is the medium for the classification or imitation namely something invented forcibly by un-natural effort. The purely natural dimension of the nature is according to Professor Sasaki the horizon of the *amorphic*, the *inform* (l'informe). And such amorphic informic state of being is indéterminé and so infinite. It must be the object of admiration. Imamichi questioned if this state of the mind is the existential liberation to the infinite from the finite and limited remarks for the detailed ontic structure of the real world of the things. Sasaki recognized this interpretation principally.

So we come now to the third type of the liberation as admiration. This type of the liberation is not subjective. Our admiration is caused by "des rougeurs du ciel crépusculaire ou grand océan". So the natural beauty is objective. And this objectivity is not the objectivity of the property. It is the being itself.

Therefore the beauty of the nature is described by Professor Sasaki as the atmosphere of the fullness of being. It is confirmed in the vivid admiration for the atmospheric circumstance. So it is one of the types of the entire-experience of the being.

The interesting exposition of Professor Sasaki evoked also many stimulating questions and discussions.

Mr. Murayama put a question about the notion of passivity used by Professor Sasaki and Mr. Tanigawa put the question about the difference between the pure natural landscape and the mixture of the natural object and the man-made thing. Sasaki answered to Murayama the passivity in question is not only the stage of perception but one of the sort of contemplation, and yet the admiration is "expérience donnée" by the force of the being. To Tanigawa, Sasaki answered that the natural beauty is the entire which can contain man-made things. Tanigawa insisted on the subjective difference between natural beauty and the beauty of art. Sasaki did not say against Tanigawa but gave good comment that the beauty of nature is not respect for the necessity of structure but the admiration of the entire.

Professor Armbruster challenged all of us, who asked in this Entretien for the aesthetic value in the technological cohesion, with his presentation of the ethical problem. He put the question about the possibility of the normative ethics at present time. Professor Armbruster tried to construct the moral normativity through Kantian thought. He pointed out that the so-called formalism in Kant's moral philosophy is not so formal as the world says. The categorical imperative is really the principal form of moral decision, but this form is not possible without real chance of decision, and the real chance of decision is materially very concrete for each person. So, the experience of usage of categorical imperative is actually the synthesis of formal and material ethics. Imamichi said what Armbruster stated is right so far as the phenomenological structure of decision concerns, but Imamichi put a question; Because the external force of social structure diminishes our moral decision, the normative activity changed itself to the social rule. And when these social rules break down, or when the individual cannot follow this social rule, we must finally face the chance of moral decision. But this breakdown is actually "Grenz-situation" where one cannot think about the moral normativity. So, is it not impossible to construct the normative ethics at present day? Or at least is it not impossible to realize the moral decision within the normative ethics?

Tertulian pointed out, in this political world the individual morality must suffer, especially at the most important moment. Tertulian said, Armbruster's synthetic interpretation of Kant's formalism is right but the real content of material side must be historical and the reference to the historicity in the socio-political world compels us to change the moral to the skillfulness (Geschicklichkeit). Armbruster spoke against Imamichi and Tertulian in the following

argument:

The structure of human act is not simple. As Kierkegaard said, the ethical stage is not the final stage of human act. One cannot remain only in the ethical domain. It must be integrated in the religious salvation because the human moral decision, although it is serious and honest, cannot be always perfect. Beyond the secular effectivity or evaluation there is the domain of integration of moral value. According to Armbruster Tertulian tried to reduce the moral to the skillfulness and Imamichi tried to reduce the human freedom to the subjective cry in the Grenzsituation. Further Armbruster expressed his doubt about the Japanese morality. What is the core of the Japanese moral philosophy?

Imamichi tried to explain his opinion about Japanese moral: The force of the transcendent is not strong in Japanese ethics, ethics is really *ethica inter homines*. So, the ethics is the final stage of the immanent moral consciousness of the Japanese. The task of the purification which stands beyond the ethics, does not belong directly to the religion but to the aesthetics. He used, utilizing the title of Professor Sasaki *mutatis mutandis*, "la puissance de l'esthétique" in other sense than in Sasaki's title. The beauty of the act is higher than the goodness of the act, because the former is possible only when the self-sacrifice is done. In this discussion we can state that we found the fourth liberation, that is to say human liberation from the morality to the religiousity or at least to the "Weltanschauungs" faith, may it be to the beauty or may it be to the socialist welfare.

The round table with Professor Ricœur was held because of his friendly attendance for a short time at our Entretien. It was executed in the form of discussion between Prof. Ricœur, Prof. Tertulian and Prof. Imamichi concerning Ricœur's conference on "Philosophie et langage" in the University of Tokyo.

Although Prof. Tertulian estimated the effort of Ricœur to rebuild the way from language to reality, which has been neglected in the modern linguistic sciences, Tertulian designated the ambiguity of Ricœur's word reality because at one hand the reality can be the work as poem, which is also one of the systems of linguistic signs, and on the other hand the reality can be the real thing designated by linguistic signs. Ricœur says, so far as the relation between ego as myself and the world as the other concerns, there is no difference between the semantic cohesion of the poem as world and the physical cohesion as world.

Imamichi recognized Ricœur's opinion that the language is not object but means. However, according to Imamichi one must make clear the difference of types of the ways from the language to the reality. It is a question for what the language is a means. Imamichi said, the epistemological activity of language and its communicative activity are not the same, that is to say, the language as the heuristic and the language as the conveying are the different

ways from language to reality. The former is for the relation between subject and world, and the latter is for the relation between subject and subject.

If it is so, the interpretation of art as one of the linguistic functions will lose its stable position because the work of art is at one hand a text which must be known as the object of heuristic activity, on the other hand there is a personal system which is the dimension for communication. If we make stable this unstable position of interpretation, we must synthesize both these activities of language in one function, namely, we must make interpretation through integrating epistemology and communication. That is the synthesis of logics and rhetorics. This sounds beautifully but it is methodically impossible, unless we can propose one positive way for that synthesis.

Ricœur recognized Imamichi's analysis of two ways from language to reality. But Ricœur protested saying that the work of art as poem can also designate the world in other ways of discourse. Therefore we must know the direction of such designation. It is the main function of interpretation. Tertulian protested against the objective tendency of Ricœur's interpretation. Ricœur spoke against Tertulian's comment and said that the work of art as poem has no information but connotation. This connotation has perhaps no fixed limitation but at least it has some limited directions. So Ricœur insisted on the possibility of the objective designation of connotation as total dynamics of poem.

Imamichi supported Ricœur's objectivity of interpretation and put the question what is the direction of connotation of poem, namely, what is the end of the re-description of the poem. Ricœur answered the spiritual situation may be one of the ends. It concerns the self-realization through the human signs in the work. Imamichi proposed the other answer, namely, the work of art may have information and may have connotations but the soul of the poem is more than informative univocum, more than connotative aequivocum, namely it is an evocative discovery of transcendent idea for which the work in question as total exists.

Through this discussion we can point out without danger that Ricœur has accentuated the objectivity of interpretation, the ground of which is immanent in text, and he pointed out also the subjectivity of aesthetic judgement. The fifth liberation is the liberation of human spirit from the little world of prejudice or from the limited univocum of information to the final-infinite world of art through the heuristic interpretation. Imamichi dares to propose a new concept "*infinitus mundus finalis*", both because the work of art is essentially "*finalis*", since it aims at its final perfection, and because the work of art is essentially infinite, since its connotation is always fresh.

Prof. Tertulian has shown us really very important things. At first I would like to enumerate four eminent points.

- 1) Confrontation with many new scholars, whose books have not yet

been studied well in Japan, like George Poulet, gives us a new scope of study and stimulates us for the modern literary critiques.

2) The precise and also new philosophical interpretation of some well-known scholars like Lukács gives density to his conference.

3) The need of the subjective identification of the ontological or of the value in the aesthetic critics of the works is especially emphasized.

4) The value of the work of art is not patent but latent. So we must deliberate or make free the value itself from the material context.

In the discussion the attention of the participants was concentrated on the last two problems in the connection with the theory of Ricœur and of Imamichi.

Mr. Kasahara showed his sympathy to the subjective identification of Tertulian and put the question to Tertulian if he is relativist in the problem of interpretation or if he admits the absolute unicity of interpretation on which Imamichi insists. Tertulian answered it is nonsense to insist on the absolute unicity of interpretation of the work of art. Like the playing of the musical work, the interpretation must be subjective execution for evocation of the latent value of the work. Kasahara questioned further what is the rational ground of this subjective interpretation like musical execution of the work. Without this ground we cannot have any scientific or philosophical conviction for the executed interpretation.

Tertulian answered one of the most important grounds for it is the recognition of the historicity of the work. The historicity contains also the social condition and genetic explication e.g. the interpretation of Shakespeares of Jan Cott is according to Tertulian not right because of its unhistoricity.

Mr. Kubo questioned the relation between genetic historicity and atemporal value. Tertulian transformed this question to the question of the relation between genetics and axiology. According to Tertulian interpretation of the work of art must be dialectically ambivalent to these two sides. Through this tension rises the subjective identification. Imamichi spoke against Tertulian's subjectivity of interpretation which was spoken in Tertulian's answer to Kasahara's question. Each pianist, e.g. plays the piece with his interpretation. So, there are many pre-aesthetic interpretations. But as the task of us aestheticians we must criticize which pre-aesthetic so-called interpretation is the nearest to the ideal interpretation. Imamichi introduced the theory of his friend Pareyson, who is one of the most eminent aestheticians today, that interpretation is of multitude and the aesthetic judgement is unique. But Imamichi's opinion is just opposite. The aesthetic judgement may be multiple and relative but interpretation must be unique. Because the interpretation is according to Imamichi one constructed system of many aesthetic judgements and not "Sinngebung" but "Sinnfindung" namely, philosophical invention of the soul of works which must be evocated to the human consciousness. Tertulian said, so far as the task of aestheticians concerns, the interpretation

must be naturally not arbitrary but philosophical, and what he means does not so differ from what Imamichi said. The discussion was ended because of the lunch break.

The round table with Tertulian was held in the evening. Mr. Tanigawa put the question on the problem of the difference between Tertulian and Ricœur, especially on the possibility of axiological point of view. Tanigawa acknowledged the world of text of Ricœur which is the correlative of the poetical re-description. The orientation of the non-significative re-description, namely the connotative function compels our interpretation to objectivity, while the movement of the interpretation of Tertulian is the reduction to the self through the work. It is really self-identification but it is absorbing the text into the subjective redoublication.

Tertulian estimated Tanigawa's critics but at the same time protested against him saying that the text is also in the case of Ricœur a medium for the self-realization, and the interpretation of the work of art is one of the recognitions but it is not the objective recognition of the world. The world of text of Ricœur is also the other world than the so-called reality which is the object of the science or common sense. In this respect Tertulian agrees with Ricœur. But Tertulian insisted on the difference between his immanent self-identification in the work historically constructed by the human consciousness and Ricœur's objective self-realization through the human signs in the work as world of text.

Sasaki questioned Tertulian about the role of sentiment and will in the interpretation as self-identification because without "delectatio", namely without sentimental pleasure there is no real interpretation of the work of art. According to Sasaki's opinion, both Ricœur and Tertulian presupposed this pleasure before the spiritual operation of interpretation, but it must be reflected not as a matter of course. Tertulian recognized Sasaki's right comment but added his opinion saying that Ricœur's reference to imagination is one of the phases of pleasure and for Tertulian himself the interpretation is spiritual movement for self-identification not in general experience but especially in aesthetic experience which is already joyful.

So the interpretation by Tertulian is a movement from value *a quo* as pleasure to value *ad quem* as self-identification. Imamichi pointed out the importance of interpretation as a task of present aestheticians. It must be individual effort of intellect, but it must not be a relative result, because the an interpretation is also one of the types of intellectual recognitions of humanity through the work of art. So, through the discussion evoked by Tertulian's very interesting conference we can find out the sixth liberation, namely the liberation of the value as human possibility of beauty from the material virtuality.

Meanwhile there was held a special lecture in Japanese language of Professor

Ei-kyu Ree of Sugen University in Korea. Its title was "Temporality of the Art of Bashō—Interpretation of the Haiku Old Pond—". In incredibly beautiful Japanese Prof. Ree exposed three philosophical characters of Bashō's work.

1) His poem in its first appearance depicts the ontic fact clearly so that the presentation of being itself may be anticipated without the cadre of tradition.

2) Beauty of stillness with which one can feel the being of thing itself is the essence of his poem.

3) The metaphysical enlightenment without logics through which the voice of natura naturans can be touched, is the climax of his poem. Professor Ree has utilized the method of Heidegger's philosophy. Peculiarly he remarked the importance of Dohō's "Sanzōshi" where Dohō interpretes the secret method of Bashō. Dohō said "mitomeru (hold to look as recognize)" "kikitomeru (hold to hear as memorize)" and "iitomeru (hold to say as make a poem)" are the systematic complex of Bashō's creation. It is the cut of the time. This cut is the point of breaking through the human soul to the eternity.

Mr. Manabe showed very deep acknowledgement because he has also made effort to come near this poet through Dohō. Ree's communication has evoked many philosophical points in the problem of interpretation of poems.

To hold as "Ins Werk setzen" is interesting in Ree's lecture. But Mr. Tozawa has pointed out if it is not a generalization in the general aesthetics of the poetics of one genre of a haiku. Ree answered he wished positively to extract the aesthetic general possibility of "poetics of haiku" through philosophical thinking. Not only Ree's deep interpretation, his wide knowledge on Japanese literature and his precise Japanese language have also astonished us. Here is also one sort of liberation of old text to the modern philosophical world.

Lastly out of the frame of this Entretien there was also a round table with Prof. Helmut Kuhn who has visited Japan occasionally for the lectures in Tokyo Art University and in Japanese National Congress of Aesthetics. Prof. Kuhn wished originally in his lecture at the Tokyo Art University to have an encounter with the theory of extasis remarked by Imamichi. But because of the limited time, he exposed directly his own theory. At the round table in the University of Tokyo he has pointed out the importance of the "Teleologie der Natur" and "Erscheinung der poetischen Kraft" in the process of interpretation of art. Because the former is ontic anticipation of the possibility of cosmic creation and the latter is epistemological reflexion of human creation. The former is objective pre-existence of things and the latter is subjective presentation of the inner exaltation. So, there is a difference between two types of beauty. The latter type of beauty must be "Festlichkeit".

Imamichi exposed his point of view: "Art is the perfection of the objective

transformation of the matter. The interpretation is the subjective integration of this perfection. The ontological reason of the extasis could be the union of the two transcendences for completion and for integration. If it is so, we may propose a new idea of teleology of the experience of art, the summit of which is the extasis as liberation. Perhaps this liberation has Kuhn's Festlichkeit as its phenomenal form.

For the last word of all:

In all the reports and discussions with round table we could find many modern problems of aesthetics which may be reduced to the layers of liberation. The reason why the liberation of each sort comes up to the horizon of our Entretien "Art, technology, value" is clear, because the art is essentially the effect of human liberation of matter from its night to its light in form and because the time of technology is the stage of conflicts between heterogeneous types of liberation. The value which we wish to realize is also the freedom as liberation. So we may select our next task "art and liberation" or "Ars ut liberatio humana". This total report was written within limited time space. I hope there is not so much lack of topics in the intellectual tension of our Entretien. I thank heartily all members of this International Entretien for their intellectual activity and spiritual friendliness.

University of Tokyo