

Considering Aesthetic Communication Mediated by Images: the Case of “Remoscope”

KANAME Mariko

Osaka University, Osaka

MAEDA Shigeru

Kyoto Seika University, Kyoto

Our purpose in this paper is to consider a training method for aesthetic communication, which is necessary for living in a modern world with an overwhelming diversity of visual images, through an examination of the significance of the visual workshop conducted by the Japanese NPO, “Remo.” Awareness of the rapid collapse of an aesthetic band among people has prompted many public institutions, particularly art museums, and private associations to actively hold cultural events in an attempt to restore it. Most of these events, however, remain experimental because they are oriented by hypotheses about human sensibilities. It is an urgent issue imposed on aesthetic study to propose theoretical grounds and direction to these experimental attempts.

1. What is “Remoscope”?

The word “Remoscope” was coined to denote images taken according to the ‘Lumière Rules’ devised by the Japanese NPO, ‘Remo’ (Record, Expression and Medium Organization). The Remo team has developed a filming method based on the work of the Lumière brothers who were pioneering filmmakers at the end of 19th century. The method consists of the following six rules: 1) Maximum 60 seconds; 2) Fixed angle (using a tripod); 3) No sound; 4) No editing; 5) No effects; and 6) No zoom. In the Remoscope workshop, participants, as a group, view each other’s everyday images taken according to these six rules (Fig. 1, 2). User-friendly digital video cameras provide freedom from complicated technical problems. In other words, there are no differences reflected in the quality of images taken by both skilled and amateur



Fig. 1 Children filming an “everyday image” using a digital video camera (photo by Tetsu Kubota)



Fig. 2 Workshop’s participants watching their video footage (photo by Tetsu Kubota)

participants. Therefore, Remo does not use the word “art” in regard to its workshop. All footage is simply called “material.”

The Remo team is motivated by the critical feeling that in modern life, people are in danger of losing their sense of independence and initiative as a result of the overwhelming diversity of visual media and its content. They organized the NPO and developed several activities (i.e., Archive for Human Activities, video lounge, etc.) associated with visual media.[1] Among them, the Remoscope workshop is intended as a form of practical basic media training for handling these visual media. Fortunately, while there is an overwhelming diversity of visual media in the modern world, people are generally able to easily purchase various visual media for recording. For some time now, almost all mobile phones have come equipped with a digital camera, and many are capable of capturing moving images. Since this technology has become less expensive each year, most adults today own at least one type of visual recording device. The workshop aims to make it as easy and familiar for people to deal with these media as it was for them to use paper and pencil in the past.[2]

How can we estimate and theoretically underpin the significance of the Remoscope workshop? In the beginning, we had taken a skeptical attitude toward this workshop style. In Japan at least, this kind of workshop that aims to teach personal sensibility and creativity commonly exploits and gathers its participants’ creativity in exchange for the trivial satisfaction of feeling that they are involved in an artistic or creative endeavor. In the end, the organizer is viewed as the authentic “creator.” There, it is considered “creative” to invent a system for exploiting and gathering anonymous creativities of the public. In corresponding with the Remo team, however, we began to think that the workshop could potentially have some significance in regard to the public’s level of media literacy.

2. The significance of the Remoscope workshop and truly aesthetic communication

1) Comparison with modern filmmakers

On the Remo website, their workshop is compared to ‘Ku-kai.’[3] ‘Ku (句)’ means ‘Haiku’ and ‘Kai (会)’ means ‘meeting’. Particularly during the Edo period, people from various social classes gathered to take part in “Ku-Kai.” They composed Haikus about a particular scene or some aspect of cultural heritage inserting a designated theme, and rated their Haikus together. This was the formation of an aesthetic community that was independent of economic interests and social distinctions.[4] The fact that the Remoscope workshop adheres to the “Lumière Rules,” whereby its participants are urged to produce “banal,” but longer takes of footage, reminds us of Andrey Tarkovsky’s reference to Japanese Haiku. This Russian filmmaker, who himself preferred to use long takes, explained his own film theory: “What attracts me in haiku is its observation of life - pure, subtle, one with its subject... This is pure observation. Its aptness and precision will make anyone, however crude his receptivity, feel the power of poetry and recognize - forgive the banality - the living image which the author has caught.”[5] Does this mean that the Remoscope workshop would be a kind of hi-tech Ku-Kai that becomes more accessible by its provision of user-friendly digital video cameras?

Moreover, one member of the Remo team, Tetsu Kubota, describes the Remoscope

workshop footage in comparison with Gilles Deleuze's concept of a "pure optical image" or "time-image." [6] In fact, Deleuze wrote about Japanese filmmaker Yasujiro Ozu as follows: "The still life is time, for everything that changes is in time, but time does not itself change, it could itself change only in another time, indefinitely... Ozu's still lifes endure, have a duration, over ten seconds of the vase... A bicycle may also endure; that is, represent the unchanging form of that which moves, so long as it is rest, motionless, stood against the wall (*A Story of Floating Weeds*). The bicycle, the vase and the still lifes are the pure and direct images of time." [7] According to Deleuze, Ozu's empty shot has this potential because it can show pure duration without being stained through organic context that prepares human action. We can easily imagine that these images are similar in appearance to those taken according to the Lumière Rules. Therefore, it seems that the Remoscope workshop encourages people to create similar images to those of filmmakers that Deleuze described as "modern" and its significance lies in reliving the creativity experienced by these filmmakers.

However, by thinking in this way, we make the mistake of ignoring the Lumière Rules and their purpose. The rules more or less force the participants to not exercise their creativity assuming that the progress of digital devices has made it easier to produce images. If we ignore the purpose of the Lumière Rules, we have to identify the images of "modern filmmakers," which mark an elaborate deviation from Hollywood's continuity editing, with Remoscope's simple non-professional footage. From this viewpoint, exclusive focus is placed on the footage as an outcome of the workshop and leaves its very process overlooked in accordance with the restrictive rules. We should add that this viewpoint ignores its adopting a style of workshop and misunderstands the aspect of participant appreciation. When watching "modern" films on a screen at the cinema or on a television set at home, several acquaintances may accompany the viewer and share the experience. As long as this is a contemporary film, the conversation afterwards may take on a critical tone since one can estimate how much the others know about film critique. On the other hand, since the participants of the workshop probably do not know each other very well, they cannot be expected to deepen their understanding about modern films but rather to simply voice their subjective impressions. Again, we should remember the Lumière Rules, which focus the workshop's interest not on the quality of the footage taken but on the shared experience of viewing it.

2) Comparison with appreciation education

Let us examine the significance of the Remoscope workshop through another comparison. Since the 1990s, many Japanese art museums have adopted a method of appreciation education developed by MoMA educator, Amelia Arenas, and have practiced it, beyond its original purpose of making a social connection between the art museum and local schools, as if it were a workshop that could improve students' sensibilities. [8] The fact that Remo itself assimilates its workshop with Kukai, as noted earlier, easily leads us to compare it with this kind of educational practice. Just as in the Arenas workshop where students verbalize what is happening in a representative level of a famous painting such as Rembrandt's "Night Watch" or Hokusai's "Ukiyo-e," Kukai participants put their shared vision of the same scene into words of Haiku. Moreover, in both the Remo workshop and appreciation education, participants share

the results of verbalization derived from their visual impression generally without having any previous knowledge of art history or film theory.

The difference between them, however, should not be overlooked. The aim of the Arenas workshop is to ensure that all participants are capable of describing what is happening in the painting with respect to its representation, using language that is intelligible for others and, of course, themselves.[9] In fact, as the *Smithsonian* magazine reports, the NYPD introduced this workshop for its police officers and found that it was very effective in helping officers objectively describe to their colleagues the scene of a crime or the appearance of a suspect.[10] On the contrary, since Haiku uses poetic language, the aim of Kukai is to share the sensibility expressed through the poetic words of a Haiku rather than the objective correlations between ordinary language and visual impressions. What pleases people in Kukai is that the same scenery or theme results in different Haikus through the different sensibilities of participants and, through the words of the Haikus, one can become aware of the being and mode of the different sensibilities of others.[11]

As in Kukai, the participants of the Remoscope workshop are also not forced to objectively describe the footage but instead simply talk to each other about their subjective impressions after viewing the footage as a group. But, against Remo's self-definition, the difference from Kukai is also obvious. In contrast with the Kukai participants who not only share their sensibilities but also write their own Haikus with poetic creativity based on knowledge about "Kigo (季語= season word)," formula and classic Haikus,[12] the workshop participants simply choose an object and point a digital video camera in its direction. In short, there is no creativity necessary for this except the ability to share sensibilities. In this regard, we tried to examine the workshop in reference to 'sensus communis' as the subjective principle for universal validity of the judgement of taste in Immanuel Kant's *Critique of Judgement*. In fact, it suggests that it is not irrelevant to suppose the ability for sharing sensibilities among the participants of the Remoscope workshop and there is surely a subjective principle for this sharing distinct from the objective common sense or language demanded in the Arenas workshop.

3) What is aesthetic communication?

Our comparative examination above reveals not only the significance of the Remoscope workshop but also the meaning of truly aesthetic communication. Participants of so-called "artistic" workshops regard the experience as an opportunity to exercise their creativity. This is possible when the word "art" no longer means skills for creating beautiful things, which had counted in the classic era, and consequently, the expression of one's personality comes to be generally regarded as "creative" without any acquisition of such skills. And, since the progress of digital devices has actually exempted us from this acquisition, all we need for the slightest satisfying feeling of being an "artist" is a personality to the extent of "many men, many minds" and authorization by the workshop host who qualifies the expression of this personality as "art." Max Weber critically pointed out this personality craze at the beginning of the last century: "... the tendency of many people (especially young people) to worship certain idols, the cult of which we today find firmly established on every street corner and in every periodical. These idols are "personality" and "experience." They are closely linked. The idea is prevalent

that the latter constitutes the former and is a part of it. One puts oneself through agonies in order to have “experience” - as this is thought to be part of the appropriate way of living for a personality - and if one fails, one at least has to act as if one had this gift of grace.”[13] Here, the “artistic” workshop brings a kind of circulation. Participants bring their own personality into the workshop, which transforms it into an “artistic” experience, and then this experience becomes a new part of the personality. They may realize a gradual growth in personality by going from one workshop to another, but we should remark that it is the host of each workshop who authorizes it as “artistic” at each cycle of this circulation.[14] Therefore, we do not think that this kind of workshop develops aesthetic communication among people with different personalities as long as it depends on the authorization of the workshop host.

We also do not think that appreciation education develops aesthetic communication among its participants. As we have seen, its participants express their sensibilities in words and learn about the other participants’ verbalized sensibilities to realize a multiplicity of sensibilities. What we question is that this process consistently depends on objective language ability and is supervised by a “navigator.” Therefore, we can imagine an extreme case where the navigator esteems a participant who says something appropriate to the context of the dialogue, without referring to the painting in question, by reading the navigator’s intent to direct the workshop.

On the other hand, we detect the possibility of aesthetic communication in the Remoscope workshop because it daringly established the Lumière Rules to repress the participants’ creativity and, when they watch the banal images derived from these rules, they are not forced to talk about what is happening in the image (this would be useless since they are the very participants who filmed images) but only about their subjective impressions. While the “artistic” workshop still values the quality of the act of production and its secondary product, and appreciation education, the quality of linguistic communication in relation to the artwork, the Remoscope workshop demands from its participants only the exertion of sensibilities and provides an occasion where they exclusively realize that their sensibilities are, or are not, in accord. On this kind of accordance among sensibilities, Kant remarked in his *Critique of Judgement*: “Hence they must have a subjective principle which determines what pleases or displeases only by feeling and not by concepts, but yet with universal validity. But such a principle could only be regarded as a *common sense*, which is essentially different from common Understanding which people sometimes call common Sense (*sensus communis*); for the latter does not judge by feeling but always by concepts, although ordinarily only as by obscurely represented principles.”[15] Based on this remark, we can consider that the participants of the Remoscope workshop, simply by talking to each other about whether they find their own footage agreeable or not, become convinced that there is surely a kind of subjective principle of judgement claiming universal validity beneath the objective common sense and that this claim also belongs to the other participants’ judgement.

2. Kant’s ‘sensus communis’ and aesthetic communication

1) Some reservations

We believe that it is possible to theoretically define the Remoscope workshop practice and

its significance by referring to 'sensus communis' as the subjective principle that Kant claimed for universal validity of the judgement of taste. In fact, the Remoscope workshop footage provides a typical example that illustrates the judgement of taste. The banal image taken with a video camera is abstracted from our practical interests because it is not only cut into a certain frame but is also cut from the images that could be next in the real context or the chain of continuity editing.[16] As Kant imagined, in *Critique of Judgement*, that he was asked if he found the palace that he saw in front of him beautiful, the Remoscope participant is also asked: "If this mere representation of the object is accompanied in me with satisfaction, however indifferent I may be as regards the existence of the object of this representation." [17] Thus, should we take the Remoscope workshop as part of the aesthetic education of man envisaged by Friedrich Schiller? Nevertheless, this comparison is obviously improbable. Since the use of a video camera with the Lumière Rules in the workshop does not place importance on the creation of images, but rather the appreciation of them, we can hardly think that the participants realize a communion between 'formal impulse' and 'material impulse' through their 'play instinct'.

Hans-Georg Gadamer, who referred to the pre-Kantian concept of 'taste' in his *Truth and Method*, criticized Kant and Schiller.[18] In his view, Kant considered this concept as the harmony between cognitive powers within individuals and was able to bridge natural concepts and the concept of freedom through this subjectivation of the concept. Schiller substantialized this harmony to develop his concept of aesthetical education of man. Gadamer says: "In his aesthetic writings, Schiller took the radical subjectivation through which Kant had justified transcendently the judgment of taste and its claim to universal validity, and changed it from a methodological presupposition to one of content." [19] In Gadamer's historical perspective, Schiller's substantialization for the Ideal of aesthetic cultivation was followed by the Romantic-Idealistic concept of "genius," which was the unconscious production of nature, and then the concept of "experience (*Erlebnis*)," which was derived from the generalization of this unconscious production within the concept of life. We already saw Max Weber's criticism against the craze of this concept of "experience" at the beginning of the last century. And, we cannot think in this historical perspective that the fascism of the last century has nothing to do with the method of "artistic" workshop where the "navigator" shows concretely how the harmony should be between the cognitive powers and leads people toward its fulfillment.[20]

At least our consideration on the Remoscope workshop should place importance not on the quality of the banal images or the mental state of the participants viewing them, but on the situation itself where the participants as a group can appreciate the images. Therefore, we do not adopt Gadamer's conclusion that the artwork itself makes people recognize "the proper being" through its expression, even though he referred to the artistic usage of photography.[21] Rather, we would like to refer to Thierry de Duve's discussion that developed around the "banal" object of a urinal.

2) Remoscope as readymade

In his *Au nom de l'art*, Thierry de Duve also tries to re-read the Kantian doctrine of aesthetic judgement referring to the pre-Kantian concept of 'taste' in a similar vein to Gadamer,

and in turn, to make a positive step forward from the antinomy between “judgement without the aesthetics, or aesthetics without the judgement” into which our contemporary art criticism falls.[22] We believe this antinomy represents a misunderstanding of the Remoscope workshop as we have seen before. Let us follow his re-reading for a while. According to de Duve, the antinomy is derived from a misunderstanding of Kantian restrictions on ‘Ideas.’[23] ‘Judgement without the aesthetics’ designates the tradition of those thinkers, from Hegel to Habermas, who believed that art could demonstrate a rational Idea through a certain intuition. Although Kant insisted that a rational Idea was not cognitive because it did not give any intuition, they think that art could be an appearance of the rational idea, or some kind of truth and therefore has a virtual power to inform people of this truth. Consequently, they are disappointed by art that eventually fails to do that. On the other hand, ‘aesthetics without the judgement’ indicates the tradition of thinkers, from Nietzsche to Deleuze, who believed that the harmony (or unharmonized harmony) of cognitive powers in the aesthetic Idea could be expounded upon by the concept of the “will to power” or “intensity.” Although Kant argued that this aesthetic Idea was not cognitive because it was connected to intuition without any mediation of concepts, they think that these concepts could replace themselves with a restrictive concept of “art,” and consequently that the concept or the term ‘art’ is already useless. Indeed, the term is not important, but truly important is their proposal of another restrictive concept as an alternative without any consciousness.

To resolve this antinomy, we must rethink art rather than taste, strictly along the lines of the Kantian doctrine of aesthetic judgement. Of course, as de Duve remarks, when Kant distinguished ‘taste’ as a need for judging the beautiful and ‘genius’ as a need for producing it, the judgements of ‘this is beautiful’ and ‘this is art’ were definitively different.[24] Duchamp’s readymade, however, erased this difference between the production of artwork and its recognition by condensing the two into a single artistic practice.[25] In this regard, we can presume that the digital video camera used in the Remoscope workshop with its Lumière Rules would be a mechanical tool for this erasing as well. Today, as long as various mechanical tools have banished the distinction between “taste” and “genius” with the help of post-modern art theories, de Duve argues that the judgement of “this is art” is an extension of the aesthetic judgement of “this is beautiful” and claims universal validity as the latter did in Kant’s doctrine. Furthermore, we can presume that the subjective judgement exerted by the participants of the Remoscope workshop on images that they had taken can also claim universal validity.[26]

However, de Duve’s resolution imposes an order on us. The judgement of taste, which was considered as a “je-ne-sais-quoi” judgement power shared by everyone and superior to that of connoisseurs even before Kant,[27] could claim universal validity in Kant because it was based exclusively on the subjective principle of harmony between cognitive powers (*sensus communis*) without referring to any objective prejudgement. According to de Duve, the judgement of taste, which became inseparable from the artistic practice, imposes on each of us an order similar to Kant’s categorical imperative prohibiting us from referring to an established condition or sense of purpose in relation to art. That is to say: “make anything-whatever in such a way that it would be called art. And also make it in such a way that, through what you would have made, an object or result from your maxim, you would have felt that this anything-

whatever would have been imposed on you by an Idea which is its rule.”[28] While de Duve expressed this imperative as it was for artists, we would like to rewrite it simply in relation to Kant’s original expression and the Remoscope workshop as follows: “Judge that banal image as art (or not art) only according to that criterion whereby you can at the same time will it to become a universal canon.” In considering this kind of imperative, we can see how it would be irrelevant to think of the Remoscope workshop as an opportunity for people to become modern filmmakers under the supervision of its coordinator. By thinking in this way, we fail to understand this workshop on two counts. On one hand, we misunderstand it by presuming that every participant can produce images that demonstrate some kind of truth as modern filmmakers do. On the other hand, we misunderstand it by presuming that the images produced according to a given procedure can be considered as art and that every participant can understand what art is. On the contrary, the Remoscope workshop encourages its participants to realize that there surely is an aesthetic principle that is exclusively subjective but also sharable beneath the objective common sense, and to judge aesthetically according to this principle on their own responsibility.

Conclusion

We can conclude that the Remoscope workshop turns each of its participants into someone who can independently evaluate images. Since the 1950s when TV broadcasting began to spread without video-recording devices, an image was evaluated for qualities other than its formalistic or representative ones. Today, its value depends on how it is arranged with other images reflecting the coordinator’s intentions. Regardless of the medium or object, this totally distinct way of evaluating images will not disappear. On the other hand, the popularization of user-friendly video cameras has produced many banal images some of which are posted to TV stations. By selecting and sorting them into programs, TV stations translate them into worth. Certain types of news shows in which the newscaster appropriately combines announcements, video footage and comments from experts give a helping hand to this trend. It is considered there that the latent “creativity” of the general public is authenticated under the supervision of the coordinator, similar to the “artistic” workshop. In this regard, part of the significance of the Remoscope workshop is to create a clear consciousness about this situation among its participants.

This trend forms an aesthetic regime as Jacques Lancière has remarked, and prolongs a political one by distributing the visible and the invisible.[29] In 2008, the “Obama girls” became famous by posting their own images accompanied by tags on YouTube without receiving any reward. The images became as valuable as those of movie stars and celebrities who had declared their support for presidential candidate Barak Obama. In addition, the Obama campaign in turn succeeded in gathering these anonymous “creativities” into support for itself, by making full use of the Internet. This means that a new imaginary system on the Internet, like YouTube, is far from demolishing this regime but rather is intensifying it by generalizing the possibility of being a coordinator. We are not sure if the “Obama girls” were completely aware of this regime or not, but if the Remoscope workshop develops its method reflecting this

regime of images, it can bring a clear consciousness about it among its participants.

Notes

- [1] *Archive for Human Activities*, commonly known as the AHA Project, aims to promote making a process: collecting and keeping private 8mm films or videos, and allowing public access to them. As for *Alternative Media Gathering*, Remo is thinking about how people who are involved in many activities send and use information, while changing the cultural and social information flow backed by the penetration of information-communication technology at the present. Remo tries to create some area of exchange information among participants and guests. See Remo's website in Japanese (<http://www.remo.or.jp/ja/project/aha/>). "Video lounge" is the type of project that Remo seeks for the possible application of projected images as interiors...music clip, screen saver, contemporary art, and so on. Remo rethinks the grammar of images through the position that part of the projected images will be consumed as part of the architecture, as "moving wallpaper," and tries to reconstruct the appropriate way and grammar for the output of such images. Cf. Remo's website in Japanese (<http://www.remo.or.jp/ja/>).
- [2] We suppose that Remo's aim reflects the concept of "la camera stylo" of Alexandre Astruc. Cf. "Naissance d'une nouvelle avant-garde - la camera stylo" in *L'ecran française*, Vol. 144, 1948, p. 325.
- [3] See Remo's website: "Special skill is not necessary in this workshop. Any participants can make a work among a beginner and experienced, and they enjoy viewing it with others. It is a workshop like a "Ku-kai" that participants enjoy a serene amazement, when an ordinary scene is seen in various perspective and dissimilated."
- [4] Cf. Kyoji Kobayashi, 俳句という遊び—句会の空間 (*Play of Haiku: Kukai's space*), Iwanami Shoten, 1991.
- [5] Andrey Tarkovsky, *Sculpting in Time; Tarkovsky The Great Russian Filmmaker Discusses His Art*, translated by Kitty Hunter-Blair, Austin: University of Texas Press, 2006, p. 66.
- [6] Naoki Honma, Tetsu Kubota, "Otherwise Than Recording on Image-Communication," *Communication-Design 2008*, Center for the Study of Communication-Design, Osaka University, 2009, p.140.
- [7] Gilles Deleuze, *Cinema 2: The Time-Image*, translated by Hugh Tomlinson & Robert Galeta, London: Athlone Press, 1989, p. 17.
- [8] The "Is This Art?" exhibition was held at Art Tower Mito, Kawamura Memorial Museum of Art, and Toyota Municipal Museum of Art from December 19. 1998 to March 22. 1999. This was based on Arenas's methodology of one-on-one viewing education. On the site of Art Tower Mito, it is emphasized that each participant can ensure the flow of one's thoughts as well as one's feelings.
- [9] We previously discussed this point in Mariko Kaname, "Considering Aesthetic Communication: directions in art appreciation," *Communication-Design 2006*, Center for the Study of Communication-Design, Osaka University, 2007, p. 103-120.
- [10] "Teaching Cops to See" in the *Smithsonian* magazine, October 2009.
- [11] According to Kyoji Kobayashi, originally Ku-kai as well as Cha-kai (tea ceremony) or Uta-awase was the common medium of communication. "Although participants praise or dispraise other's Haiku, they don't argue about this matter in white or black, they confirm a relationship between their words and themselves, or express it. In doing so, the participants gauge the difference or distance between themselves and others." See Kobayashi, *op.cit.*, p. 249. The author makes a distinction between two cases: first, the confirmation of a correspondence relation between aesthetic impression and language; and second, the comparison to others' sensibilities through language.
- [12] *Ibid.*, p. 253: "How to bring back the ku-kai is a very difficult issue. First, it is not easy to communicate through Haiku. This would require that all participants have a minimal level of common culture and take pride in language. Moreover, it is necessary to have some interest in creating verses in order not to be stereotypical, and to have some knowledge of Haiku in all ages."

- [13] Max Weber, 'Science as a vocation' in *Max Weber's Complete Writings on Academic and Political Vocations*, ed. and with an introduction by John Dreijmanis, trans. by Gordon C. Wells, New York: Algora Publishing, 2008, p. 33.
- [14] It seems that the same topic is problematic also in art appreciation education. See Tomoki Hirano, "みることによる学び—視聴覚教育理論と批判的メディアリテラシーの視点から (Learning through seeing: from the viewpoint of a theory of audio-visual education and a critical media-literacy)" in *ACOP Report 2009* (Art-Communication Kenkyu Center, Kyoto University of Art and Design). The essay includes the ex-post questionnaires for participants in appreciation education that show how the consciousness of many viewers is directed to the "navigator."
- [15] Immanuel Kant, *Kant's Critique of Judgement*, translated with introduction and notes by J. H. Bernard, London: Macmillan, 1914, §20.
- [16] Deleuze insisted repeatedly that the chain of images according to Hollywood's continuity editing was a copy of the organic scheme that practically connects our perception to adequate action. Cf. Deleuze, *op.cit.*, p. 26: "So-called classical narration derives directly from the organic composition of movement-images [montage], or from their specification as perception-images, affection-images and action-images, according to the laws of a sensory-motor schema."
- [17] Kant, *op.cit.*, §2.
- [18] Hans-Georg Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, translation revised by Joel Weinsheimer & Donald G. Marshall, New York & London: Continuum, 2nd revised edition, 1989.
- [19] *Ibid.*, p. 82.
- [20] About the relation between fascism and the substantialization of an aesthetic Ideal considering it as a goal, see Thierry de Duve, *Au nom de l'art - pour une archeologie de la modernité*, Paris: Minuit, 1989, p. 139.
- [21] Cf. Gadamer, *op.cit.*, p. 140: "Even today's mechanical techniques can be used in an artistic way, when they bring out something that is not to be found simply by looking. This kind of picture is not a copy, for it presents something which, without it, would not present itself in this way. It says something about the original [e.g., a good photo portrait]."
- [22] de Duve, *op.cit.*, p.76.
- [23] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 84.
- [24] Kant, *op.cit.*, §48: "For *judging* of beautiful objects as such, *taste* is requisite; but for beautiful art, *i.e.* for the *production* of such objects, *genius* is requisite."
- [25] Cf. de Duve, *op.cit.*, p. 82: "And yet, with the readymade, 'taste' and 'genius' become one thing while to judge and to produce are condensed into a same and single act."
- [26] *Ibid.*, p. 85: "The move of readymade gives to anyone the right to produce the artistic judgements aesthetically, it grants to ordinary people the genius in addition to the taste."
- [27] For example, cf. Jean-Baptiste Dubos, *Réflexions critiques sur la poésie et sur la peinture*, vol. 2, §26: "It is necessary that the professional people often make a mistake because their judgements are usually shattered by those of public whose voice will make the destiny of works. It is always the feeling of public that wins when the connoisseurs (*les Maitres de l'art*) and the public have different opinions about a new product..."
- [28] de Duve, *op.cit.*, p. 141.
- [29] Jacques Lancière, *The politics of aesthetics: the distribution of the sensible*, trans. with an introduction by Gabriel Rockhill, London/New York: Continuum, 2004.

This is a revised version of a paper that was originally presented at the 18th International Congress of Aesthetics, Beijing, August 2010. We owe a great debt of gratitude to Professor Thierry de Duve and Professor T. O. for their supportive advice and encouragement.