

EDITORS' INTRODUCTION: PHILOSOPHY AND THE 'AFFECTIVE TURN'

Marguerite La Caze and Henry Martyn Lloyd

This special issue of *Parrhesia* has developed from the 2010 Australasian Society for Continental Philosophy's Conference at the University of Queensland on the theme of the philosophy of affect. The tradition of philosophies of affect is deep and wide, encompassing both denigration and celebration. For the Stoics, passions such as yearning, spite, grief, and fear were incorrect judgements which were excessive and contrary to reason and nature. However, not all affects were maligned: joy, caution, and goodwill, were to be cultivated. Plato, understanding the affective power of art, banished the poets from the Republic. Yet, famously, he found the origin of philosophy in wonder and the love of wisdom in *eros*. For Descartes the passions were associated with the animal spirits, with the substantive union of mind and body; if properly trained, they contributed to the good life. For Spinoza all human activity including cognition produces and is produced by affect. His account of the actions and passions of the human mind was crucial to his task of showing the connectedness of humans to nature and the naturalising of moral concepts that resulted from this view. In the ethical life Kant subordinated the affects and passions to reason. In Nietzsche's hands the denial of passion was rewritten and became a philosophy of affirmation. The philosophical tradition of affect became more focussed in the twentieth century, through the work of philosophers such as Sartre, Merleau-Ponty, Deleuze, Guattari, Irigaray, Foucault, and many others. Merleau-Ponty recognised that as different cultures variously express love, they express a variance to archetypal western conceptualisations as well, and this difference of affect is a difference in the emotion itself. Affects, according to Deleuze in his deployment of Spinoza's work, are independent of their subject. With Guattari he developed an anti-oedipal philosophy of desire and theorised art as a bloc of sensations, a compound of perceptions and of affects. The psychoanalytic tradition reads the life of the body into that of the mind: libido is in part embodied drive. Irigaray links wonder to an ethics of sexual difference. And for Foucault, far from being a mere descriptor of emotional states, affect is the site of the production of the modern soul. After a diverse history, containing so much variety, the question of affect remains firmly on the philosophical agenda: this issue explores recent developments in Continental philosophical approaches to affects.

THE SCOPE OF THE "AFFECTIVE TURN" AND THE STUDY OF AFFECT

For our purposes, the concept of affect encompasses passions, moods, feelings, and emotions and has been a recurrent theme throughout the history of philosophy, albeit more extensively in some periods than others. Yet

EDITORS' INTRODUCTION: PHILOSOPHY AND THE 'AFFECTIVE TURN'

more recently it has been claimed that since the mid-1990s there has been an “affective turn” in the humanities and social sciences. There is much evidence for such a “turn.” We note the Australian Research Council’s grant to the Centre of Excellence for the History of Emotions is the largest ever awarded to humanities research in Australia.¹ This grant is indicative of the growing international interest in the history of the emotions—there are centres for research into the history of the emotions at the University of London and the Max Planck Institute for Human Development in Berlin—and of a perception that inquiry into the emotions is of broad interest to the academy. Within literary studies the idea of a “turn” is supported by moves away from a preoccupation with theory. Since the rise of literary theory in the 1980s it has now become common to talk of “theory” as having “passed” even if it is believed that the moment of theory cannot be undone.² If the theory movement foregrounded cognitive responses to the text and thought affective responses redundant, the “affective turn” can be understood as a willingness to return to questions of readers’ affective responses. Within philosophy, evidence for the existence of an “affective turn” can be seen in the renewed interest in understanding the role of affects in, for example, the texts of Hellenistic philosophers, Descartes, Spinoza, Hume, and Kant, and in theorising the passions and emotions through developing phenomenological, psychoanalytic, and post-structural accounts of the affects. This special edition of *Parrhesia* itself and the 2010 conference which preceded it, are evidence of lively current interest in affect in Australasian Continental Philosophy. Broadly then the “turn” may be understood in terms of renewed and widespread scholarly interest in corporeality, in emotions, and in the importance of aesthetics.

Yet explicit reference to the “affective turn” as such occurs, not broadly across the humanities and social sciences, but much more narrowly in cultural studies/critical theory.³ Furthermore, claims that the “turn” constitutes an “epistemological shift” which has occurred widely in the humanities and social sciences seem hyperbolic.⁴ On the one hand, the turn to the history of emotions has not been driven by an epistemological or methodological shift but rather by the application of well established research practices, specifically those of cultural history, to the historical question of emotions. On the other hand, interest in affects themselves has been relatively constant throughout the history of philosophy. Thus, narrowly understood, the “affective turn” appears to be a specific phenomenon within cultural studies/critical theory. To substantiate this claim we need to examine the specific epistemological or methodological shifts which are taken to constitute the “turn” by those who explicitly identify with it. What does it mean to say: “the affective turn ... expresses a new configuration of bodies, technologies, and matter instigating a shift in thought in critical theory?”⁵

Proponents of the “turn” to affect locate it at the nexus of several intellectual vectors. The most comprehensive outline is given by Melissa Gregg and Gregory Seigworth in the introduction to *The Affect Theory Reader*.⁶ Though they stress the provisional status of their outline, Gregg and Seigworth trace eight vectors which together orient the “turn.” In summary, these are: phenomenological and post-phenomenological theories of embodiment; cybernetics and theories of the human/machine/inorganic; non-Cartesian traditions in philosophy; aspects of psychological and psychoanalytic theory; traditions critical of normalising power including feminism, queer, and subaltern and disability studies; a collection of attempts to react to the linguistic turn; critical theories and histories of the emotions; and aspects of science and neurology.⁷ Broad support for this list is provided by Patricia Ticineto Clough who, while tending to privilege a tradition which begins in Spinoza and leads into cultural studies/critical theory via the work of Gilles Deleuze and Brian Massumi, also notes the influence of psychoanalysis, the Heidegger/Haraway tradition of cybernetics, and post-Foucauldian critiques of normalising power.⁸

Within this broad list, the literature both extolling and criticising the idea of the “affective turn” tends to recognise the dominance of two influences. For Gregg and Seigworth, “undoubtedly the watershed moment for the most recent resurgence of interest and intrigue regarding affect and theories of affect” came in 1995 with the publication of two essays:⁹ Eve Sedgwick’s and Adam Frank’s “Shame in the Cybernetic Fold: Reading Silvan Tomkins,” and Brian Massumi’s “The Autonomy of Affect.”¹⁰ These essays have given “substantial shape to the two dominant vectors” in the “turn.”¹¹ The importance of these two essays is affirmed by Ruth Leys in her critical and wide-ranging discussion of the “turn”: Leys privileges the Sedgwick/Tomkins vector,

which leads from Silvan Tomkin's psychobiology of affects and bodily drives, as well as the Spinoza/Deleuze/Massumi vector.¹²

The effect of these vectors coalescing in cultural studies/critical theory is that beyond a broad and inclusive interest in embodiment, emotions, and aesthetics, the "affective turn," narrowly considered, foregrounds a collection of quite specific methodological/epistemological considerations and mobilises a relatively small set of intellectual tropes.

In [the affective turn's] wake, a common ontology linking the social and the natural, the mind and body, the cognitive and affective is beginning to appear, grounding such concepts as assemblage, flow, turbulence, emergence, becoming, compossibility, relationality, the machinic, the inventive, the event, the virtual, temporality, autopoiesis, heterogenic and the informational, for example.¹³

A characteristic assessment remarks that affects arise "in the midst of *in-between-ness*: in the capacities to act and be acted upon"¹⁴: affect arises between the thinking mind and the acting body, between the power to affect and the power to be affected, between two bodies, and between bodies and the world.¹⁵ "Synthesis" is another common trope of the "turn."¹⁶

Taking the "turn" as narrowly defined, the "affective turn" is a phenomenon located *outside* the ongoing traditions of philosophy even as it draws from them. This conclusion is implied by the "turn" itself: the list of vectors which orient the "turn" note several identifiable traditions of philosophy which feed into the "turn" both from a place outside (i.e. separate traditions of philosophy) and before (i.e. traditions which predate the "turn's" beginning in the mid-1990s). Philosophy has long been interested in affect and has been affected in turn: since ancient times philosophers explored wonder, love, desire, anger, lust, joy, melancholy, hate, sadness, and later anxiety, shame, anguish and many others.¹⁷ The essays in this issue take this detailed discussion of the affects as well as their theorisation further.

This collection of essays speaks to the theme of affect and will do so from within the broad and inclusive array of contemporary Continental Philosophy. In this sense these essays are part of, and celebrate, the "affective turn," broadly defined. But the essays also speak *to* the "affective turn" and in doing so adopt a critical distance from it. Particularly, the essays engage with the vector which leads from Tomkin's psychobiology of affects, or with that which lead from aspects of science and neurology. At least three papers speak directly to these themes: those by Paul Redding, Jane Lymer, and Stuart Grant.

Ruth Leys, in her analysis of the two major vectors orientating the "turn," places Tomkins in a tradition which goes back to William James and before him to Charles Darwin.¹⁸ There is no question that James is a pivotal figure. For Paul Redding, twentieth-century philosophical and psychological thought about emotion effectively started with his work. Redding's paper, "Feeling, Thought, and Orientation: William James and the Idealist Anti-Cartesian Tradition," takes James's work both as a point of origin and as a point of orientation. From James, Redding looks backwards, not to Darwin and nineteenth-century biology, but before him to a variety of non-dualist approaches to the mind that have been adopted at various times since the seventeenth century. Redding locates James within an anti-Cartesian tradition which includes thinkers as diverse as the common-sense realists such as Reid and idealists and romantics, including Fichte. This anti-Cartesianism, a tradition that aimed at undermining dichotomous conceptions of body and mind, is significant and is itself one of the vectors of the "turn." As an example, Redding discusses the famous case of Phineas Gage and his accidental frontal-lobotomy. He also looks forwards from James to contemporary neuroscience and to experiments on perception, to the tactile vision substitution systems (TVSS) technology developed by Paul Bach-y-Rita in the late 1960s and continuing today. James's work on emotion is a vantage point from which Redding looks both backwards to the tradition of German Idealism and forwards to contemporary neuroscience and experimental psychology.

EDITORS' INTRODUCTION: PHILOSOPHY AND THE 'AFFECTIVE TURN'

Although the connection is not explored explicitly here, James's anti-dualism and theory of affects precedes Merleau-Ponty's work on active perception and on the body-subject. And Merleau-Ponty's interest in and use of experimental psychology, especially Gestalt psychology, is well known: there are strong if implicit connections between this literature and the features of perception which the TVSS technology demonstrates. Jane Lymer's paper "Merleau-Ponty and the Affective Maternal-Foetal Relation" draws on Merleau-Ponty's work and deploys it in the context of contemporary obstetrics in order to develop an empirically supported understanding of the maternal-foetal relationship as an instance of affective communication. Lymer's paper has two aspects: In the tradition of Iris Marion Young, Lymer gives a rich phenomenological description of the pregnant body. She links this description with a scientific account of the inter-uterine formation of the foetus's body schema, developing Merleau-Ponty's theory to now include the idea that the foetus's body schema develops pre-partum, not, as he thought, post-partum. Demonstrating the fact that the pregnant body is both singular and divided, Lymer's paper focuses on the body-schema, first in terms of the pregnant mother and her body schema, and second, in terms of embodied communion of affect between this self and the foetal other. Lymer's paper has several implications, including the continued relevance of Merleau-Ponty to the empirical sciences and the importance of the affective structure of the maternal-foetal relationship.

The focus on the proximity of affect theory to science and empirical phenomenology continues with Stuart Grant's "An Approach to the Affective Dimension of Speaking." Insofar as the "affective turn" is conceptualised as a reaction against the "linguistic turn"—that is as a turn away from post-structuralism's analysis of language *without* reference to the affected subject or the nominally subject-less affect—Grant's paper, linking the study of language to the affective dimensions of the speaking subject, can be understood to participate in *both* by linking the "linguistic turn" and experimental phenomenology. Grant calls for research that will reveal the constitution of the affective, expressive, and embodied dimensions of speaking. For Grant "affects are expressive: rage shouts or stifles, lust sighs and moans, enjoyment smiles, surprise gasps."¹⁹ This is a provocative article in that it sets research questions for the phenomenological study of the living, embodied act of speaking. Grant begins with the recent tradition of French linguistics, before drawing on Giorgio Agamben's location of a realm between sound and meaning, and integrating Herder's *On the Origin of Language* and its emphasis on the animal ground of human speech. He then suggests using Agnes Heller's Tomkins-inspired theory of the affect, to reveal this rather neglected phenomenon. Grant imagines a phenomenological investigation derived from contemporary techniques in experimental phenomenological psychology. The aim is "to catch, reveal and hold the fleeting movement of the affective dimension of speaking as it resonates the human body, as expression of its experience of itself and the stimuli which activate it from inside and out."²⁰

Grant is optimistic that his investigations will bracket the socially and culturally determined aspects of higher-level cognitive functions of language and reveal the unmediated human animal which lies beneath, that his is "an approach which can be applied and tested across different cultures to provide a comprehensive account of what it means to speak."²¹ This optimism is shared, if less explicitly stated, by Redding and Lymer. And it is shared by many of the vectors orienting the "turn", especially those which lead from experimental psychology and neuroscience and from much of the phenomenological tradition. Affects, it is often held, are unmediated.²² These three papers together represent a tradition of inquiry, strongly aligned with the empirical sciences, which seeks to inquire into an ontologically stable substrate of the rational faculties. The three following papers also seek to inquire directly into the affects, and they do so from the perspective of aesthetics, without such firm ontological commitments. Papers by Christine Tams, Geoff Boucher, and Magdalena Zolkos each in their own way examine the relation between affects and art.

Christine Tams's "Dense Depths of the Soul: A Phenomenological Approach to Emotion and Mood in the Art of Helene Schjerfbeck" explores the complexity of the artistic expression of affects. Tams quotes Schjerfbeck as she expresses her notion of the work of the artist: "I have always searched for the dense depths of the soul ..., where everything is still unconscious – there one can make the greatest discoveries."²³ The paper is a study of "the attitudes of expression," where expression is composed of the body as a gestural expression that is closely connected to the inner state of mind. For Tams, expression as an act, "contains two topoi: the

expressed, which can be seen in the facial or gestural expression, and the *expression* itself, which lies beneath the surface (of a painting) and has to be revealed.”²⁴ Her elegant and sophisticated essay is a study of the attitudes of Schjerfbeck’s expression: Tams reads what Schjerfbeck expressed—the artworks themselves. She studies Schjerfbeck’s portraits and self-portraits, analysing a painting’s artistic production, the technique, application, and treatment of paint and texture as well as the composition of the painting’s motifs. The paper is also a study of Schjerfbeck’s inner expressions using her intimate letters to gain access to the inner attitude of expression as she was externalising it in her painting. More than this, Tams’s paper is itself a phenomenological study of moods and emotions, specifically grief, passivity, contemplation, sorrow and despair, shame (a significant emotion for the phenomenological tradition, especially Sartre), aggression, sorrow and melancholy, fear and despair, anxiety or angst (following Kierkegaard, a key affect for the existentialists), and affinity with and fearful anticipation of death.

Geoff Boucher’s “The Politics of Aesthetic Affect – A Reconstruction of Habermas’s Art Theory” takes the focus on communication and linguistic meaning further, expressly working within a “post-metaphysical” tradition, one which sets aside the question of the unmediated affected animal. Boucher traces and engages with the complex and changing relationship in Habermas’s thought between the subject of communicative action and the autonomous and affective work of art. Boucher argues that Habermas’s theory of art is best understood in terms of the manner in which the artwork discloses silenced needs. The paper begins with the views Habermas expressed in *The Theory of Communicative Action*, tracing the concessions that Habermas makes to various critics, and arriving at his retraction of his earlier position in more recent work. For Boucher this retraction is a loss; he defends Habermas’s early view against his latter. In many ways, Boucher’s paper continues a long established philosophical problematic in that autonomous art may be understood as the realm of the passions, and the paper investigates the relationship between this realm and that of communicative reason. He raises the theme of mediation between the affects and reason which is prominent in this edition particularly in papers by Sharpe, Formosa, and Deutscher; we will return to this theme below. Boucher defends Habermas’s early view, which allows that autonomous art can make truth claims. He does this by focusing on the role of the art critic who establishes the possibility of a translation between autonomous art and cognitive, normative, and explicative discourse. For Boucher, “art and criticism *together* articulate and redeem authenticity claims [made by art] – specifically, artworks non-propositionally articulate such claims, and criticism redeems these claims argumentatively.”²⁵ For Boucher, while artworks alone cannot gain universal acceptance, art criticism can.

From the beginning of the twentieth century, to the beginning of the twenty-first, and to this collection’s second investigation into inner experience and the affects through the work of art; from painting to film, this collection moves to Magdalena Zolkos’s paper “Violent Affects: Nature and the Feminine in Lars von Trier’s *Antichrist*.” Von Trier is an always controversial filmmaker and his film *Antichrist* is no exception, having attracted much critical attention particularly *vis-à-vis* its (and von Trier’s) claimed misogyny. Without dismissing this concern, Zolkos’s paper develops instead a nuanced and arguably more foundational reading of the film in terms of the affective nexus of the feminine, nature, and evil. Avoiding too a more obvious reading of the film in terms of horror, Zolkos uses Susan Sontag to read the film in terms of its pornographic aspects, its sexually explicit and violent images, aspects that for Zolkos account for its performative and affective qualities. This approach highlights the film’s proximity to an aesthetics of transgression; transgression is taken by von Trier, by Bataille and via him by Sontag, and by Zolkos as the transgressing of the rational subject and so of the rational therapeutic discourse. And so the audience, drawn into the affective engagement of this deeply visceral film, is for Zolkos, challenged to break with the rational and its calculated imaginary. The affect of transgression, particularly as it is established by Bataille, is anguish. Zolkos broadens the range of affects and reads *Antichrist* in terms of the affects of outrage and unease, shame, lust and desperation (rather than fear which is indicative of horror as a genre), despair, sorrow, and especially grief. Radicalising the terms of Tams’s paper, Zolkos takes the investigation into the “inner expressed” to mythological depths: the film becomes the expression of von Trier’s two-year-long severe depression, of the dark world of his imagination. She stresses the profound ambiguity of the film and thus our affective responses to it.

EDITORS' INTRODUCTION: PHILOSOPHY AND THE 'AFFECTIVE TURN'

This group of six papers contributes to expanding the reach of the “affective turn,” either by theorising the affects or by investigating affective lives themselves – the attitudes of expression – and their expression in the work of art. The papers understand the affects in general and in relation to art. Philosophy’s continuity with the “turn” is evident in these essays, which are situated in both philosophy and in the “turn.” They demonstrate the richness of philosophical tradition by contributing to phenomenological and post-phenomenological theories of embodiment, non-Cartesian traditions in philosophy, aspects of psychological and psychoanalytic theory, and aspects of science and neurology.

THE “AFFECTIVE TURN”: A CRITIQUE

The “turn” to affect cannot be taken without at the same time being a turn *away* from something else. Importantly it is a turn away from rationalist traditions of philosophy which are often characterised simply as “Cartesian” to signify cognitive or reason-based approaches. So the “turn” is construed as a turn away from minds, towards bodies. We note, for example, the continued importance of journals like *Body and Society*, a journal which recently published a special edition on affect.²⁶ We note too the recent special edition of *Hypatia* where Debra Bergoffen and Gail Weiss capture much of the mood of the “turn” by celebrating the extent to which we have come, “from a Platonic world where the body is a threat to virtue, from a Cartesian world where my personhood is reduced to a cogito, [and] from a Kantian world where ethics is a matter of disembodied universal principles.”²⁷ One of the celebrated ideas of the “turn” is that it “has led us to rethink the frameworks of scholarship and research that have separated the mind from the body.”²⁸ This “triumvirate” – Plato, Descartes, Kant – stands for what the “turn” is rejecting, forming the Other by which the “turn” defines itself. Yet, given the vectors orienting it, the “turn” ought not to celebrate bodies *simpliciter*, that is bodies as *mere* matter. Rather, it ought to celebrate non-dualist accounts of the self. And so it does not follow that affect theorists ought to, or need to, be disdainful of the concept of the mind; texts which celebrate the “affective turn” understand that “affect and cognition are never fully separable”²⁹; Michael Hardt, in referring to Spinoza/Deleuze, stresses that “each time we consider the mind’s power to think, we must try to recognise how the body’s power to act corresponds to it.”³⁰ As Paul Redding shows, William James, drawing as he does on non-dualist idealist traditions, does not, as is sometimes held, deny cognitive or intentional dimension to the affects. In fact rehabilitating James’s thought on these lines is a major component of Redding’s paper. And of course Merleau-Ponty’s understanding of embodied intentionality is a rejection of both the empirical subject—the subject understood as *mere* body—and the idealist subject—the subject of pure mind. Our first point is that the turn to affect is a turn away from the philosophical separation of mind and body and towards non-dualist ontologies.

A second point can be made. In its celebration of corporeality, the “turn,” narrowly construed, has a distinct tendency to re-enact the dualism being *prima facie* rejected. This tendency is especially the case insofar one of the things that is celebrated in the “turn” is the non-intentionality of emotion and affect. This is Patricia Clough:

Affect and emotion ... point ... to the subject’s discontinuity with itself, a discontinuity of the subject’s conscious experience with the non-intentionality of emotion and affect. ... The turn to affect points instead to a dynamism immanent to bodily matter and matter generally.³¹

It is clear that the subject invoked here is not the non-dualist subject, but in fact the Cartesian/dualist subject inverted: the material is privileged over mind. For Ruth Leys, affect theorists “suggest that the affects must be viewed as independent of and prior to ideology – that is, prior to intentions, meanings, reason, and beliefs – because they are nonsignifying, autonomic processes that take place below the threshold of conscious awareness and meaning.”³² Thus, rather than being a non-dualist, for Leys, Massumi “privileg[es] the ‘body’ and its affects over the ‘mind’ in straightforwardly dualist terms.”³³ Hence, the turn to affect in critical theory is also a turn, *within a dualist framework*, away from mind and toward body.

There are then two trends in the narrowly-defined “affective turn”. First, the “turn” borrows from non-dualist approaches to the body which see embodied affects as having intentional/cognitive content. This metaphysics allows theorists to reject the “ultra-rationalist” or “triumvirate’s” overvaluation of reason as being ground in a false ontology. Second, it invokes the dualism of mind and body in order to celebrate the affects as non-intentional and material. Significantly, however, this second movement lacks argumentative support: if dualism is accepted, it is hard to see why we should privilege body over mind. Particularly it is hard to see how we could *argue rationally* for this privileging; this point is a significant implication of Maxwell Deutscher’s contribution to this collection. To put this another way, there are two ways of being anti-Cartesian: The first is to reject the ontological separation of mind from body. The second is to maintain the ontological separation of mind and body but to privilege body over mind. Both of these positions fall within the remit of the “affective turn”, narrowly defined.

The first section of this essay drew attention to papers in this collection which are internal to the vector of non-dualist anti-Cartesianism. There are also papers which contribute to the study of affect from within a dualist perspective. Together they present the argument that insofar as the “turn” establishes affect as situated in movements *between*, particularly between mind and body, affect theorists ought not to be against dualism *per se*, so much as against a dualism which refuses mediation between the two poles. Accordingly, one of the very significant features of this collection is the place of essays on Kant (Formosa and Deutscher) and on philosophers influenced by Kant (particularly Habermas and Arendt, discussed by Boucher and Calcagno): these essays proceed in terms of mediation between the rational and the affective. More broadly it should be noted that scholars of Plato, Descartes, and Kant are in fact very interested in questions of affect. Kant is most often and most directly addressed by this collection. Other allegedly “ultra-rationalist” or “anaffective” thinkers are addressed particularly in papers by Heinämaa and Sharpe. Moreover, insofar as they are established as the Other of the “affective turn” the “triumvirate” and their allies are established only in caricatured form. It may be that the notion of a rational mind which experiences affects in a wholly disembodied way is only ever a cliché invoked for the purpose of ridicule.³⁴ In this vein, one of the prominent features of this collection is the manner in which it nuances philosophical responses to the question of affect that are often rejected merely because they are “rationalist.” That is, they show that as affect theorists and others set themselves against a tradition of what we may call anaffective thought, they do so only by simplification of those philosophies.

This nuanced reading of the affective dimension of philosophies is most evident in the contribution by Sara Heinämaa, “Varieties of Presence: Heidegger’s and Husserl’s Accounts of the Useful and the Valuable.” Heinämaa begins by noting that it is often held that Husserlian phenomenology is a cognitivist and ultra-rationalist philosophy, preoccupied with science, cognition, and theoretical apprehension. As she shows, this notion stems from the critique that Heidegger launched against classical phenomenology in *Being and Time*. Heidegger establishes an understanding of Husserlian objects as being a replication of the Cartesian *res extensa* and, as is well known, he rejects the idea that objects are inert as being unsuitable for the description and analysis of our practical and communal relations with the things which surround us and other humans. Heidegger holds rather that objects are active in affecting us; objects motivate us by their own forces and powers. Heidegger associates Husserl with Descartes, and does so in order to distance himself from both of them. In response Heinämaa sets herself the historical and conceptual task of showing the inadequacy of this understanding of Husserl and the fruitfulness of his phenomenology for understanding practicality and affectivity. She does this by focusing on the question of presence in Husserl’s and Heidegger’s thought, arguing that while there are clear and important differences in their analyses, this should not lead us to dismiss their common stand: both argue that presence is an essential but hidden element of experience; both contend that it can be captured by phenomenological examinations independently of theoretical and scientific considerations. Heinämaa’s aim is to show as erroneous the picture of twentieth-century phenomenology which sets in simple opposition epistemological-phenomenological explication (a philosophy of knowledge), and hermeneutic-existential interpretation (a philosophy of life). She demonstrates how Husserl accounts for the affective, aesthetic, and axiological nature of our response to objects.

EDITORS' INTRODUCTION: PHILOSOPHY AND THE 'AFFECTIVE TURN'

In contrast, the paper by Antonio Calcagno, "The Role of Forgetting in Our Experience of Time: Augustine of Hippo and Hannah Arendt" stresses the risks inherent in not considering the relation between time and affect. The paper's manner of engagement with the theme of affect may not be immediately apparent. Calcagno examines the role of forgetting in theories of time specifically in the context of Arendt and Augustine. The paper begins with Arendt's idea of the fragmented past and continues with her use of Augustine and his notion of forgetting. For Arendt's Augustine forgetting is constitutive of the structure of temporality. For Calcagno, what is significant in the relationship between Arendt and Augustine is her own forgetting, that is, the absence of the question of forgetting in her own work, particularly in the *Life of the Mind*. Calcagno reminds Arendt and shows that Augustinian forgetting becomes that which makes fragmentation possible in Arendt's theory of time. The paper then focuses closely on the importance of forgetting: Calcagno shows that forgetting and remembering work together; it is only by virtue of forgetting that we can understand memory and so therefore the past.

Arendt's work is susceptible to caricature by affect theorists as "ultra-rationalist." They may note for example the extent to which the Arendtian notion that during thinking we are nowhere – that is, timeless and spaceless – is opposed to the "turn's" interest in embodied specificity: consider for example the distance on this point between Arendt and Merleau-Ponty, for whom the thinking body must always have a specific location. Arendt is well known to have taken a rather disparaging position *vis-à-vis* the affects. Take, for example, for her claim that love is anti-political or that pity and compassion lead to the extremes of violence.³⁵ Calcagno's paper centres on one aspect of that neglect in the role that forgetting takes in affectively colouring our memory. As Calcagno shows, for Arendt the constitutive moments of time, namely, the past, the present, and the future, are "forces"; for the "affective turn," "affect is in many ways synonymous with *force* or *forces of encounter*."³⁶ The forgetting of forgetting is losing sense of how "all of the colorations offered by forgetting could affect the tonality or moods of willing: fear and hope."³⁷ A number of other papers in the issue complicate the picture of those philosophers considered antithetical to affect.

Matthew Sharpe's paper "'Only the Present is our Happiness'; On Affects in Ancient Thought: in Memoriam Pierre Hadot" is a critical tribute to Hadot, a towering figure in French academia known in contemporary Continental Philosophy mostly through his influence on Foucault's late work. Sharpe's paper is a return, via Hadot, to Classical philosophy, but with a critical eye. The major concern of his paper is to evaluate the purported other-worldliness of Classical philosophy, its anaffectivity. Against Nietzschean critiques of the devaluation of life involved in Classical thought, Sharpe, following Hadot, argues that the ancients do not sanctify a form of philosophical life-denial or other-worldliness. Rather they advocate what Nietzsche may have termed a revaluation of values, a refocus of attachment to the domain of things we can each control, and to the manner in which we perform the actions we are undertaking. As Sharpe shows, Hadot's substantive thesis is that Classical philosophy was first of all a program of existential transformation, a way of life, the principal means of which were spiritual exercises. Classical philosophy in fact took the affects as their central concern; it was a philosophical therapeutics of the passions. The therapeutic effect of philosophy came from the view that the passions involved false judgments and it was by virtue of their falsity that they engender unhappiness. Classical philosophy did not aim at the elimination of the passions, at least in their positive aspects, and it did *not* advocate the withdrawal of interest in all worldly goods or human relations. Rather it prescribed an attitude of reserve as worldly goods are pursued. The sage attains to *eupatheia*, which involves a fitting joy, gladness, and cheerfulness.

Heinämaa's argument against the cliché of the "ultra-rationalist" philosopher is continued in Paul Formosa's paper, "A life without Affects and Passions: Kant on the Duty of Apathy." The paper is a detailed reconstruction of the particulars of the Kantian duty to apathy. Formosa's starting concern relates to Sharpe's: "An apathetic life is not the sort of life that most of us would want for ourselves or believe that we have a duty to strive for. And yet Kant argues that we have a duty of apathy, a duty to strive to be without affects and passions."³⁸ However, rather than a duty to be wholly without feelings or inclinations, Formosa shows that for Kant, we ought to strive to be without affects and passions only to the extent that they disrupt the exercise of rational self-government. Apathy for Kant is "not about a 'lack of feeling' or 'subjective indifference with respect to

objects of choice,' but a question of rational engagement with values."³⁹ Continued too is Sharpe's interest in philosophical therapeutics which is foregrounded in Formosa's reading of Kant. Control over our affects and passions is gained through practices of habituation and reinforcement. Moral failure for Kant lies, not in experiencing inappropriate feelings in the first place but rather in the failure to cultivate appropriate feelings. The incorrectness of representing Kant's duty of apathy as being the duty to be wholly without feelings or inclinations is most evident when we consider motivations to the good — the feelings we are duty-bound to cultivate. Formosa concentrates on beneficence as an important example where habituation is at work, so too is the example of polite social interaction. Love and respect for others and oneself, compassion, sympathy, and moral feeling are all appropriate emotional responses to the worth of persons.

Both Sharpe and Formosa make the relationship between reason and the affects the central focus of their papers. Maxwell Deutscher's paper "Sting of Reason" also makes central the question of reason and the passions but he does so playfully and through the frame of Michèle Le Dœuff's notion of the philosophical imaginary. For Le Dœuff "the demons of counter-reason," will be part and parcel of the philosopher's practice, and will inevitably be the foundation of philosophy's idea of reason. For Deutscher, Plato, Hume, and Kant provide three pivotal moments at which to investigate reason's imaginary. The paper is framed with a reading of Plato's *Phaedrus* and the myth of the tripartite soul. Deutscher reads the myth to show that the passions are neither blind nor stupid, each having its own reasons and its own passion, and reason is rendered as a brute, guiding the horses only with a heavy use of the lash and bridle—thus for Deutscher the sting, or the lash, of reason. Plato's reason is shown as "a being whose passion is for control at any cost."⁴⁰ Significantly for this collection Deutscher shows that "Plato's story here never fitted that old cliché of a platonic reason versus earthy passion."⁴¹ The major task undertaken by Deutscher is a reading of Hume. Famously Hume reverses the Platonic relationship: reason is and ought to be the slave, not the master, of the passions. Hume does this by treating reason as inert, unable to wield causal power. Here too Deutscher works to undo these figments of Hume's imaginary, or in any event to show the ghosts which haunt it, showing the manner in which in the face of common experience Hume has to concede that reason performs an ancillary role in relation to passion's aims. Specifically Deutscher shows that reason has the power to structure our various motives: it is an enabling or disabling cause after the manner of a trigger or switch. Rather than being inert, the sting of reason differs in its mode of action to the force of the passions. Deutscher finally turns to Kant's pure practical reason. Kant avoids the clash of freedom and causality by placing pure reason in the noumenal and actions in the phenomenal. He then bridges the two domains with pure practical reason which, in the idea of our respect for moral law, establishes the possibility of traffic between them. Here too Deutscher shows the ghosts in Kant's attempts to understand this feeling of respect as being devoid of affective pleasure. Kant must borrow from the phenomenal world of feelings to describe the noumenal world of pure reason: not only our feeling of respect, but also our awe and satisfaction all speak of affective pleasure. So while for Kant pure practical reason bridges the two worlds, Deutscher shows the bridge is already presupposed. Deutscher ultimately prefers Kant's imaginary to Hume's though the terms of his understanding of Kant are not exactly Kant's own: Deutscher denies the noumenal/phenomenal divide and so understands that "pure reason cohabits with pure passion and thus, like sense and desire, appears as a phenomenon."⁴²

Deutscher's paper shows that before either reason or passion can take precedence over its Other it must import it into its own province. He shows that the separation of reason from the passions will never be complete, that each one's reliance on the other is fundamental. But in the end Deutscher does not argue for the elimination of a division between them, but rather supports the distinction within our emotionally intelligent lives. Deutscher's paper has a significant corollary: it undoes the imagined opposition of reason and the passions which, insofar as it allows the investment in anti-rationalism, is a source of much of the enthusiasm of the "affective turn." Powerfully, Deutscher implies the "turn's" fundamental complicity in the imaginary it rejects. What is left is the live interplay between the mind and body, reason and the passions.

The idea that reason can operate in a therapeutic relationship with the passions/affects is central to the interaction between Calcagno's paper on Arendt and Bernard Stiegler's essay, "Suffocated Desire, or How the

EDITORS' INTRODUCTION: PHILOSOPHY AND THE 'AFFECTIVE TURN'

Cultural Industry Destroys the Individual: Contribution to a Theory of Mass Consumption," which is presented here in translation by Johann Rossouw. Bernard Stiegler is a theorist at the very centre of the "affective turn." His series *Technics and Time* in particular is a substantial component of the vector which is formed by theorists of cybernetics and of the human/machine.⁴³ The question of time is of central importance to both Stiegler and Arendt and so too is the place of memory. For Stiegler memory takes three forms. He develops Husserl's notions of primary and secondary retention to include tertiary retention: primary retention is what the subject retains in their consciousness of an event during its unfolding, secondary retention is what they remember of the event after its finishing and finally, tertiary retention is an exact "remembering" of the event outside any consciousness, such as in audio or video recordings. For Stiegler, "The life of consciousness consists in such arrangements of the primary retentions, filtered by the secondary retentions, while the links between primary and secondary retentions are in turn determined by the tertiary retentions."⁴⁴ It is here that the question of technics comes together with the question of time. The concern for Stiegler is that as tertiary retention becomes industrialised it constitutes a technology of control that fundamentally alters the life of the individual. This allows for what he calls the hyper-synchronisation of the time of consciousnesses. For Stiegler the threat to the individual of contemporary mass-media forms of leisure is the fact that the individual no longer has free individual time. Rather the sensory experience of social or psychic individuals is replaced with the conditioning of "hyper-masses." The aim is to ensure the flow of new products ceaselessly generated by economic activity, for which consumers don't feel a spontaneous need.

As Calcagno shows, for Arendt there are broadly three axes of time: time as lived or experienced; time as spontaneity and natality; and finally time which as past and future makes possible the present and so the very existence of human beings. Nonetheless, in this context Arendt's call to return to the timeless no-place of thought can be understood to be a call to step outside the pervasively controlled time which is a feature of hyper-industrial capitalism as Stiegler analyses it. Reading Stiegler and Arendt together arguably demonstrates the continued need for philosophical therapeutics: Stiegler's analysis of the conditions of hyper-industrial capitalism is countered by Arendt with her call to find a place outside of time: this is her call to *think*.

AFFECT AND REASON IN THE PHILOSOPHICAL TRADITION

Taken together this collection contributes to the "affective turn" by engaging in studies of affect grounded in non-dualist ontologies and by considering affect in relation to the work of art. The collection also works against the narrowly defined "turn" by providing nuanced readings of philosophers understood by the "turn" only in clichéd terms, as ultra-rationalist or anaffective. This is a particular theme of Heinämaa's paper which shows the centrality of affectivity to early phenomenology. The collection shows the "affective turn" the rationalist ghosts which still haunt it. Deutscher does this by showing in his reading of Hume the spuriousness of imagining that the passions can wholly rule reason. Calcagno does this by showing the very great continuity between the theorists within the "turn," particularly Stiegler, and those which the "turn" would Other, particularly Arendt. Embodiment is not a significant theme in Arendt, nor is it in Calcagno's essay. It is perhaps here that the question of affect taken as a philosophical problematic sounds in its most striking counterpoint to the question of affect as taken up by the narrowly defined "affective turn." There is a warning which Calcagno's paper sounds to the "turn," a warning against a turn to the body as a *naïve* turn away from the mind. Developing this theme papers in this collection argue for the retention of the place of reason *vis-à-vis* the affects/passions. Taken together Sharpe's and Formosa's papers present to the "turn" a serious challenge on behalf of the philosophical tradition: if the "affective turn" is the embrace of affect at the expense of reason, then it is a turn away from the possibility of philosophy as therapeutics or as existential therapy. That is, the "affective turn" is a turn away from the notion that reason distances itself from the affects/passions in order to wholly disavow them. Rather reason does so in order to critically and constructively engage with them. If philosophy is to be a way of life, a process of habituation which is the substance of what Hadot calls spiritual exercises, the possibility of this critical engagement must be maintained. More profoundly, without reason's ability to distance itself from the affects, philosophy can no longer operate as critique: understanding becomes individually and politically purposeless; we are to remain at the whims of our individual or collective passions/affects.

MARGUERITE LA CAZE AND HENRY MARTYN LLOYD

Finally, the issue includes three exciting book reviews by Paul Redding, Matthew Sharpe, and Robert Sinnerbrink, of new monographs by James Chase and Jack Reynolds, Joanne Faulkner, and Matthew Sharpe and Geoff Boucher. We would like to thank the authors who have contributed the papers which constitute this special edition. For their careful, constructive comments, we thank the reviewers who assisted in the review process. And we would like to thank *Parrhesia* and the journal's regular editors. The Australasian Society of Continental Philosophy 2010 conference was sponsored by the University of Queensland's School of History, Philosophy, Religion, and Classics and by the Graduate School: we thank them for their support. We would finally like to thank those who helped us organising that event including: Michelle Boulous Walker, Chad Parkhill, Andrew Wiltshire, and the dedicated and enthusiastic team of volunteers without whom the conference would not have been possible.

DR. MARGUERITE LA CAZE is a Senior Lecturer in philosophy at the University of Queensland. She has research interests and publications in European and feminist philosophy. Her publications include *The Analytic Imaginary* (Cornell, 2002) and *Integrity and the Fragile Self*, with Damian Cox and Michael Levine (Ashgate, 2003) and articles published in *Symposium*, *Derrida Today*, *Hypatia*, *Parrhesia*, *Philosophy Today*, *Philosophy and Social Criticism*, *Political Theory*, and *Contemporary Political Theory*.

HENRY MARTYN LLOYD is a post-graduate candidate at the University of Queensland. He works at the nexus of intellectual history and philosophy. Martyn researches the history of French philosophy, particularly on eighteenth- and twentieth-century French thought. His thesis is on the Marquis de Sade in the context of Enlightenment philosophy.

EDITORS' INTRODUCTION: PHILOSOPHY AND THE 'AFFECTIVE TURN'

NOTES

1. See: <http://www.emotions.uwa.edu.au/>
2. See for example: Daphne Patai, ed. *Theory's Empire: An Anthology of Dissent* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2005).
3. See for example: Patricia Ticineto Clough and Jean Halley, eds., *The Affective Turn: Theorizing the Social* (Durham & London: Duke University Press, 2007); Gregory J. Seigworth and Melissa Gregg, eds., *The Affect Theory Reader* (Durham & London: Duke University Press, 2010).
4. Lisa Blackman and Couze Venn, "Affect," *Body & Society* 16, no. 7 (2010): 7.
5. Patricia Ticineto Clough, "Introduction," in *The Affective Turn: Theorizing the Social*, ed. Patricia Ticineto Clough and Jean Halley (Durham & London: Duke University Press, 2007).
6. Gregory J. Seigworth and Melissa Gregg, "An Inventory of Shimmers," in *The Affect Theory Reader*, ed. Gregory J. Seigworth and Melissa Gregg (Durham & London: Duke University Press, 2010).
7. *Ibid.*, 6-8.
8. Clough, "Introduction."
9. Seigworth and Gregg, "An Inventory of Shimmers," 5.
10. Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick and Adam Frank, "Shame in the Cybernetic Fold: Reading Silvan Tomkins," *Critical Inquiry* 21, no. 2 (1995); Brian Massumi, "The Autonomy of Affect," in *Parables for the Virtual: Movement, Affect, Sensation* (Durham & London: Duke University Press, 2002).
11. Seigworth and Gregg, "An Inventory of Shimmers," 5.
12. Ruth Leys, "The Turn to Affect: A Critique," *Critical Inquiry* 37, no. 3 (2011): 465-6.
13. Blackman and Venn, "Affect," 7.
14. Seigworth and Gregg, "An Inventory of Shimmers," 1.
15. See also: Michael Hardt, "Forward: What Affects Are Good For," in *The Affective Turn: Theorizing the Social*, ed. Patricia Ticineto Clough and Jean Halley (Durham & London: Duke University Press, 2007).
16. Hardt, "Forward".
17. See for example: Hagi Kenaan and Ilit Ferber, "Moods and Philosophy," in *Philosophy's Moods: The Affective Grounds for Thinking*, ed. Hagi Kenaan and Ilit Ferber, *Contributions to Phenomenology* (London & New York: Springer, 2011).
18. Leys, "The Turn to Affect: A Critique," 437.
19. *Ibid.*, 125.
20. *Ibid.*, 125.
21. Schjerfbeck in: Christine Tams, "'Dense Depths of the Soul': A Phenomenological Approach to Emotion and Mood in the Art of Helene Schjerfbeck," *Parrhesia: A Journal of Critical Philosophy* 13, (2011): 159.
22. See: Leys, "The Turn to Affect: A Critique," 437. See also part two of this essay.
23. Schjerfbeck in: Christine Tams, "'Dense Depths of the Soul': A Phenomenological Approach to Emotion and Mood in the Art of Helene Schjerfbeck," *Parrhesia: A Journal of Critical Philosophy* 13, (2011): 159.
24. *Ibid.*
25. Geoff Boucher, "The Politics of Aesthetic Affect – A Reconstruction of Habermas's Art Theory," *Parrhesia: A Journal of Critical Philosophy* 13, (2011): 74.
26. Blackman and Venn, "Affect."
27. Debra B. Bergoffen and Gail Weiss, "Embodying the Ethical - Editor's Introduction," *Hypatia* 26, no. 3 (2011): 459.
28. Patricia Ticineto Clough, "Afterward: The Future of Affect Studies," *Body & Society* 16, no. 1 (2010). See also: Leys, "The Turn to Affect: A Critique," 436.
29. Seigworth and Gregg, "An Inventory of Shimmers," 3.
30. Hardt, "Forward: What Affects Are Good For."
31. Patricia Ticineto Clough, "The Affective Turn: Political Economy, Biomedicine, and Bodies," in *The Affect Theory Reader*, ed. Gregory J. Seigworth and Melissa Gregg (Durham & London: Duke University Press, 2010), 206.
32. Leys, "The Turn to Affect: A Critique," 437.
33. *Ibid.*: 468.
34. We note, for example Luce Irigaray's reading of love as intermediary between the mortal and immortal in Plato's *Symposium* and thus a challenge to strict divisions between mind and body: Luce Irigaray, *An Ethics of Sexual Difference*, trans. Carolyn Burke and Gillian C. Gill (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993). We note too Deborah Brown's argument that Descartes's ontological separation does not imply functional separation and that for Descartes the affects are a function of the substantial union of mind and body: Deborah J. Brown, *Descartes and the Passionate Mind* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006) and Nancy Sherman's articulation of the complex role of emotions in Kant's ethics, Nancy Sherman, *Making a Necessity of Virtue: Aristotle and Kant on Virtue* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).
35. Hannah Arendt, *On Revolution* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1965); Hannah Arendt, *The Human Condition*, 2nd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998).

36. Seigworth and Gregg, "An Inventory of Shimmers," 2.
37. Antonio Calcagno, "The Role of Forgetting in Our Experience of Time: Augustine of Hippo and Hannah Arendt," *Parrhesia: A Journal of Critical Philosophy* 13, (2011): 27.
38. Paul Formosa, "A life without Affects and Passions: Kant on the Duty of Apathy," *Parrhesia: A Journal of Critical Philosophy* 13, (2011): 98.
39. *Ibid.*, 109.
40. Maxwell Deutscher, "Sting of Reason," *Parrhesia: A Journal of Critical Philosophy* 13, (2011): 82.
41. *Ibid.*
42. *Ibid.*, 91.
43. See for example: Mark Hansen, "The Time of Affect, or Bearing Witness to Life," *Critical Inquiry* 30, no. 3 (2004).
44. Bernard Stiegler, "Suffocated Desire, or How the Cultural Industry Destroys the Individual: Contribution to a Theory of Mass Consumption," Trans. Johann Rossouw, *Parrhesia: A Journal of Critical Philosophy* 13, (2011): 59.