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Thursday, October 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2:00 PM–3:30 PM</td>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>Arts and Administration Building Lobby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Memorial University of Newfoundland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30 PM–5:00 PM</td>
<td>Plenary Session</td>
<td>JAMES MENSCH (ST. FRANCIS XAVIER UNIVERSITY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“A THEORY OF HUMAN RIGHTS”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chair: Iain Macdonald (Montréal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert G. Reid III Theatre (A-2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arts and Administration Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Memorial University of Newfoundland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 PM–7:00 PM</td>
<td>Reception</td>
<td>Junior Common Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R. Gushue Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Memorial University of Newfoundland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Friday, October 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 8:30 AM–9:00 AM  | Coffee and Registration  
Outside the Drawing Room  
Guv’nor Inn                                                                 |
| 9:00 AM–9:45 AM  | **Olivier Huot-Beaulieu**  
(Université de Montréal)  
“Négativité et logos dialectique chez le jeune Heidegger”  
Chair: Ludvic Moquin-Beaudry (Montréal)  
The Drawing Room |
| 9:45 AM–10:30 AM | **Marie-Eve Morin**  
(University of Alberta)  
“Making sense of the world beyond Heidegger”  
Chair: Peter Gratton (MUN)  
The Drawing Room |
| 10:30 AM–10:45 AM| Coffee break                                                          |
| 10:45 AM–11:30 AM| **Peter Harris**  
(Memorial University of Newfoundland)  
“Patterns of Triunity in Heidegger’s ‘Time and Being’: Contexts of Interpretation”  
Chair: Antonio Calcagno (King’s UWO)  
The Drawing Room |
| 11:30 AM–12:30 PM| **Matthew Altman**  
(Central Washington University)  
“Fichte’s Ethics as First Philosophy: A Levinasian Response to Kant and the Problem of Other Minds”  
Chair: Kyla Bruff (MUN)  
The Drawing Room |
| 12:30 PM–2:15 PM | Lunch  
(on your own)  
Business Meeting (the Study, all are welcome) |
### Plenary Session

**JONATHAN LEWIS**  
(Royal Holloway, University of London)  
“ADorno on Wagner: Problems of Interpretation in Modern Philosophy”  
Chair: Daniel Adsett (MUN)  
The Drawing Room

**CHRISTINE DAIGLE**  
(Brock University)  
“AMBIGUITY, VOLATILITY, TRANS-SUBJECTIVITY... AUTHENTICITY?”  
Chair: George Ingerman (MUN)  
The Study

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3:00 PM–4:00 PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **CHRISTINE DAIGLE**  
(Brock University)  
“AMBIGUITY, VOLATILITY, TRANS-SUBJECTIVITY... AUTHENTICITY?”  
Chair: George Ingerman (MUN)  
The Study  
**ALIA AL-SAJI**  
(McGill University)  
“BEAUVOIR, BERGSON AND MATERIAL LIFE: BETWEEN PHILOSOPHY OF EXISTENCE AND PHILOSOPHY OF LIFE”  
Chair: Christine Daigle (Brock)  
The Drawing Room  
**KARIN NISENBAUM**  
(University of Toronto)  
“ROSENZWEIG AND SCHELLING ON THE ETHICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THEOLOGICAL CATEGORIES”  
Chair: Joseph Carew (Wuppertal)  
The Drawing Room  
**MEIRAV ALMOG**  
(Tel-Aviv University)  
“MERLEAU-PONTY: THE EXISTENTIAL ONTOLOGY OF STYLE”  
Chair: Don Beith (Bishop’s)  
The Study |

---

### Saturday, October 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 8:30 AM–9:00 AM| Coffee and Registration  
Outside the Drawing Room  
Guv’nor Inn |

---

**MEIRAV ALMOG**  
(Tel-Aviv University)  
“MERLEAU-PONTY: THE EXISTENTIAL ONTOLOGY OF STYLE”  
Chair: Don Beith (Bishop’s)  
The Study

---

**KARIN NISENBAUM**  
(University of Toronto)  
“ROSENZWEIG AND SCHELLING ON THE ETHICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THEOLOGICAL CATEGORIES”  
Chair: Joseph Carew (Wuppertal)  
The Drawing Room

---

Please note: this event is by invitation only.  
Speakers, chairs, and members of the CSCP executive are on the guest list.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Panelists</th>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:45 AM–10:30 AM</td>
<td><strong>LUDVIC MOQUIN-BEAUDRY</strong>  &lt;br&gt; (Université de Montréal)  &lt;br&gt; « Aufklärung et limitation du possible »  &lt;br&gt; Chair: Olivier Huot-Beaulieu (Montréal)</td>
<td><strong>DON BEITH</strong>  &lt;br&gt; (Bishop’s University)  &lt;br&gt; “The Earth as Radical Ground: A Phenomenology of Jointed Movement and Earthly Space”  &lt;br&gt; Chair: John O’Keefe (MUN)</td>
<td>The Drawing Room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 AM–10:45 AM</td>
<td>Coffee break</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45 AM–11:30 AM</td>
<td><strong>SHANNON HOFF</strong>  &lt;br&gt; (Institute for Christian Studies)  &lt;br&gt; “The Ethics and Politics of Conscience”  &lt;br&gt; Chair: Suma Rajiva (MUN)</td>
<td><strong>FIONA UTLEY</strong>  &lt;br&gt; (University of New England)  &lt;br&gt; “Considerations of a Phenomenology of Trust”  &lt;br&gt; Chair: Brad Dunne (MUN)</td>
<td>The Drawing Room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30 AM–12:30 PM</td>
<td><strong>Plenary Session</strong>  &lt;br&gt; <strong>LISA GUENTHER</strong>  &lt;br&gt; (Vanderbilt University)  &lt;br&gt; “No Man is an Island: Levinas, Crusoe and Money”  &lt;br&gt; Chair: Marie-Eve Morin (Alberta)</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Drawing Room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30 PM–2:00 PM</td>
<td>Lunch (on your own)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 PM–2:45 PM</td>
<td><strong>FANNY SÖDERBÄCK</strong>  &lt;br&gt; (Siena College)  &lt;br&gt; “Action, Narration, and the Public Sphere: Towards an Arendtian Aesthetic Theory”  &lt;br&gt; Chair: Emily Jean Gallant (MUN)</td>
<td><strong>EVAN CLARKE</strong>  &lt;br&gt; (Boston College)  &lt;br&gt; “Two Modes of Time in the Phenomenology of Michel Henry”  &lt;br&gt; Chair: Chandra Kavanagh (MUN)</td>
<td>The Drawing Room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:45 PM–3:45 PM</td>
<td><strong>Plenary Session</strong>  &lt;br&gt; <strong>JOHN RUSSON</strong>  &lt;br&gt; (University of Guelph)  &lt;br&gt; “Intimacy and Economy: On the Phenomenology of Intersubjectivity”  &lt;br&gt; Chair: Sean McGrath (MUN)</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Drawing Room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:45 PM–4:00 PM</td>
<td>Coffee break</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Panel

**The Theologico-Political Schelling**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4:00 PM–4:45 PM</td>
<td>Cynthia Coe</td>
<td>(Central Washington University)</td>
<td>&quot;The 'Sobering Up' of Œdipus: Levinas and the Trauma of Responsibility&quot; Chair: Victoria Smith (MUN) The Drawing Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:45 PM–6:15 PM</td>
<td>Cindy Sautereau</td>
<td>(Université Laval)</td>
<td>«“L’énigme de l’autre”: altérité et réciprocity dans l’herméneutique du soi de Paul Ricoeur » Chair: Sarah Kizuk (MUN) The Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30 PM–9:30 PM</td>
<td>Devin Zane Shaw</td>
<td>(University of Ottawa)</td>
<td>&quot;Pure Contingencies: A Critique of Markus Gabriel’s Formal Ontology&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:45 PM–6:15 PM</td>
<td>Joseph Carew</td>
<td>(Bergische Universität Wuppertal)</td>
<td>&quot;Žižek’s Reading of Schelling&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:45 PM–6:15 PM</td>
<td>Sean McGrath</td>
<td>(Memorial University of Newfoundland)</td>
<td>&quot;The Role of the Negative in the Late Schelling&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30 PM–9:30 PM</td>
<td>James Bradley</td>
<td>(Memorial University of Newfoundland)</td>
<td>&quot;Philosophy and Trinity&quot;                                             Chair: Sean McGrath (MUN) The Drawing Room</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Dinner

Sign up at the registration desk by Friday for a common meal at the Guv’nor Inn. (CSCP members’ meals will be subsidized. Cash bar.)

### Party

Hosted by the Professor Jim Bradley and the Department of Philosophy, MUN 117 Strawberry Marsh Road, St. John’s
The CSCP would like to thank the following people and groups for their support in making this conference possible:

Nous tenons à remercier les personnes et groupes suivants pour leur appui :

Professor Evan Simpson; the Office of the Vice-President (Academic), Memorial University; the Department of Philosophy, Memorial University; Their Honours, John and Jane Crosbie; the Memorial University Philosophy Society; Mrs. Jennifer Dawe; Ms. Victoria Smith.

Abstracts / Résumés

Meirav Almog, *Merleau-Ponty: The Existential Ontology of Style*  
What turns a painting by Vermeer into “a Vermeer”? Is it only the fact that it was created by Vermeer? What is this elusive thing called “the artist’s style”? These questions, in the wake of André Malraux’s exploration of them, occupy Maurice Merleau-Ponty. Taking the concept of Style into account, painting – Style’s most exposed and direct manifestation – can no longer be taken as a mere representation of the world. Yet, Merleau-Ponty’s position, unlike Malraux’s, does not take the painting to be a simple expression of the artist’s private feelings. This paper is concerned with Merleau-Ponty’s concept of Style, centering on a fundamental problem that, following Husserl, deeply occupies Merleau-Ponty and is distinctively manifested in Modern painting: how humans are intertwined within generality by that which is mostly their own. Style serves as a fundamental key to this mystery, whose existential and ontological implications are far-reaching, since Style appears to be, in fact, an essential character of human existence.

Matthew Altman, *Fichte’s Ethics as First Philosophy: A Levinasian Response to Kant and the Problem of Other Minds*  
Kant provides no theoretical or practical basis for asserting others’ personhood, yet according to Kant’s ethics, this is crucial for determining our moral obligations. Fichte overcomes this problem by claiming that our sense of obligation is primary, and from that we must conceive of others as persons. We do not need first to establish others’ humanity because our existence as
morally responsible subjects depends on being “summoned” by other persons. In the Wissenschaftslehre, the problem of other minds gives way to a phenomenology of moral experience, thus anticipating an important concept in contemporary Continental philosophy.

Michael Austin, Subjectivity and Structuralism
While attention has been paid to the pre-evental in Badiou insofar as such an analysis could foster political revolution, nothing substantial has been said on the possibility of a primal or ur-event. In attempting to understand what could constitute the first event, we will explore Badiou’s anthropocentrism and his connection to the structuralist understanding of the relation of humanity to nature as one of alienation—as exemplified by his allegiance to Lacan and Rousseau. It will be suggested that to accept Badiou’s model of subjectivity, one must also accept the structuralist thesis that the human is equiprimordial with language.

Don Beith, The Earth as Radical Ground: A Phenomenology of Jointed Movement and Earthly Space
The Copernican debate hinges on whether the earth moves or rests—but this sense of rest is a mere privation of movement. In this paper I demonstrate how a sense of absolute rest undergirds three different senses of movement. First, by reading Aristotle, I demonstrate that locomotive bodily movement rests on an unmoving Earth which cannot be conceived of as a mere moveable or immovable body. Second, I argue that Merleau-Ponty’s account of perception as habituated bodily movement relies on a conception of the past as not merely elapsed time but as a non-present but absolute ground within the present. Finally, I work out the implications of the moving and perceiving body’s dependence on absolute rest by reading a late fragment where Husserl boldly asserts that the earth does not move, but rather serves as an original “place” that is not yet in extended space or serial time, but serves as the ground of all spatial and temporal sense.

Evan Clarke, Two Modes of Time in the Phenomenology of Michel Henry
In this paper, I develop an account of Michel Henry’s theory of temporality. I show that Henry distinguishes between the immanent time of Life and the transcendent time of mundane experience. I next offer a critique of this theory. I show that while Henry’s two-fold model of time is phenomenologically illuminating, it creates problems at the level of his overarching, meta-phenomenological theory of Life. I argue that that this overarching theory can nevertheless be discarded, without damage to the integrity of Henry’s basic observations with respect to temporal experience.

Cynthia Coe, The “Sobering Up” of Œdipus: Levinas and the Trauma of Responsibility
Levinas’s work insistently challenges the association between responsibility and intention, an association he attributes to the Greek tradition. However, the undermining of this strict pairing of responsibility and deliberate choice also lies at the core of that most iconic of Greek tragedies, Oedipus Tyrannos. Oedipus’ shifting self-conception dramatizes the traumatic structure of responsibility characteristic of the human condition. In his later work, Levinas describes the ethical demand as coming from an immemorial time, disrupting the normal consuming and
gathering power of the knowing ego, and opening a space and the uncanny impetus for responsibility. We are confronted with the question “What right do I have to be?”, but the question can of course only be asked by one who already does exist, and so finds herself accused of what she has not chosen and unable to rectify what she has done. That is, our responsibility is not limited to what we have consciously chosen and deliberately performed.

**Christine Daigle, Ambiguity, Volatility, Trans-subjectivity… Authenticity?**
My paper brings Beauvoir in a conversation with contemporary figures such as Grosz and Braidotti as well as Foucault in order to address the problem of the ethical and political authentic striving for a human being that ought to be defined as ambiguous. I begin by defining ambiguity and examining how the existential subject that makes itself freely is never in isolation. This subject is in need of caring in the midst of its existence as an embodied worldly being. As a being with-others, the ambiguous subject ought to care for himself but also for others. I conclude that for this subject to be authentic it is crucial that relations with others be reciprocal and be the positive agonistic encounter of freedoms that Foucault calls for. Such relations will foster and sustain authentic becoming for the ambiguous self. The ethics of ambiguity thus leads to a politics of ambiguity with authenticity as its driving force.

**Anna Ezekiel, Death and Affirmation in Novalis’ Account of the Poetic Self**
This paper argues that, despite his valorization of death, the work of Friedrich von Hardenberg (Novalis) is an attempt to affirm human existence. Novalis’ vision of the human being is of a developing, organic, “poetic” self that creates and recreates itself by integrating its various characteristics and experiences into a single, meaningful whole. By doing so, the poetic self overcomes the isolation and loss of purpose that attends an account of the self that overemphasizes individuality and consciousness. It might seem strange to cast Novalis as a writer of affirmation, given his reputation as life-denying, escapist, and morbid. However, Novalis’ celebration of death does not entail a rejection or denigration of life. Rather, Novalis reclaims death for his account of what life is and why it is valuable, viewing this project as important for overcoming the fragmented and alienated existence that he sees as having arisen as a result of the hegemony of discursive reason.

**Peter Harris, Patterns of Triunity in Heidegger’s “Time and Being”: Contexts of Interpretation**
The essay on “Time and Being” is central to Heidegger’s later thinking on the question of Being. Its importance is sometimes overlooked, perhaps on account of the difficulty of its material. Some key notions around which it circles are: time and being, giving and sending, the triune ecstatic relations of time, and the further triunity of giving, time and being, which Heidegger designates as “matters,” not entities. By reference to earlier thought on subsistent “relations of opposition” in the theology of the Trinity, I provide a context in which interpretation of Heidegger’s thought is to some extent facilitated. I draw the conclusion that, in spite of the entirely different context of Heidegger’s thinking on these matters, a thread of continuity with the metaphysical tradition which he seeks to overcome is a valuable aid to the interpretation of this key text.
Shannon Hoff, *The Ethics and Politics of Conscience*
In this paper I will explore the tension between shaping and being shaped—between the authority of tradition, laws, norms, and social practices, and the authority of the single individuals needed to enact them. I will show that in interpreting, maintaining, and challenging a tradition, every human being risks transgression—of the *tradition*, of its own *self* as an inheritor of it, and of the *demand*, mostly embodied in others, to act responsibly. What I will argue here, however, is that this risk is necessary, and that acting in the service of an inheritance requires creating it anew and making it speak in new ways. I want to explore, that is, the *necessity* and *necessary risk* of interpretation, and do so in interaction with the work of Hegel and the tradition of continental philosophy more broadly, suggesting the ways in which this theme has enlivened this tradition.

Olivier Huot-Beaulieu, *Négativité et lógos dialectique chez le jeune Heidegger*
Qui se rapporte à *Être et temps* et constate le rôle décisif qu’y exerce la négativité pourrait être tenté d’y percevoir l’œuvre d’une interprétation dialectique de la phénoménologie. Et pourtant, Heidegger pourrait difficilement y être plus sévère à l’égard de la dialectique qu’en la qualifiant d’« embarras philosophique authentique » et qu’en lui substituant une plus radicale « 'herméneutique’ du lógos ». (SZ, 25, tr. 41) *Être et temps* en révèle toutefois bien peu quant aux motifs profonds de cette préférence et c’est pourquoi il peut être pertinent de se rapporter aux textes issus des années vingt, où ceux-ci sont exposés et développés plus longuement. Heidegger y met en effet en scène, sur un ton singulièrement polémique, les enjeux du débat qui oppose l’authentique phénoménologie au néohégélianisme montant. À partir d’un survol de ces textes, il nous sera possible de prendre la mesure des griefs de Heidegger à l’endroit de la dialectique hégélienne, mais aussi de constater que son opposition frontale camoufle une secrète appropriation.

Jonathan Lewis, *Adorno on Wagner: Problems of Interpretation in Modern Philosophy*
Plausible as the analytical approach to philosophy seemed to be in the light of the predictive and technological power of the natural sciences, the project of setting up a theory of meaning in this manner is now widely regarded as decisively flawed. This paper will attempt to explore the tensions between the analytical school and continental traditions through their contrasting approaches to interpretation. Taking a comment by Theodor W. Adorno in 1963 as my starting point, the study will illustrate how Adorno’s interpretation of Wagner aligns itself to a specifically Continental way of approaching aesthetics as exemplified by Martin Heidegger and Hans-Georg Gadamer. I will not be attempting to transcend the issues surrounding interpretation. Indeed, as this paper aims to show, to attempt to surpass these problems would be nothing short of an attempt to overcome one of the major philosophical questions which divides the continental school of philosophy from those following in the analytical tradition.

Ludvic Moquin-Beaudry, *Aufklärung et limitation du possible*
Le thème de l’émergence de la Raison à partir du mythe est central à *La dialectique de la Raison* et à l’entreprise générale de l’École de Francfort. C’est que ce qui s’annonçait comme une libération par rapport à la pensée mythique et à la domination justifiée par celle-ci s’est
retourné : la liberté vis-à-vis de l’arbitraire de la nature s’est payé d’un asservissement plus grand encore. Et, à son sommet, la raison a fini par replonger dans le mythe. Dans cet essai, nous proposons, en suivant Adorno, une analyse de cette «nouvelle domination» en montrant de quelle façon l’Aufklärung est venue restreindre le champ de la possibilité, que ce soit dans le domaine conceptuel, dans le langage, dans les rapports économiques ou dans l’ordre politique. Cela appelle à penser la domination non pas comme une simple imposition hétéronome, mais, plus fondamentalement, comme un étouffement du possible.

Marie-Eve Morin, Making Sense of the World Beyond Heidegger
Even though the Heideggerian influences on Jean-Luc Nancy’s thought are impossible to ignore, this paper seeks to bring to the fore the originality of Nancy’s thought, and especially of his ontology. Nancy’s critical engagement with Heidegger is not restricted to a mere recasting of being-with as the centre-point of ontology. Much more radically, Nancy transforms the basic meanings of essential Heideggerian concepts such as existence, finitude, sense, and world. Ultimately, Nancy lays the groundwork for an ontology that would not be subject to the speculative realists’ criticism of “correlationism” (since neither sense-making nor world-forming are human activities), while at the same time salvaging the crucial notion of sense. As such, Nancy treads a middle path between phenomenology and object-oriented philosophy.

Karin Nisenbaum, Rosenzweig and Schelling on the Ethical Significance of Theological Categories
If we agree with Moses Mendelssohn’s claim in his Morning Hours that Immanuel Kant’s repudiation of all traditional proofs of God’s existence in the Critique of Pure Reason “destroyed” traditional metaphysics, including religion, can there be a post-critical belief in revelation? This paper shows why it is significant that in The Star of Redemption the German-Jewish philosopher Franz Rosenzweig calls the theological categories—Creation, Revelation, and Redemption—categories. In the first Critique Kant argued that the categories or pure concepts of the understanding are necessary conditions of the possibility of experience; analogously, in The Star of Redemption Rosenzweig argues that the theological categories are necessary conditions of the possibility of moral agency in the wake of Jacobi and Schelling’s complaints against the nihilistic consequences of a thoroughly immanent philosophy. Rosenzweig’s employment of the term ‘category’ thus shows that his theistic belief in a transcendent and revelatory God is justified by what we may regard as a transcendental argument.

Cindy Sautereau, « L’enigme de l’autre » : altérité et réciprocité dans l’herméneutique du soi de Paul Ricoeur
Qui est autrui ? Voilà l’énigme que je voudrais porter à la réflexion. La dialectique ricœurienne de l’ipséité et de l’altérité nous indique que penser l’autre implique certes une réflexion sur le soi, mais aussi et surtout sur leur rapport. Or, ce rapport en est un de réciprocité. Mais encore faut-il s’entendre sur la teneur particulière que Ricoeur confère à ce concept. En effet, si, à la requête de l’un, l’autre répond, les deux mouvements ne sont pas pour autant équivalents. La relation éthique est et demeure dissymétrique. Une forme d’égalité peut cependant être trouvée dès lors que le mouvement du retour prend les traits de la reconnaissance. Au sein d’une telle
relation, l’énigme de l’autre se résout alors : autrui est à la fois mon semblable et l’irremplaçable. Autrui est le prochain.

**Fanny Söderbäck, Action, Narration, and the Public Sphere: Towards an Arendtian Aesthetic Theory**

In *The Human Condition*, Hannah Arendt depicts the artist as a storyteller who makes tangible the otherwise so fleeting and unpredictable political realm: she makes the world durable through the objectification of our actions. Through a reading of works by French artist Esther Shalev-Gerz, this paper aims to update Arendt’s analysis of the relationship between art and politics. I argue that art, rather than serving merely as a tool for documenting political action, has the potential to make possible such action. I thus propose that we view art as action rather than as an objectification of action. I discuss art not in public spaces but art as a public space, thereby resurrecting the sort of space that Arendt celebrated in her work: a space where stories can be born, narrated, and remembered.

**Fiona Utley, Considerations of a Phenomenology of Trust**

In a series of radio lectures from 1948, Merleau-Ponty identifies a fundamental characteristic of human existence as being an intertwined affective state of anxiety and courage. How are we to understand this state, especially as we are also directed to our affective life if we want to understand “the birth of being for us?” While this fundamental characteristic of human existence is developed through the notion of ambiguity and this indeterminacy is corporeally lived, claiming such an affective state as expression of our inherent state of precariousness, seemingly gives this defining feature of our existence a *special feel*. In this paper I explore what I will refer to as phenomenological trust as this intertwined affective state.