

31 st Annual Meeting of the Husserl Circle: February 22-25, 2001, Bloomington, Indiana

Author(s): Christian Lotz

Source: *Phänomenologische Forschungen*, 2001, No. 1/2 (2001), pp. 295-298

Published by: Felix Meiner Verlag GmbH

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24360491>

REFERENCES

Linked references are available on JSTOR for this article:

https://www.jstor.org/stable/24360491?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references_tab_contents

You may need to log in to JSTOR to access the linked references.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



Felix Meiner Verlag GmbH is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Phänomenologische Forschungen*

JSTOR

BERICHT

Christian Lotz, Corinne Painter

31st Annual Meeting of the Husserl Circle February 22-25, 2001, Bloomington, Indiana

The perspectives out of which Husserl research has been taking place, and so also the varied projects in which such research has been involved, have seen a transformation within the last years. Scholars such as Dan Zahavi, Anthony Steinbock, Richard Cobb-Stevens, as well as Jim Hart, have not only discovered new horizons within Husserl's later phenomenology or his ethical theory, but they have also connected Husserl's phenomenology to contemporary philosophy.¹ Indeed, outside of Germany, research in Husserl seems still to be very much alive.

In connexion with this continued and growing research on Husserl within America, it is interesting to see in which ways Husserl is being thematized and employed within the United States. At the 31st annual meeting of the Husserl Circle, which took place February 22-25 in Bloomington, Indiana and was hosted by Jim Hart (Indiana University), approximately 50 – mostly American – Husserl Scholars met for four days, discussing various problems and themes either that Husserl himself considered or for which Husserl's thought at least provides a certain motivation and path. Thus, although phenomenology has from its inception been characterized as an *international* movement, it seems obvious that today the heart of Husserl scholarship has been shifted outside of Europe.

At the meeting, the permanent secretary of the Husserl Circle, Burt Hopkins (Seattle University), not only announced the publishing of a „New Yearbook in Phenomenology“ but also a new series which shall publish both translations and

¹ Dan Zahavi: *Self-Awareness and Alterity. A Phenomenological Investigation*. Evanston 1999; Anthony Steinbock: *Home and Beyond. Generative Phenomenology after Husserl*. Evanston 1995; Jim Hart: *The Person and the Common Life. Studies in Husserlian Social Ethics*. Dordrecht 1992; Richard Cobb-Stevens: *Husserl and Analytical Philosophy*. Dordrecht 1990.

new editions of the most prominent research books on Husserl. As an example, Klaus Held's book, *Lebendige Gegenwart*, will be translated and published by „Noesis Press,“ a new publishing venture initiated by Hopkins. In addition, new translations of *Ideen I* and *Formale und Transzendente Logik* will be worked out as well. Fortunately, and in contradistinction to Kluwer's program, the books appearing with Noesis Press shall have reasonable prices, so as to be more easily accessible both to students as well as to scholars. The „New Yearbook“ is open to all scholars who work in the field of phenomenology, and it intends to publish the most serious and scholarly articles in the area of phenomenological philosophy, even when they prove to be very lengthy.

Special sections of the meeting were devoted to the discussion of Dan Zahavi's study *Self-Awareness and Alterity*, and to Husserl's revisions of his Sixth *Logical Investigation*. John Brough (Georgetown University) and Richard Cobb-Stevens (Boston College) presented comments on Zahavi's text by referring to present thematics within the debate on Self-Awareness, and Ullrich Melle (Leuven) presented a detailed report and interpretation of Husserl's reformulation of the most important investigation in his early masterpiece. Papers were also given by Lester Embree (Florida Atlantic University): „Vegetable Constitution“; by James Mensch (Saint Francis Xavier University, Nova Scotia): „Real and Ideal Determination in Husserl's Sixth Logical Investigation“; by Ingo Farin (Indiana University): „Husserl, Natorp, and Heidegger on the Theoretical Attitude“; by Christian Lotz (Marburg): „Changing our Past? Remembering and Renewal in Husserl's Phenomenology“; by James Dodd (Boston University): „Evidence“; by Mark Blum (University of Louisville): „Phenomenological History and Phenomenological Structuralism“; by George Heffernan (Merrimack College): „Later Husserl's Sprachvergeessenheit“; and by Nam-In Lee (Seoul National University): „Concept of Primordality in Husserl's Fifth Cartesian Meditation“. In addition, a view from outside of the traditional phenomenological program was delivered by Piet Hut (Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton), whose talk was entitled „The role of Husserl's Epoché for Science: A view from a Physicist“. Hut's presentation forcefully articulated certain possibilities that Husserlian Phenomenology can offer toward the goal of opening up a research culture in which the sciences can learn from philosophy at the same time that philosophy can learn from the sciences.

Though each paper given this year at the Husserl Circle merits especial commentary in this report, owing to the structural limitations of a work of this nature, we are prevented from commenting here on every paper.

John Drummond (Fordam University) gave an outstanding paper, entitled, „Respect as a Moral Emotion: A Phenomenological Approach,“ in which he offered an Husserlian analysis of respect. By pointing first to the Kantian prob-

lematic as formulated within the *Critique of Practical Reason*, Drummond developed a demanding yet plausible alternative to the Kantian thesis by outlining Husserlian conceptual possibilities. In particular, he referred to Husserl's „value theory,“ which he claimed offers an approach for solving the Kantian abyss between empirical emotions and apriori insight into the moral law. Furthermore, Drummond offered a complex account of intersubjectivity that does not tend to miss – as so many accounts do – the fundamentally *ethical* level of the experience of the other that is given through empathy. According to Drummond, the latter is based on feelings, and feelings constitute the intentional mode of being directed toward *values*. Drummond claimed that respect must be historically constituted in order to be felt in empathy. He closed his paper by stating that „Recognitional respect, then, requires not only the example of authentic agency in lives we encounter; it requires a moral education that extends our imaginative abilities so as to allow us to recognize other possibilities, especially other cultural possibilities, for manifest goods and for authentically realizing our capacities for rational agency“.

Elizabeth Behnke's (Study Project in the Body) presentation at the meeting, which was entitled, „The Immediacy of Primal Motility,“ was rather memorable; for it was at one and the same time (i) provocative and unusual, insofar as it required not only „mental“ attentiveness to her proposals but so also a „bodily“ attentiveness that is usually all but absent at philosophical presentations, and (ii) a testimony to the depth with which Husserl treated the problem of kinaesthetic awareness. By asking the Husserl Circle attendees to perform various „experiments“ (e.g., „approaching the practical kinaesthetic horizon,“ „inhabiting primal motility at the leading edge,“ and „matching kinaesthetic situations or constellations in wakeful willing and actively allowing“) in which certain typically unnoticed bodily movements were „intentionally“ performed and specifically attended to, Behnke demonstrated the fundamental connexion between a kinaesthetic awareness – or intentionality – and every mode of human activity, even what in the tradition we call specifically theoretical activity. Though Husserl has been criticised for not having understood the fundamentality of bodily comportment and kinaesthetic intentionality, Behnke's many references within her essay to Husserl's work suggest that we have much to thank Husserl for with respect to paving the way for serious and sustained considerations of kinaesthetic consciousness, considerations that Behnke is herself undertaking with great enthusiasm.

Lastly, Andrew Cutrofello (Loyola University) – a new-comer this year to the Husserl Circle – whose paper was entitled „Categorical Intuition Revisited,“ offered a thoughtful analysis of the connexion between Husserl's notion of categorical intuition and the analytic attempt to account for the world's meaningful-

ness, suggesting that categorial intuition (as Husserl conceived it) has a certain appeal not only for Phenomenologists but also for Analysts, insofar as it *could* provide a way to account for the meaningfulness of world without succumbing to the problems associated with psychologistic accounts (a main worry of Frege), which compromise the very „objectivity“ that a genuinely philosophical account of meaningfulness tries to achieve. Referring to Sellars, as well as to some of Sellars' followers, e.g., Davidson and McDowell, Cutrofello looks more closely at their assessment of categorial intuition, maintaining that after all – though in a different language – each in his own way does not *deny* something like categorial intuition, though they reject the notion that categorial intuition occurs *independently* of sensuous intuition, which, Cutrofello rightly notes, is also the position of Husserl. Recognising also Quine's influence on McDowell, Cutrofello points out „that McDowell essentially embraces a doctrine of categorial intuition while repudiating everything that would come from the Husserlian reductions“, which response, he claims, is unexpectedly similar to Heidegger's reaction to Husserl, given that McDowell and Heidegger seem to share next to nothing in common philosophically. Then, after taking us through the Kantian problematic, that is, the problem of intuition and judgment, suggesting it as the source of the contemporary divide between Continental and Analytic philosophy, Cutrofello proposes that we would do well to more closely examine the legacy of Husserl's Sixth Investigation within the context of trying to forge a way of bridging the abyss that appears to divide Analytic and Continental philosophy.

To summarize the tendencies of the current research as presented at the 31st Meeting of the Husserl Circle, we have on the one side scholars who tried to analyze Husserl in a more contemporary context (e.g., Zahavi, Cobb-Stevens, Brough, Hut, Cutrofello), and on the other side, scholars who read Husserl within the horizon of traditional phenomenology (e.g., Mensch, Heffernan, Farin, Blum, Embree), and still a third group of Husserlians who presented an orthodox commentary on Husserl (e.g., Dodd, Lotz, Melle, Behnke, Nam-In Lee). This has the consequence that we find within the American reception of Husserl's philosophy a *pluralistic* program of research, namely one that promises a rich, broadly-scoped, and open range of possibilities to think about Husserl, and, just as important, of ways to employ his thought in new and compelling philosophical projects. In all, each paper that was delivered in Bloomington not only represented, but also set high standards, in its approach to reading and employing the thought of Husserl.