EVERYTHING IS IN EVERYTHING

JACQUES RANCIÈRE
Between INTELLECTUAL
EMANCIPATION and
AESTHETIC EDUCATION



JASON E. SMITH & ANNETTE WEISSER

Everything Is In Everything Jacques Rancière Between Intellectual Emancipation and Aesthetic Education

Program
Anthologies & Art Theory

Edited by Jason E. Smith Annette Weisser

Authors

Arne de Boever Claire Fontaine Peter Friedl Jeremy Gilbert-Rolfe Maria Muhle Jacques Rancière Jason E. Smith Jan Voelker Annette Weisser Evan Calder Williams

Edition

English December 2011

ISBN: 978-3-03764-265-8 Softcover, 140 x 230 mm

144 pages Images 19 b/w

CHF 20 / EUR 14 / £ 12 / US 19.95

A POLITICS OF AESTHETIC INDETERMINATION: AN INTERVIE WITH FRANK RUIDA & IAN VOFI K

Jacquer Rawiis

is The Disnibution of the Seculial, you applie of a "primary postfination" on the basis of which it is possible to group the cereitatic regime of or." Can you explain these two concepts it is there of advance between the teach O's settled how can the relationship between the distribution of the sensible and the cereitatic regime to describe? And, to oak will one more question, how does the specific lose of the cereitatic regime state to the lates of distribution.

atequate Brootiers I spoile of a "primary aerobricis" in the sense that even practices that are not "artistic," was a policies, prosupport the sensible configuration of a certain world profites defence a common world, is defines objects in common, which is also to say that a creducted contain objects from this common, which is also to say that a creducted contain objects from this common, and policies defence the form of competence required to see these common objects, to defense them and to act with regard to them that is, it dissinguishes between those who have the long-posture and those who do not. Now, the distinction is a memor of sensible reddence or obviousness before being a matter of philosophical or particular distinction. It is necessary to be a sensible or patched definition, the nearest device policies capacity on the bost of the practical distinction of a human language that can decision and debuts, as egisted procession of a human language that can discoust and debuts, as egisted procession of a human language that can discoust and debuts, and conputed of the common section of the common of the "we" that they speak, so reduce their speech to the mere noise of aimma "we" that they speak, so reduce their speech to the mere noise of aimma "he what is seen, on the way what is seen is surplike and over who can we and say it. This brings into play, thous, a distribution of the windle, the supplike and the double, in both senses of the word partiage" what is not also contained, but show that doesn't be the between and separates the tree to side of what is seculate and involving, and the and installele, possible who do not, those who can from those who cannot, exc. The primary and impossible, and the doubted on the distribution of the vessible, or the distribution is when them of common, southle experience the vest tempore who do not, these temporal contributions is when the consolider of particle of the tempore who do not, these call of the delate contribution, of the vestib and expand Kant's concept, that these a priori forms are always historically determined forms, and this does not simply must form that each is and such as historical period. For these forms themselves define certain types of historicary: autons stress of history, definitionizes or what is repeated historically classification or what is not historical, definitionized historical forms. They are who sho not. And these forms are above all polarical forms. They are the product of tomoson and conflicts the history of options in the history of the ways these who were not "seen" to be capable of discorning and algaing common affairs have been all the no nodars the field of the visible, the stypids and the thistologic that shows them up within this incapacity. A destribution of the smaller of forces.

Be in within the bisocial and polesmical framework that the regular of identifications of the arm and distor, as the suggests of procupition and shought that repeate out overant activities recognized a sett, fine and shought that repeate out overant activities recognized as sett, fine and thought that repeate out of the regular contribution of the contribution of

1

Rancière and aesthetics

For Jacques Rancière, politics is not primarily the exercise of or struggle for power, but the institution of a certain type of space and time, a mode of visibility and intelligibility that creates a tear in the consensual fabric of a given form of collective life. Art institutes just such a space and time, in which the fundamental polarities of experience—activity and passivity, form and matter, appearance and reality—are suspended and transformed.

The essays collected in this volume, based on a symposium held at Art Center College of Design (Pasadena), consider the knot formed in Rancière's work between aesthetics, politics, and education. From his earliest work ("The Lesson of Althusser," 1974) to his magisterial book on the pedagogical theory of Joseph Jacotot ("The Ignorant Schoolmaster," 1981), the theme of education has been at the center of Rancière's concerns; his apparently recent turn to aesthetics, after the 1995 publication of "The Disagreement," should in turn be understood as a continuation of his studies of the aesthetic experiments conducted during the post-work nights of 19th-century proletarians ("The Nights of Labor," 1981).

The questions forming the horizon of this collection are therefore: what would it mean to propose a new aesthetic education of humanity today? How would the resurrection of this concept transform the current concepts of art, politics, and pedagogy? And to what extent is it necessary to return to the founding moments of aesthetic theory to rearticulate the relation between art and politics today.

Published with Art Center Graduate Press, Pasadena.