

Call For Papers for Session 1: Words and Concepts
THE 34TH CONGRESS OF CIHA, BEIJING 2016: TERMS

Chairs of the Session:

Viola Hildebrand-Schat, Goethe-Universität, Frankfurt am Main, Germany

Hildebrand-Schat@kunst.uni-frankfurt.de

WANG Yong (Mr.), National Academy of Art China, Beijing, China

zhwang45@aliyun.com

CHEN Liang (Junior Chair, Mr.), Universität Heidelberg

chen.eins@gmail.com

Please submit the abstract of your paper for this session to the chairs before June 30, 2015.

Starting with the difference of the term “art” we want to look at the wide field of linguistic terms, to explain the significance and meaning by the relaying cultural determination. Important differences are to be expected between the western and the eastern world, languages with an alphabet and logographic and morphemic systems. Which representations are linked to the terms, which functions, ideologies and cultural relation are linked to the term? Taking into account that the understanding of the term “art” is not only linked to the way how language is use and expressed, but as well to a deeper understanding of culture and it historical development, we would like to direct the discussion to the following fields of reflection:

Etymology

The different etymologies of the term “art” in the diverse languages are not only a difference of terminology. Moreover they refer to different origins and therefore to different meanings. This includes differences of what is related to the term, differences of traditions and culture. While in one language one term is sufficient, other languages use several. However, each term includes its own concept. The differences are not only of importance within one language. Moreover they refer to the different meanings of the term. The right expression connects always with a given context as well as with a special complexion of meaning.

The Term and its Content

Within the diverse terms one can find the diverse conception of art. They result from the different traditions. The difference of the term “art” relates to the idea of the work, the concept of the work and the technic of the work, i. e. the craftwork. Differences are just given through the possibility producing an artwork and the skill necessary to produce an artwork. An artwork exists by its concept as well as by its material realization. Therefore we have to make a difference between the intellectual, spiritual and material side of an artwork. The difference of meaning within the terms related to art becomes especially evident in compositions such applied arts, performing arts or decorative arts. They all refer to different conceptions of art.

Context

The meaning of art, its functions and ideas, its relation to nature and reality depends on time and space. We find different concepts in different regions and at different times. Moreover

the meaning of art changes continuously. The most important examples include mimetic art and the concept of mimesis, then art as idealization of nature and finally concepts of art, which refer to reality. Within the 20th century we observe in the Western world several changes of paradigm. Now art follows more and more a purpose on its own, such as *l'art pour l'art*.

Concepts of Art

Following André Malraux art is just a determination. Objects become art, as soon as they are transferred from their original context into the museum. Liberated from common use, from any practical handling and function, they can be nothing else but art. Throughout history various periods specify the term "art" in different ways and link it to various concepts. This question may refer to space as well as to time.

Term and Technology

Of interest is the relation between the term "art" and the related technology. For example the Russian expression of painting an icon is "pisat ikony", which means literally "to write an icon". Which conception of work and its meaning are linked to such expression? In this context research on influences of technic on the coining of the term "art" will be of interest. Research on the term "art" may also address the relation between art and nature. Common sense states that art is men made. But alternatives concepts were developed as well. How than do we have to understand the Russian „ne rukodwornij“, or "autopoiesis".

Westernization and other Forms of Historical Development

The difference of terms becomes obvious within the Chinese Culture. In various periods of ancient China art was not only linked to different terms such as yi-shu and shu-shu-fang-ji, above all their meaning differed from everything linked to the term "art" in Western cultures. Even if the process of westernization has lasted quite long, only since the second half of the 19th century a modern term of art has been introduced in China. But replacing the traditional Chinese art terms has given rise to problems: Even if these terms are able to explain phenomenon similar to the West, they cannot explain the specificities of Chinese art. Similar processes have occurred in other cultures, may be under the influences of colonization and westernization.

Globalization and Nationalization

Focusing on different concepts of art the question of a global art must be taken in account. Are the different concepts of art, especially in their relation to nations, traditions and countries, are not averse to any form of globalization? Does globalization not require a universal understanding of the term art? And how such an universalization can take into account the variety of culture, religion and tradition linked to art? They become of special interest with an engaged art, such as social and political orientated art. How can engaged art be considered as art? And how can an art, following this definition, be global? Another point of interest will be reflections on the term "art" in the conflict of globalization and nationalism. Do the various conceptions of the term "art" and the meaning related to each of them contradict globalization? Does globalization demand a term of art, which will be understood everywhere in the same sense, notwithstanding differences in culture, history and tradition.

The topics described above point to some ideas treating term and content of art in its different and widely differing areas. For the section we expect contribution from linguistic and cultural studies. Results may be from researchers on the linguistic terms of art and the influence of the cultural historical and political contexts. The question may direct to the impact of cultural influence on the meaning and content of the term “art”. They may derive from technic, idea or craft. Other ideas related to words and concepts of the term art are welcome.

Call for Papers for Session 2: The Rank of Art
THE 34TH CONGRESS OF CIHA, BEIJING 2016: TERMS

Chairs of the Session:

Annika Waenerberg, University of Jyväskylä, Finland
annika.waenerberg@jyu.fi

LV Pintian (Mr.), Chinese Traditional Academy of Arts, Beijing, China
limyk@163.com

YANG Jing (Junior Chair, Ms.), University of Jyväskylä
tigeryangjing@hotmail.com

Please submit the abstract of your paper for this session to the chairs before June 30, 2015.

This session explores parameters behind the value of art, asking how different value systems are promoting artworks or preventing them from being seen, appreciated or taken seriously. The session investigates evaluation, judgment, categorization and interpretation of artworks out of different ideological and cultural preferences, and consequences of these preferences. The session is providing critical insight into how different value systems affect relationships between artworks, artists and audiences.

The purpose of the session is to encourage different views and positions in relation to the rank of art. The session will present well-studied comparative and case studies, focusing on parameters such as center and periphery, highbrow and lowbrow, old and new, familiarity and strangeness, equal and unequal, permission and taboo, laughable and non-laughable, and art and non-art. The session pays attention to changing and shifting parameters, their static and dynamic qualities, and the introduction of new parameters.

We present a frame of four subject areas to be taken into consideration when preparing a proposal:

1) Evaluation criteria within different social and cultural settings:

Evaluation criteria of art vary according to time and society. There are external and internal factors intertwining with each other and co-influencing the making and reflection of art. Internal factors center on aesthetic aspects of artistic production, meanwhile external factors focus on relationships between art and other spheres of culture and society, such as historical, social, ideological, economic and scientific circumstances.

2) Transformation of value systems under conflicts and sudden change:

Conflicts and abrupt changes in society can lead to confusion and quick transformations concerning evaluation criteria of art. The subject explores transformations of criteria of art under the influence of cultural shocks, when encountering societies and cultures are representing very different value systems of art.

3) Introduction of non-mainstream artists and art groups:

Artworks created by individual artists have often been neglected in mainstream art history, for instance those works created by amateurs, demented artists, folk artists, aboriginal artists, etc. This subject is dedicated to the evaluation criteria of art works and art movements that have previously been underexplored.

4) *The value of reproduction of artworks:*

Reproduction of artworks affects artistic ideas, styles, and techniques throughout the history of art. The reproduction of artworks includes various forms such as imitation, copy, replica, or forgery. Postmodern paraphrasing and citation can be seen as a kind of reproduction. Reproduction of art is related to critical issues of Art History, such as the evaluation of originality and authorship.

Call for Papers for Session 3: Imagination and Projection
THE 34TH CONGRESS OF CIHA, BEIJING 2016: TERMS

Chairs of the Session:

Fred Kleiner, Boston University, USA

fsk@bu.edu

SHAO Yiyang (Ms.), China Central Academy of Fine Arts, Beijing, China

yyangshao@cafa.edu.cn

HU Qiao (Junior Chair, Ms.), University of Glasgow, Glasgow, Scotland, UK

qiaohu.bridget@gmail.com

Please submit the abstract of your paper for this session to the chairs before June 30, 2015.

The third section investigates the socio-cultural foundations of artistic difference. Special attention will be given to the fact that some societies and realities have been mythologized so that they appear to be especially imaginative or hallucinatory. The discussion will focus on two aspects of this topic. The first is the issue of the relationship between the socio-cultural background and the artistic concept(s) it produces. The second is the symbiosis between imaginative and hallucinatory symbolization and contemporaneous artistic concepts, that is, how artists project their own imagination on nature and artifacts to produce artworks that are characteristic of their unique time and place.

At the most fundamental level, artists throughout history have created "imaginative and hallucinatory" images of things that have never existed, usually in the context of religion and mythology, for example, the sphinx in Egypt, the centaur in Greece, the dragon in China, the feathered serpent in Mexico, angels and demons in Christian art, Dreamings in Australian Aboriginal art, etc. Indeed, such representations are among the oldest known, for example, the 30,000-year-old composite feline-human from Hohlenstein-Stadel, Germany. The creation of virtually all artworks almost always involves the transformation of the real world through the artist's imagination and the projection of that vision in the artwork.

Apart from the picturing of beings that exist only in legend and religion, during the long history of art, artists have frequently been called upon to represent imaginary events in narrative art. Among the countless subjects and places that artists have represented, of great potential interest for this section are the ways that artists have created pictures of Heaven and Hell, whether in representations of the horrors suffered by the Damned in Hell in Romanesque church portals (or in the paintings of Hieronymus Bosch), or in Tang dynasty visions of the Western Pure Paradise of the Amitabha Buddha. Similarly, many artists have, either at the request of their patrons or on their own initiative, represented the miraculous in paintings and sculptures. In this category, of course, would be the innumerable artworks that portray the miracles performed by Christian and other saints and the miraculous apparitions and transformations of gods and spirits. Examples include the different forms that gods such as Jupiter take in Greco-Roman legend and art (eagle, swan, etc.), the miraculous transformations of appearance that are at the heart of much of the art of Pre-Columbian Mesoamerica, the visionary paintings of Moreau and the Symbolists in Europe in the late 19th century, and the various incarnations of Hindu deities in Asia. Of special interest will be the deliberate choice by European Surrealist painters in the 20th century to create, usually without any reference to mythology or religion, "imaginative and

hallucinatory" works of art that "project the artist's imagination on nature and artifacts."

The fact that this congress will be held for the first time in China also provides the opportunity to examine these questions in the contemporary global context. If artworks are products of their time and place of origin, how does an artist incorporate cultural symbols into an artwork created for a worldwide audience? Do mythologies change over time or when they cross boundaries and migrate from one cultural context to another? How does one negotiate comparative frameworks in local and global, historical and contemporary contexts? In contemporary art, are there any universal mythologies that are taking shape? Do the development of new media and multimedia works necessitate adjusting the "concepts of art history"?

The special appeal of the theme of section 3 is how the basic questions posed can be applied to a diverse range of artistic cultures from antiquity to the present and serve to elucidate how artistic concepts reflect the socio-cultural background not only of artists but also of their patrons. The discussion of this theme in Beijing will also serve to underscore how all artworks, even seemingly realistic ones that imitate nature, are still products of the artist's imagination. For example, in Classical Greece, famous for its rationality and emphasis on measurement, the statues of beautiful athletes with perfect bodies are not images of real people but the projections of a philosophical notion of what constitutes perfection. Thus "imagination and projection" is a very rich theme indeed. It is hoped that this section will make a major contribution to the Beijing Congress's overall theme of "Concepts of Art History."

Call For Papers for Session 4: Appreciation and Utility
THE 34TH CONGRESS OF CIHA, BEIJING 2016: TERMS

Chairs of the Session:

Faya Causey, the National Gallery of Art, Washington, USA

f-causey@nga.gov

HANG Jian (Mr.), China Academy of Art, Hangzhou, China

com.hang@qq.com

**ZHANG Chunyan (Junior Chair, Ms.), Bauhaus Institution of China Academy of Art,
Hangzhou, China**

85866539@qq.com

Please submit the abstract of your paper for this session to the chairs before June 30, 2015.

The organizing committee for the 2016 Congress presented the following for Session 4:

“This session is about how a culture understands the function of art. For this topic, we recommend a discussion focusing on the functions of works of art or artifacts and how their function as artworks and artifacts is determined by the social roles that they play.”

The terms Appreciation and Utility and their cognates each have long histories in many cultures in regard to the contested terms “artwork” and “artifact/artefact.” What are those histories and what is the present discourse about the terms -- within individual societies, cultures, and in a global construct? How have these terms affected the production, use, marketing, exchange, consumption, and reception of “artwork” and “artifact” in the past and in the present? How have the elements of science and technology affected the essence or culture process of Appreciation and Utility within societies of varying degrees of industrialization? How have specific productions affected the meaning or use of Appreciation and Utility in the past and in the present? Are the terms limiting or unrestrictive? How do the terms Appreciation and Utility enrich the concepts of art history on a global scale or in cross-cultural understanding?

Proposals: Case studies of individual objects, groups or classes of objects or of an art category (e.g. conceptual art or decorative art) that elucidate the theme are one way to address Session 4. Has the object/objects or category been appreciated or valued differently over time and/or within different groups? Are there notable cases that have challenged classification as “art,” “artwork” or “artifact/artefact”? Another approach might be to concentrate on a key artist, artisan (in every sense of the term), author, publication, public exhibition, museum display, or monument. Yet another would be to consider the role of a philosopher, or of the discipline of the history of art, anthropology (including folklore), sociology, or archaeology in the consideration of an individual object/groups or classes of objects, art category, monument, display or exhibition.

**Call For Papers for Session 5: Self-Awareness or Self-Affirmation
THE 34TH CONGRESS OF CIHA, BEIJING 2016: TERMS**

Chairs of the Session:

Alessandro Nova, Kunsthistorischen Institut in Florenz, Florence, Italy
nova@khi.fi.it

YU Hui (Mr.), Research Institute of the Palace Museum, Beijing, China
yuhui_pm@aliyun.com

LIU Yufeng (Junior Chair, Mr.), Research Institute of the Palace Museum, Beijing, China
Lyf8291@sina.com

Please submit the abstract of your paper for this session to the chairs before June 30, 2015.

In an increasingly “global” world that is both positively hybrid and negatively mixed up, it can be useful to ponder historical periods in different cultures that were eager to present their art to their public as independent, self-contained, “pure”. Although this “purity” suggests a self-image of detachment and concentration on its own production, it should be analyzed as an intellectual and cultural construction, since societies have always been hybrid, and since art itself can hardly be understood without heteronomy. Hence, at least three possible discourses inherent to the idea of art’s “purity” should be examined in order to critically reflect upon this phenomenon:

- The birth of a “national”, local, independent style related to the self-awareness of the artistic expression.
- The idea of an autonomous, “absolute” art, free from any contingency.
- The complex dialectics between art as social fact and autonomous artefact.

Concerning the first discourse, the question of independence is closely linked to the self-awareness of the artist as an autonomous, poietic subject, and to the birth of a specific “national” style. If the most celebrated artists of the 14th and the 15th centuries were still deeply affected by the practical desires of their patrons, the situation changed radically at the beginning of the 16th century, at least in Italy. Patrons wanted an object, any object from the hand of great artists; they wanted a “Leonardo”, a “Raphael”, or a “Michelangelo” more than a religious or a mythological image. This phenomenon gave birth to an unprecedented interest for the visual arts from the part of the intellectual elite such as Pietro Bembo or Baldassarre Castiglione. This explosive, very dense circuit brought about a recognizable “national” literary as well as visual language, which was tightly connected with a new self-awareness or self-affirmation of the artist, an aspect that Giorgio Vasari addressed so brilliantly in his *Vite*.

As far as the second discourse is concerned, one could begin with Immanuel Kant’s concept of the “purposiveness without purpose” of art as portrayed in his *Critique of Judgment*. A few years later Friedrich Schiller molded the concept of man’s “aesthetic education,” which should have been independent from any form of utility. This idea of art’s “entireness” (Schelling’s “Ganzheit”) and its necessary autonomy from utility had nothing to do with the current, naively reductive concept of *art for art’s sake*, even though the philosophers of German Idealism were important forerunners of the 19th-century formula of the *l’art pour l’art*. Their plea for the autonomy of art implies a deep understanding of the intrinsic efficacy – and therefore relevance – of art, an aspect that would become fundamental for Theodor W. Adorno’s aesthetics, and was addressed in Ad Reinhardt’s famous article *Art-as-Art* (1962), as well as in his minimalistic, radical black paintings.

In order to comprehend these two discourses coherently, and with the necessary historical and critical approach, one should however not forget what Adorno called the “double character” of art (i.e., its status as both a social product, a *fait social*, and an autonomous artifact), an aspect that is still of great contemporary topicality. The awareness of this dialectic tension will be helpful in considering the concepts of independence and self-awareness, and will also allow investigation of the issue of the *critical* potential of art. What does Adorno mean with his difficult thesis that “art becomes social by its opposition to society”, and what does this imply for the ethos of the artist? Furthermore, and depending from these previous questions: to what extent can the autonomy and self-awareness of art and artist be understood as an intrinsic necessity for any kind of truly critical dimension of art? Or in other words: is autonomy actually the privileged site of social critique? Could it be that the more art is art, the more self-aware it is, the more it becomes paradoxically socially engaged, in clear opposition to the always neutralized and neutralizing “unaware” cultural mass production?

This session seeks contributions that address the issue of self-aware, autonomous, “absolute” art in all cultures and times, putting into question at the same moment this constructed image of self-affirmation and independence, and eventually analyzing the positive tension between the autonomy and heteronomy of art that fosters its oppositional and transformative powers.

Text developed in cooperation with Hana Gründler.

Call For Papers for Session 6: Politics of Identity: Tradition and Origin
THE 34TH CONGRESS OF CIHA, BEIJING 2016: TERMS

Chairs of the Session:

Sophie McIntyre, Australian National University, Canberra, Australia

mcintyre_sophie@yahoo.com.au

SHAN Jixiang (Mr.), the Palace Museum, Beijing, China

gaoliangzhou@163.com (Secretary: Zhou Gaoliang)

TIE Zheng (Junior Chair, Ms.), the Palace Museum, Beijing, China

tiezhengt@163.com

Please submit the abstract of your paper for this session to the chairs before June 30, 2015.

Notwithstanding the intensification of globalization, increased mobility and transcultural dialogue and exchange, questions of identity – of how we envision, represent and perceive ourselves as a people, community, and country – continue to generate significant cultural, intellectual, and political debate internationally. In recent years, we have witnessed the rise and spread of new and renewed nationalisms, and territorial disputes, in which national boundaries and identities have been contested and re-defined. Against this backdrop, it could be argued that the desire and need to express and assert one's identity, and to protect and promote local and indigenous cultural practices and traditions are stronger than they have been for decades. In Asia, for example, the meaning and value of cultural heritage, as a signifier of national identity, collective memory, and as a vehicle for cultural diplomacy has been gaining increasing political and cultural attention. In the visual arts, artists, curators and scholars are also turning to the past for inspiration, and they are re-examining and re-inscribing notions of tradition and authenticity which are compelling markers of identity (the popular revival of Chinese ink art may be considered part of this phenomenon).

Based on the proposition that identities are imagined and heterogeneous, in this panel we aim to critically examine the role of the visual arts and the significance of tradition in the processes of identity formation. We seek papers that question and critique the relationship between art, identity and tradition, and which open up the field of enquiry to new and alternative ways of thinking about this subject. We especially welcome papers that analyze the ways artists, curators and museums imagine, re-interpret and re-present notions of identity and tradition through the visual image, and through exhibitions and collections. The panel will take a three-pronged approach, focusing on the production, as well as the museological representation and reception of art. This can be examined within a regional, national, local community, and/or individual context, and we welcome comparative as well as historical and contemporary perspectives.

This panel will bring together young and established scholars and it will offer a platform for discussion on the changing role and relationship between art, identity, and the significance of tradition in identity construction. Papers may include a history of the issue, critical questions, philosophical reflections and theoretical positions, examples of artists, exhibits, programs or initiatives that address these issues. Some of the key questions and topics explored in this panel discussion include:

1. What roles do artists, curators, museums and government agencies play in the processes

of identity formation and how might these have changed?

2. The relationship between art, nationalism, propaganda, and political and social activism.
3. Art as a form of soft power and vehicle for cultural diplomacy.
4. The roles of history and cultural tradition in the construction and representation of identity in art, and the relevance of notions of cultural authenticity.
5. The role of the diaspora in identity formation in art.
6. The role of subjectivity, gender and ethnicity in identity formation in art.
7. Future developments and the changing role and agency of the artist in identity construction.

**Call For Papers for Session 7: Translation and Change
THE 34TH CONGRESS OF CIHA, BEIJING 2016: TERMS**

Chairs of the Session:

Sugata Ray, University of California, Berkeley, USA

sugata@berkeley.edu

ZHENG Yan (Mr.), China Central Academy of Fine Arts, Beijing, China

zyhicafa@sina.com

ZENG Qingying (Junior Chair, Ms.), Peking University, Beijing, China

chinyin.tseng@gmail.com

Please submit the abstract of your paper for this session to the chairs before June 30, 2015.

The appearance of transcultural visual forms in societies across the world has elicited significant scholarly attention in recent years. New art histories have utilized trade networks, migration patterns, and conflict zones as the locus of enquiry to engage with the question of translation and change on a global scale. The Black Atlantic, the Indian Ocean littoral, the Pacific Rim, the Silk Route, the Sub-Saharan Trail, and the Mediterranean world, among others, have thus emerged as key geopolitical constellations that have shaped the pluralistic topography of intercultural flows. While this pluritopic hermeneutics has allowed scholars to identify a set of intercultural economic, political, and geographic formations as central to theorizing translation and change, we are yet to fully confront the conceptual and methodological questions such configurations present for art history's disciplinary contours. By examining the circuitous movement of artists, objects, aesthetic concepts, and knowledge systems, the panel seeks to offer a broad vision of translation and change. Approaching *Translation and Change* through the lens of trade networks, migration patterns, and aesthetic discourses, our aim is to engage with the relatively under-theorized dialectic between the global transmission of objects and ideas and the disciplinary contours of art history in dispersed locations through three distinct, but inter-related, areas of emphasis:

» **Spatiality:** Synchronic movements across communities, cultures, nations, and empires will allow us to examine the spatialities of translation and change. How do we account for multiple spatial systems of translation and change? Along with the mobility of elite merchants, the aristocracy, and cosmopolitan art collectors, could we, for instance, account for everyday micro-practices of subaltern intercultural translations that make visible entanglements between "localized" peripheries and "cosmopolitan" global centers? How are micro-spaces, for instance the house or the hut, situated within these processes? How is the notion of space, place, and site translated through aesthetic practices? How do we account for mediatic translations, for instance from stone to paper and painting to architecture? What is the role of natural ecosystems and the landscape within aesthetic and artistic translation?

» **Temporality:** Diachronic movements mapped across lifecycles will make visible the temporalities of translation and change. How were knowledge systems, objects, and aesthetic practices translated across time and to what extent were these systems modulated to address changing social practices? Are there differences in temporal approaches to translation and change? How did the translation of objects and knowledge occur through familial lineages, guilds, and artistic intellectual communities? What was the role of didactic

manuals, art schools, and intellectual translations in a global field? Might there be a dissonance between professional structures of knowledge transference articulated through disciplinary concerns and non-formal networks of circulation? What is the role of inter-generational knowledge flow in translation and change?

» **Lexicon/s**: Moving beyond normative histories of exoticism (Orientalism) and Westernization, what are the lexicons and terminologies that allow us to consider the aesthetic and social purport of translation and change from a global perspective? While the language of art history is undoubtedly a product of the European Enlightenment, colonialism, and modern rationality, might premodern theorizations allow us to question the strictures of art history? Are there differences in regional approaches to translation? How might we write art histories that account for the dissonances in diverse global perspectives to translation without reiterating the West as art history and the non-West as affective ethnography? Can we read the translation of art history texts across cultures, the art historian's ekphrastic translation of image to text, the cultural biographies of objects, and collecting and display as processes of translation and change? Can *Translation and Change* enrich the concepts of art history on a global scale?

Call For Papers for Session 8: Art and Taboo
THE 34TH CONGRESS OF CIHA, BEIJING 2016: TERMS

Chairs of the Session:

Dario Gamboni, University of Geneva, Geneva, Switzerland
dario.gamboni@unige.ch

CHEN Lvsheng (Mr.), National Museum of China, Beijing, China
chenlusheng@chnmuseum.cn
cls77@163.com

ZHENG Yan (Junior Chair, Ms.), National Museum of China, Beijing, China
oxygen718@163.com

Please submit the abstract of your paper for this session to the chairs before June 30, 2015.

A taboo is a ritual prohibition, which may apply to persons, objects, and actions. The term comes from the Polynesian *tapu*, transmitted in the late eighteenth century by James Cook, who reported about prohibitions that could be local and provisional, as well as universal and permanent. It is often used in connection with art, but generally in a superficial way, such as when art is automatically assumed to challenge rules and conventions and to disregard what is allowed and what is forbidden, be it in terms of behaviour, subject matter or form.

This session aims at exploring more rigorously and systematically the ways in which the notion of taboo, with its roots in religion and anthropology, can contribute to the understanding of art and art history, in their relationship with decorum, power and authority.

Four areas of research can be summarily distinguished:

1. Art forms, artists and artworks subjected to prohibitions. Objects may be kept out of sight from the public or from certain categories of potential viewers and users (such as women and children for 'secret sacred objects'). Works may also be censored, prevented from being completed, and even mutilated or destroyed. Artists themselves may be prohibited from exerting their activity or from showing their work.
2. Art forms, artists and artworks that impose a prohibition or help maintaining it. It may be the case with monuments, state portraits, effigies, and various forms of propaganda. Of particular interest are images connected with the law and meant to possess a legal efficacy, as in the *pittura infamante* and *executio in effigie*.
3. Prohibitions that are inherent in art or belong to the rules of the art world, explicitly or implicitly. "Do not touch" is the most obvious one, but there have been countless interdictions crucial to the existence of art, from its creation to its reception by way of its conservation and display. Examples of these are limits set to copying and reproducing, and the issues of fake and plagiarism. Art theory is equally involved, including when it defines rules about the relationship of art with non-artistic rules.
4. Prohibitions as the theme or subject of a work of art. Even though it has become a cliché of art journalism and artists may be expected or required to "break taboos", it is the case

that artists and artworks keep questioning — sometimes at great risk for themselves and their works — interdictions deriving from power structures and from the rules governing the political, religious, economic, social or sexual domains.

These four areas partly overlap and are by no means exhaustive. Scholars interested in participating in this session are invited to send proposals related to one of them or otherwise relevant to the theme. These proposals may deal with any period and culture, and a comparative dimension would be welcome.

Call For Papers for Session 9: Autonomy and Elusion
THE 34TH CONGRESS OF CIHA, BEIJING 2016: TERMS

Chairs of the Session:

Jorge Coli, State University of Campinas, São Paulo, Brazil

jorgecoli63@gmail.com

ZHANG Xiaoling (Mr.), China National Academy of Painting, Beijing, China

zgxdmss@163.com

NING Zhuotao (Junior Chair, Mr.), Strasbourg University, Strasbourg, France

ningzhuotao@yahoo.fr

Please submit the abstract of your paper for this session to the chairs before June 30, 2015.

Authenticity in the arts, in its relations with the idea of elusion, can be considered in at least three aspects.

The first is that of authenticity in the artistic creation conceived as the satisfaction of the creator's intentions. This generic hypothesis can instigate discussion and take specific configurations in different cultures, yet provides a vector for the limits of those satisfactions. The consequence is the necessity of elusions or inventive solutions that are sometimes stimulating. The notion of authenticity imposes the examination of the relationships between art and censorship (political, religious, moral, social, pedagogical), as well as on broader questions about freedom in art. It includes the material limits that can be financial or technical. Thanks to the second term of the proposal, both situations presuppose the study of channels that can circumvent obstacles. In short, it raises a more philosophical debate about the creator's intentions and completed works.

The second is authenticity linked to authorship. The attributions, the *connaissanceurship*, the studies of primary sources search with obsession to discover who the author is. Attribution has its basis of rigor but also its rhetoric, instruments of conviction and persuasion that faces difficulties which should be overcome. The question also focuses on the diverse principles of restoration in all fields. It presupposes the determined variables in different eras and cultures, the comprehension of authenticity or truth in works of art. Those problems frequently link the notion of authenticity to the art market and its financial value of authorship, a situation that imposes the question about the means, elusive or not, that the art historian needs to situate herself in the complex interplay between "fake" and "authentic".

The third reaches the status of the notion of art and its situation in diverse cultures. The position of a work dislocated from its primary function (religious, ritual, functional, decorative and symbolic) and incorporated in diverse expository modes reaches what could be called authenticity. It is a matter of new significations that has its own semantic strategies. They reach the very notion of authenticity in its instrumental status, which for the art historian is determining what its contact with it forcibly requires elusive practices.

Proposed roundtables:

- 1) Creation versus censorship: conflicts and consequences;
- 2) Artistic production and material limits: its solutions and impasses;
- 3) Authenticity, attribution and restorations;
- 4) What does "fake" mean;
- 5) The work of art resignified in collections, museums, and in the expository modes;
- 6) The concept of authenticity and the elusive solutions of the art historian.

Call For Papers for Session 10: Gendered Practices
THE 34TH CONGRESS OF CIHA, BEIJING 2016: TERMS

Chairs of the Session:

Brenda Schmahmann, University of Johannesburg, Johannesburg, South Africa

brendas@uj.ac.za

LI Gongming (Mr.), Guangzhou Academy of Fine Arts, Guangzhou, China

limyk@163.com

XIANG Zairong (Junior Chair, Mr.), ICI Berlin Institute for Cultural Inquiry, Berlin, Germany

zairong.xiang@ici-berlin.org

Please submit the abstract of your paper for this session to the chairs before June 30, 2015.

The theme of the symposium ('Terms: Concepts of Art History') serves as a starting point for exploring the implications of the terms 'feminism', 'gender' and 'queer theory' for the discipline. Through a discussion of specific case studies, participants in this session are invited to explore how a focus on gender can enable new understandings of art of the past as well as concerns that have underpinned much art practice since the 1970s.

Two sub-themes feature as the focus of the session, and participants are asked to submit papers which fall within the framework of either of these:

I. Globalising gender studies, feminism and queer theory: Studies in which there is a focus on gender and which are directed at practitioners from the past and present in the United States, Britain and Western Europe have been complemented by work on artists from other geographies. But the date when works of art or studies underpinned by a focus on gender emerged, the form these discourses assumed and their overall impact differ from one context to another, and are nuanced by the particular political and social circumstances of the country concerned. Yet while it is generally acknowledged that concerns with gender have had a 'global' impact on art, the ways in which such concerns have manifested themselves in different geographies has at this point not been widely documented or discussed in international forums, and knowledge of work from contexts outside the United States, Europe and Western Europe tends to be somewhat limited or partial for most art historians who are not themselves from the countries concerned. In a move to address this gap in art historical discourse, papers are invited which, through selected examples, explore the implications of what feminism, queer theory or gender studies may have meant in the context of art histories and art-making practices outside the United States, Britain and Western Europe (or for diaspora artists in the West). Proposals for papers pertaining to all geographies outside the West are welcome, and those focused on Asian contexts are especially encouraged.

II. Gender and the re-reading of art histories: While early feminist work often focused on including hitherto neglected women artists in art history, subsequent feminist discourse as well as studies falling within the rubric of queer theory have focused increasingly on ways in which the style, subject matter or use of art objects might be interpreted in light of the gender politics operative within various historical periods and contexts. By bringing to light gendered concepts which may have informed the circumstances underpinning the making of art, or which may have had a bearing on style or subject matter, studies of gender may do more than simply widen knowledge about image-making practices in the past to take cognisance of, for instance, relations of power between men and women, the kinds of

constructs about 'masculinity' and 'femininity' which held sway, or attitudes towards same-sex relationships in particular timeframes and geographies: such studies may also in fact prompt a total revision in prior conceptions about the social and cultural contexts in which those objects and images were produced and the role they may have played. Working in light of this observation, papers are invited which undertake new readings of selected art works, revealing how interpretations of images and objects in light of a politics of gender have the potential to create very different readings to those which have tended to dominate art-historical canons.

Call For Papers for Session 11: Landscape and Spectacle
THE 34TH CONGRESS OF CIHA, BEIJING 2016: TERMS

Chairs of the Session:

Peter Krieger, National Autonomous University of Mexico, Mexico City, Mexico

kriger@unam.mx

FU Shen (Mr.), National Taiwan University, Taipei, Taiwan

shen.fu@ymail.com

TENG Yuning (Junior Chair, Ms.), Peking University, Beijing, China

ateng0127@gmail.com

Please submit the abstract of your paper for this session to the chairs before June 30, 2015.

“Landscape” is probably one of the most complex and interesting topics of art historical research. At present, given the increase in global hyperurbanization, the traditional distinction between “city” and “landscape” is dissolving. New hybrid forms of urban landscapes are arising creating different imaginaries which are difficult to understand. Experts have shown that “landscape” is one of the most attractive visual topics in contemporary culture. However, traditional descriptive patterns persist, opposing landscape to city. The notion of landscape is produced by neurological processes that create overlaps between fact and fiction. Multiple visual representations serve as filters and framework for landscape perception and understanding. Images of landscapes synthesize the complex accumulation of natural and cultural elements. They constitute meaning, determined by the epistemological parameters of different cultures in different times.

Therefore, art historical research may provide important insights about long-term developments and cultural differentiation of landscape representation. How do we approach the construction of landscape in image and word? Which terms did the constructors of landscape invent and use for analysis and interpretation? What kind of spiritual sources do we have to revise defining historical and contemporary landscapes? And how do beholders deal with these terms when they try to understand the complex phenomena of landscape? What relation between society and reality appears in the process of “terming” the different landscapes’ aesthetics?

To structure the session, I propose six categories, which include important facets of the topic “landscape and spectacle”.

1) The history and presence of landscape painting, one of the most influential *genres* in art history. This category examines how terms were invented and applied in order to convert land first into landscape and then into landscape painting. In this chapter, speakers may show how cultural interpretation discloses landscape and the visual schema of its representation in paintings – not only in Western art from the 17th century on, but also in the older Asian traditions and their pictorial and philosophical contexts. Also, papers may address how viewing landscapes generated mental and visual formulae which determined collective habits and environments.

2) Collective consciousness about the shape of landscapes is also produced in other visual media, such as land art installation, photography and film, as well as popular visual media

(press, television, and internet). These are spheres of visual production that offer different conditions of reception. Apart from land art installations with their site-specific impact, the frameable possessions of landscape on photographic paper or on the video screen register different states of the metamorphosis of the landscape, and they are distributed in wide circulation, with enduring effects. Thus, in this category, the media history of landscape will be reviewed as an important aspect of art historical. The proposed expansion of analysis from art works to any kind of visual production also includes popular and commercial products as well as scientific images in cartography or ecology.

3) Studies on the designers and analysts of landscape; i.e. gardeners, landscape architects, and also cartographers, geographers, ecologists, and experts from other related natural sciences. Here, landscape appears as a manifold phenomenon described by a wide range of terms. For art historians, aware of their analytic tools, this revision may inspire more complex interpretations examining images of landscape as sources for knowledge production. Papers may also address how the visual schema of artistic and scientific register of landscape are closely interrelated, and how landscape views determine world views.

4) Eco-aesthetics and eco-criticism: The environmental debate concentrates on scientific contributions and political decisions, but also includes aesthetic aspects. Images and imaginations of landscape, their expressions and terms, widen the horizon of understanding. Landscape, with all its elements, including clouds, was one of the most intense breeding grounds for visual knowledge production. Papers may deal with the epistemological function of visual landscape representation in environmental processes. Ecological thinking also offers a different approach to (art) historiography, because our discipline frequently ignores the long-term evolution of the landscape as embodied in geological formations, botanic diversity, or even climate change. If we define landscape as the penetration of time in space, then the parameters of long-term evolution should be included in paintings which refer to certain historical moments. Even the built environment with the short-term impacts of urban development is part of the landscape with its evolutionary and aesthetic characteristics, configuring specific eco-systems.

5) Political iconography of landscape: Papers in this category may analyze the production and reception of landscape's visual formulae that serve political systems, including future visions of utopia. This can include the codification of landscape by national, regional, and local stereotypes. Landscape is included in the political theory of space, where every (infra)structural and visual element can claim political significance. Landscape is a political text, constituted by certain terms. Conceptually, it spans from open, democratic landscapes to the controlled landmarks of monarchy, the restricted territories of dictatorship and even the expanding character of imperialism. Recent studies of the political landscape have revealed the potential of this art historical field of research to bring new light into traditional political debates.

6) City and landscape as spectacle, which has political, ecological, socio-psychological, and economic implications. Based on the old European notion of landscape as amenity, the so-called "society of spectacles" (Guy Debord) has converted cities and nature into isolated, simplified, often banalized elements of high efficiency in the popular entertainment business. Paradigmatic cases for late 20th century spectacular commercial landscapes are gambling cities like Las Vegas or Macao. But shopping malls and entertainment centers are

also miniature landscapes of spectacle, where the *locus amoenus* is reproduced as an artificial ambience to stimulate shopping. This kind of domesticated commercial and spectacular landscape has become an essential part of the contemporary urban settings. Art historical inquiry of landscape and spectacle analyses the configuration of visual stereotypes and their impact on urban image, taking into account what terms are used for interpretation and critique.

Call For Papers for Session 12: Garden and Courtyard

THE 34TH CONGRESS OF CIHA, BEIJING 2016: TERMS

Chairs of the Session:

Antoine Gournay, Paris Sorbonne University, Paris, France

antoine.gournay@paris-sorbonne.fr

XUE Yongnian (Mr.), China Central Academy of Fine Arts, Beijing, China

xueyongnian1@126.com

HUANG Xiaofeng (Junior Chair, Mr.), China Central Academy of Fine Arts, Beijing, China

huangxiaofeng@cfa.edu.cn

Please submit the abstract of your paper for this session to the chairs before June 30, 2015.

Gardens and courtyards, as a universal phenomenon, provide for us an ideal subject of cross-cultural and trans-disciplinary exploration. This session will provide an opportunity to raise the issue of the specificity of gardens and courtyards. It will consider the various techniques and materials used in their construction and design, and the different ways they are used and perceived in various traditions and historical contexts. It is impossible to define and understand the garden in certain perspective. The charming of a garden lies in its multi-facet significance and its warm welcome given to the endeavour of understanding it in different cultural perspectives. Technically, garden and courtyard seems to be not only concerned with space and orientation, but also with time and cycles. Functionally, creating a garden involves both making something to look at, and a place to live in. What they offer to look at, and the way they allow their users to live, can be interpreted as the expression of certain ideals concerning nature or the place of human beings in the universe.

The following issues could be addressed:

1. Space design and time-planning in the gardens of different cultures.
2. Gardens as places for specific activities (feasts, gatherings, games and art performances, religious practices...) and its connection with outer world.
3. Gardens as tools to create specific impressions and feelings.
4. Gardens as ways to express or represent ideas or show images of nature or the cosmic universe.
5. Gardens, the cultural exchange and the travel of ideas.
6. Gardens and its role in the shaping of different cultures and societies.

These issues could also serve as possible starting points or as a grid of interpretation to compare different gardens from various historic traditions.

Call For Papers for Session 13: Transmission and Adoption
THE 34TH CONGRESS OF CIHA, BEIJING 2016: TERMS

Chairs of the Session:

Seinosuke Ide, Kyushu University, Fukuoka, Kyushu, Japan
ideseiosuke@gmail.com

YANG Xiaoyan (Mr.), Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou, China
olivienyang@gmail.com
olivien_yang@126.com

LIU Chen (Junior Chair, Ms.), Tsinghua University, Beijing, China
clfirenze@163.com

Please submit the abstract of your paper for this session to the chairs before June 30, 2015.

Concept

“Transmission and Adoption” is one of the themes that has been discussed for a long time. In the transcultural spread of art and art concept between A and B, transmitted contents from A used to come to face and be exposed to some bias or filter which formed inside of B according to its cultural context, and finally they were adopted by B. The original patterns of interest of art and art concept are not necessarily guaranteed through transmission and adoption.

In this session, bearing in mind the above discussed complementary relations between transmitter and adopter, we propose to emphasize the entire process of the transcultural spread of art and art concept and their adoption, namely on the role of different modes and means of transmission. We then hope to elucidate how new modes and means of transmission could expand the value of relativity and strengthen the perceptible impact on humanity.

In the process of transmission and adoption of art and art concept, the artist and the art coordinator have held important roles. Those men of talent who were familiar with the material, iconography, and mode of expression of canonical art form could realize reproduce original form as new and prepare educative programs through their transcultural journeys. They could then contribute greatly to the transmission of art concept in different cultural spaces.

On the other hand, we know of many concrete cases in all times and places among the East, the West, and the South that artist or art coordinator did not necessarily take part in the process. In these cases of the absence, transmitted art objects and knowledge stemmed from published books of art or technical manuals for art. These sometimes took much more important roles than the artist. It should be noted also that small model and flat pattern after originals but different in their material, form, and scale functioned effectively as substitutes.

Finally, the problem of time lag of adoption was not discussed much in previous conferences and therefore it will also be discussed in this session. Frequent occurrence of time lag in the history of transmission and adoption of art and art concept is postulated to have stemmed from the historical background of the adopter that the preceded the art and art concept which formed and functioned as some bias and filter against new ones.

According to this session’s concept, we made five sub-session themes as follows. Examples are also noted after each.

Sub-sessions themes of Session Number 13

1) The Impact and Adoption of Different Modes of Expression as New

- Canonical art form of Chinese Court in East Asia
- Adoption of western art of representation(three dimensional perspective and chiaroscuro) in the East
- Adoption of language of form of Japanese print Ukiyo-e in the art of the 19th century Europe
- Discovery of art of Africa by modernist artists in the 20th century
- Circulation of performance art and installation in the contemporary art and raising or reevaluation of art of calligraphy and art for ritual

2) The Role of the Artist or the Art Coordinator in Transmission and Adoption

- Sending and inviting an artist in the East Asia or among different cultural spaces
- Role of artists who learned at and returned from dominant cultural spaces
- The circulation of religious icons by Japanese or Korean monks returned from China
- Educative program and practice in Semianrio of the Jezuitto cult in the East and the South

3) Transmission of Art Concept and Forms Through Knowledge (eg., Books and Manuals)

- The circulation of art books and practical manuals of art in Chinese cultural sphere
- Legends of artists and their influence on the formation of new movement of art

4) Change of Art Mode, Genre, Form or Material in the Process of Transmission and Adoption

- Drawing as medium of transmission of original form for textile or wall painting
- Statue to Painting and Painting to Statue in the transmission of religious icons
- Sharing the same iconography in different materials in the transcultural spread of art
- The circulation of Western reproductive prints in different cultural spaces
- Masterpieces as icon in the modern market

5) Time Lag in the Adoption of Art Forms and Art Concept

- Time lag between Korea and Japan in the access to canonical art form of China
- Adoption of Western art of modernism in different cultural spaces
- Understanding of the splashed ink painting between the East Asia and the West
- Discovery of art of the East in the West and that of the South in the East
- Reevaluation of border art in the formation of national art history

CALL FOR PAPERS

This session aims to investigate the robust process of the intercultural transmission of art and/or art concepts, and the changing patterns of interest and expression that result from transmission and adoption. Previous Congress sessions have addressed this topic but here we will emphasize the different modes, means and methods of transmission and the ways in which they affect the relative value or perception of a work, or alter the impact of art works and concepts on either side of the transmission.

Papers may in principle take up a variety of examples, but any paper proposal should keep in mind the entire process of the trans-cultural spread of art and art concepts even as they might feature one aspect of that process. To allow for coherence within the session, the

following five sub-sessions are proposed. Potential papers should address at least one of the five themes exemplified in the session concept.

- 1) The Impact and Adoption of Different Modes of Expression as New
- 2) The Role of the Artist or the Art Coordinator in Transmission and Adoption
- 3) Transmission of Art Concept and Forms Through Knowledge (eg., Books and Manuals)
- 4) Change of Art Mode, Genre, Form or Material in the Process of Transmission and Adoption
- 5) Time Lag in the Adoption of Art Forms and Art Concept

Call For Papers for Session 14: The Other and the Foreign: Contact, Curiosity, and Creative Exchange

THE 34TH CONGRESS OF CIHA, BEIJING 2016: TERMS

Chairs of the Session:

Petra Chu, Seton Hall University, New Jersey, US

petra.chu@shu.edu

DING Ning, Peking University, Beijing, China

dingning@pku.edu.cn

LIANG Shuhan (Junior Chair, Mr.), Peking University, Beijing, China

liangtiantian@hotmail.com

Please submit the abstract of your paper for this session to the chairs before June 30, 2015.

This session is concerned with the representation of the 'other' and the 'foreign' in art as well as with the reception of 'other' and 'foreign' art forms. It acknowledges that, in a global world, the notion of 'othering' is not restricted to the geographically or ethnically distant ('foreign'), but occurs within one's own (geographically defined) culture between different social classes, genders, age groups, and religious affiliations. More generally, the session focuses on the phenomenon of artistic encounter and exchange. While its parameters are worldwide, papers on all topics related to the 'other'/'foreign' are solicited in as far as they pertain to the creation and reception of art and/or the transmission of creative ideas. Papers on the contacts between specific regions or the role and place of individual artists in the process of artistic exchange are welcomed.

Questions to be addressed may include but are not limited to the following:

- Can we distinguish universal paradigms for the ways in which 'the other' is represented in art, globally?
- In the global history of art, how have animals been used as devices for 'othering', not solely as subject matter, but as a means through which artists and their audiences engage with the nature of self-other relationships?
- How can we improve our theoretical models of the reception of foreign and, more generally, 'other' art?
- Are there degrees of 'otherness', and if so, can we measure them? Can a work produced within one's own (geographically defined) culture be just as 'other' as, or more so than, a work produced in a 'foreign' culture?
- How can we theorize 'artistic exchange'?
- How do we define 'hybridity' in art? Is more than one definition possible?
- What is the relation/difference between exchanges between cultural centers and those that happen at peripheries, specifically in connection with 'hybrid' art forms?

- To what extent can artistic differences and sameness be accounted for through geography?

**Call For Papers for Session 15: Creative Misunderstanding
THE 34TH CONGRESS OF CIHA, BEIJING 2016: TERMS**

Chairs of the Session:

László Beke, Hungarian University of Fine Arts, Budapest, Hungary
beke.laszlo@btk.mta.hu

**PAN Yaochang (Mr.)/Zhang Jian(Mr.), Shanghai University, Shanghai, China /China
Academy of Art, Hangzhou, China**
panyaochang@163.net / zhangjian1028@163.com

HU Jun (Junior Chair, Mr.), Northwestern University, Evanston, US
jun.hu@northwestern.edu

Please submit the abstract of your paper for this session to the chairs before June 30, 2015.

In the spirit of the Section's proposal we can read: „The focus here is on misunderstanding and misinterpretation in the history of art. It intends to further study the problem of the reception of foreign, heterodox and non-traditional cultures.” Everybody knows the 19th century misinterpretation of the cloud and fog representation in the Chinese landscape painting as early impressionistic sign of atmosphere. Another example of a (tragic) mistake from the 20th century is the destruction of the Montecassino abbey by an American bomber because of a misunderstood verbal instruction. (The American decoder thinks the German word „Abt” (abbey) for the abbreviation of German „Abteilung” (military department).) However, our understanding of the Section title is based on the confrontation of the two concept *creativity* and *misunderstanding*.

We are interested in any kind of cross-connection between *creativity* and *misunderstanding*. In which aspect differ Western and Eastern kind interpretations of *creativity* and *misunderstanding*?

Concerning *creativity*, we are interested in the cultural determinants of conscious and unconscious part of the creative process, in the dialogue between artists and the audience, as well as the inner process by bi- or multicultural artists.

Concerning *misunderstanding* and *understanding* we recommend to analyse *creativity* as a sort of divergent thinking, deviating from the norms, especially from cultural norms, or as a result of a bias in perception or generally in understanding, how switching of cultural frames might lead to *misunderstanding*, and eventually to a creative novelty.

Misunderstanding could appear in interpreting art historical phenomena, in trying to explain changes in historical processes, interpreting old sources and documents.

Experts could not recognise fakes, they could not distinguish between original and copies. You can find historical or contemporary examples, when the author misunderstands his or her task or commission, misinterprets the subject matter (if it is a natural or a social, political phenomenon)

You could deliver comparative studies among different national traditions of the failures and their corrections. Different theories could emerge from linguistic differences of national terminologies of *misunderstanding* and other kind of mistakes, errors, failures, misfits etc.

How is it possible to convert mistakes for advantage or favour – in the composition or interpretation? How the audience or the viewer could better understand the artwork better than even the artist?

Invent new strategies to exploit errors and misunderstandings for the profit of art!

The co-chairs also welcome co-authored, interdisciplinary, intercultural and comparative works.

**Call For Papers for Session 16: Commodity and Market
THE 34TH CONGRESS OF CIHA, BEIJING 2016: TERMS**

Chairs of the Session:

Uwe Fleckner, University of Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany

uwe.fleckner@uni-hamburg.de

ZHAO Li (Mr.), China Central Academy of Fine Arts, Beijing, China

zhaoli@cafa.edu.cn

MA Xuedong (Junior Chair, Mr.), China Central Academy of Fine Arts, Beijing, China

maxuedong@chinaamrc.com

Please submit the abstract of your paper for this session to the chairs before June 30, 2015.

The global art market is one of the determining factors in the international exchange of art works and artistic ideas, it therefore essentially defines the mobility of art works, understood as »image vehicles« (Aby Warburg), as objects of an exchange of cultural traditions, pictorial information, iconographic models and creative artistic inventions, but also as objects of interest of public and private collections and finally of the political and social representation of power. The 16th section of the 34th International Congress in the History of Art in Beijing 2016 would like to focus on the implementation of an updated art historical method, in order to find appropriate ways of analyzing the effects of the art market on specific art works and their transfer history in past and present times. We are expecting proposals by specialists in this fields for papers dealing with case studies from issues like, for example, colonial exploitation through the trade of indigenous art, market-oriented creation of non-western art objects for the European market, the forced transfer of art works in political conflicts of the 20th century up to the lasting impact of market forces on the world-wide artistic production in contemporary art.

Call For Papers for Session 17: Display
THE 34TH CONGRESS OF CIHA, BEIJING 2016: TERMS

Chairs of the Session:

Michel Hochmann, École pratique des Hautes Études, Paris, France

michel.hochmann@gmail.com

GAO Shiming (Mr.), China Academy of Art, Hangzhou, China

visualcenter@vip.163.com

ZHANG Chen (Junior Chair, Ms.), China Academy of Art, Hangzhou, China

vici0029@hotmail.com

Please submit the abstract of your paper for this session to the chairs before June 30, 2015.

The display of art has been the topic of many research programs in recent years, especially among the historians of collections and of museums. By investigating this topic, we endeavour to understand how a work of art or an object interacts or has interacted with its environment, what kind of relationships it establishes with its viewers or with other objects, in which context it is or has been presented? Through the history of art, we attempt at the same time to discover how these objects were shown, to what kind of public and for what purpose? All these issues naturally have much to do not only with museology or questions raised by contemporary exhibition making practices, but also with anthropology or social history.

The papers for Session 17 might perhaps consider the spaces that surround works of art in different cultures and civilizations, the way these works were integrated, compared or classified with others, how the viewer was introduced to these objects, how publics were constructed, what they had to do in order to gain access to these objects and what kind of ceremonies accompanied their contemplation? Furthermore, how have art historians shaped the narratives of art history through exhibitions? How can devices of display rewrite narratives? What effect does the exhibition have on art historical concepts and methodologies? Throughout history, how have "curators" engaged in the performance of differences by engaging in exhibition making practices?

Here, we want also to clarify the nature of what one might call the politics of display. Art has changed radically in the last 50 years, becoming far more complicated as a practice, at once both visual and conceptual, relational and political, discursive and performative, capitalized and institutionalized. Accompanying these changes, today, we find the museum to be no longer merely a seat for the Muses, having become instead a complex hybrid of - amongst other things - theatre, cinema, classroom, workshop, congress hall and public square. In the same way, display is not only an attendant design grammar for the museum exhibitions, nor is it merely to do with publicising artworks. Rather, display is itself the construction of a situation in the sense Guy Debord deployed the term, as a means to: "produce new social relationships and thus new social realities". The politics of display refers not to the politics of identity or of the multicultural management that governs the making of exhibitions and historical narrative, but concerns rather the ambiguous relationship of labor and work, aura and fetish, authorship and ownership, object-hood and event-hood, consumption and communication.

Display, as the moment of art's disclosure, is not to do solely with the placement of artworks, nor is it simply a "jouissance installation"; it presents us rather with a possibility, to overcome the fetishism of museum, to transcend our limits of spectatorship.

Call For Papers for Session 18: Media and Visuality
THE 34TH CONGRESS OF CIHA, BEIJING 2016: TERMS

Chairs of the Session:

Frederick Asher, University of Minnesota, Minnesota, US
asher@umn.edu

Eugene Wang, Harvard University, Cambridge, US
eywang@fas.harvard.edu

HUANG Bing (Junior Chair, Ms.), Harvard University, Cambridge, US
shuhuangbing@gmail.com

Please submit the abstract of your paper for this session to the chairs before June 30, 2015.

Perspective for the Session

Introduction

For the session on Media and Visuality, we ask not only how the globality of the present information age impacts the formation of cultural identities but also to what extent it actually does so. The world, we argue, has long been connected, but generally in ways that preserve the cultural identity of individual groups, for example, the merchants who established trade depots, as Philip Curtin called them, far from home. But they were not isolated, and aspects of their culture, including visual imagery, were often shared distant from home, for example, Buddhist and Hindu merchants from India settled along coastal Southeast Asia and China, whose religion, and the visual imagery that accompanies it, came to be adopted by host cultures.

The Questions and Issues

How, we ask, is that different from the present age in which instantaneous communication, including sharing of visual imagery, makes possible a more homogeneous world culture. Or does it? Do present-day artists in Southeast Asia or China, for example, areas impacted by Buddhism and Hinduism of Indian trade diasporas, now lose cultural identity, or do there remain distinctive features to the contemporary art of these regions. Do we need to assume a dominant artistic culture, i.e. the Euro-American artistic practice and forms that modern media spreads, and is universally adopted? Or might there be examples of the reverse, that is, like the Japanese Ukiyo-e impact on French artists late in the 19th century, Euro-American artists who find stimulus from the visual cultural production elsewhere in the world? Above all, given the importance of media, we ask about the role of diverse media in shaping global arts, creating an environment of both sharing and resistance, of national or regional artistic dialects, and an audience that might respond favorably or antagonistically to the visual production.

The Papers We Envision

We seek papers that not so much celebrate the globalized visual culture made possible by the Internet and related means of sharing but rather ones that critique the notion of a commonly shared visual world. As we think of literature, for example, we note the highly distinctive forms that are culturally unique developed by Latin American authors such as Gabriel García Márquez and Roberto Bolaño, whose prose would never be imagined as global except in terms of the audience for it. Can the same be said of the visual arts? Or do

we look at Ai Wei Wei and Anish Kapoor as artists but not regionally specific ones? What, then, are the impacts of “common time” and the breakdown of spatially distinctive entities?

Draft Call for Papers

Since time and space – faster movement of time and fuzzier definitions of space – have changed the ways in which people interact in the present day, we seek papers that will explore case studies, e.g. artists or movements that are impacted by the more intimately connected world. We could imagine, for example, papers on performance art in Asia or Latin America but asking, at the same time, about the ways in which performance is significantly different from premodern practice. We could imagine papers that focus on audience, as much as practice, and the ways in which reception of new artistic forms is shaped by communication in a present not impeded by constraints of slow communication. And finally, though not exclusively, we seek papers that examine popular participation, recognizing that even patronage for artistic production is no longer entirely the province of the politically and financially elite. Do art historians, for example, shape taste? Is there truly today a pop audience for the visual arts as there is for music, one that not only consumes but also shapes the production of visual art?

**Call For Papers for Session 19: History of Beauty vs. History of Art
THE 34TH CONGRESS OF CIHA, BEIJING 2016: TERMS**

Chairs of the Session:

Claudia Cieri Via, Sapienza University of Rome, Rome, Italy

claudia.cierivia@uniroma1.it

LIU Weidong (Mr.), Nanjing University of the Arts, Nanjing, China

moji_ny@sina.com

DAI Dan (Junior Chair, Mr.), Nanjing University of the Arts, Nanjing, China

dai-tan@hotmail.com

Please submit the abstract of your paper for this session to the chairs before June 30, 2015.

The relationship between the concept of Beauty and Art History, between aesthetics and Art History, the theme this panel proposes, calls into question a wide spectrum of issues regarding the status of Art and the role images, history, culture, and national and ethnics identities play in a globalized world. The aim of this panel is to reconsider the relationship between the concept of art and the concept of the canon in critical terms and in a dialogue with the scholarly debate the issue generated in the past decades. Special attention will be given to comparative studies able to broad the cultural and spatial borders and engage different cultural identities in their diverse contextual and transcultural dimensions. Possible points of reference include the pictorial turn and the anthropology of images, specifically the question of agency. By questioning the boundaries between artworks and images, between Art History and Visual Studies, these interpretive models call special attention towards the diversity of ethnic and national identities and their respective discrete cultures.

This session will focus on the following topics:

- The concepts of beauty and of the canon through a reconsideration of the different canons formulated by different cultures in relation to their original contexts and their possible migrations.
- The concept of beauty as antithesis of ugliness: a transcultural field of inquiry.
- The role images play in the field of communication, freedom of artistic expression, and defense of human rights.
- The aesthetic experience today and its connection to the neuro - and cognitive sciences.
- Art and the artistic process: the concept of agency.
- The attention towards the image and the emergence of history and memory.
- The vitality of images, "as if they were alive."
- The animation of images, between consecration and intelligence.

**Call For Papers for Session 20: Professional Education and Aesthetic Education
THE 34TH CONGRESS OF CIHA, BEIJING 2016: TERMS**

Chairs of the Session:

Gabriela Siracusano, National University of Tres de Febrero (CONICET-UNTREF), Buenos Aires, Argentina

gasiracusano@gmail.com

ZHANG Gan (Mr.), Tsinghua University, Beijing, China

zhanggan@tsinghua.edu.cn

LIU Ping (Junior Chair, Ms.), Tsinghua University, Beijing, China

fessart@hotmail.com

Please submit the abstract of your paper for this session to the chairs before June 30, 2015.

Changes in art and art history education have always been linked to diverse purposes (aesthetic, political, religious, historical, etc.) settled by the artistic communities within different societies and cultures, as well as to the development of scientific and technological knowledge and devices.

In Western tradition, art education has shown to be a complex but also flexible field by which aesthetic theories, concepts and methods applied in artistic practices can be traced: from a pyramidal guild educational structure mostly based in secret knowledge and skills in Medieval times, to the gradual opening of artist's workshops in Modern times, the insertion of the painting and sculpture as part of the Liberal arts, or the powerful arousals of the academies by the 17th century. It's worth saying that there are also disparities between European practices concerning these issues, and the way they were performed in the Americas, especially during the so called Colonial period, where professional and non-professional art education evidence blurred limits in many regions.

As for Eastern traditions, in China non-professional art education is probably, if not more, at least as important as the professional one. So called high art was limited to the group of *literati* (specially before Ming Dynasty). Within Chinese tradition, non-professional artistic creation and appreciation (painting, calligraphy, literature, poetry, music and other high arts) were part of basic training for *literati*, as a way of practicing Dao. By 19th century the art education reformers in China, introduced not only the Western art, but also the Western art education system in order to build from the foundation a new nation to pair with the West. This initiative has greatly influenced the direction of Chinese art, until today.

As for Western aesthetics and art history's writing and teaching, theories and methods advanced from a biographic and teleological history based in progress and in the domain of illusionary mimesis of reality. The hegemony and survival of Classical styles, the problem of meaning (iconography) and the question on how to define certain forms and styles through the creation of categories, have been within the main traditional topics for centuries. In China, the *literati* non-professional artists had the absolute authority over art and art theory. They praise highly the artworks with pure ink painting language. This taste turns the strokes and ink into the most unique and the most attractive elements of Chinese painting, which dominated the artistic critique and art history writing for centuries. During the 20th century, the practice of Western art education mode introduced new critical criteria, which changed the face of Chinese art.

The advent of the “information era” within the 20th and 21st centuries is definitely challenging all these statements, and –what seems more interesting- producing new “communicating vessels” between East and West. The intimate relationship between art, science and technology, the promotion of international networks, the place of interdisciplinarity, artist’s involvement in local, regional and world’s political, economic and ecological subjects, the ongoing development of visual media and digital technologies, the intersection and connection between senses (visual, audition, smelling, etc) and the arousal of new industrial materials to be combined with new uses and meanings of traditional and non-traditional ones, among other topics, appear to be today at the center of a global discussion, which exceeds geographical and cultural frontiers.

As a consequence, art and art history and aesthetic education are facing similar situations and challenges all around the world, although may be with different solutions. On the other hand, new artistic concepts, environments (from the ateliers to the scientific labs) and methods, together with new models of communication and transmission, demand new specialized art education, which of course also affects the development of art history discourses.

This session, therefore, intends to discuss these and other aspects, putting an accent in confluences and disparities between Eastern and Western traditions, in order to promote a fluid and deep dialogue between the participants, that will guide us to new conclusions and perspectives.

**Call For Papers for Session 21: Connecting Art Histories and World Art
THE 34TH CONGRESS OF CIHA, BEIJING 2016: TERMS**

Chairs of the Session:

Eva Troelenberg, Kunsthistorisches Institut in Florenz, Florence, Italy

troelenberg@khi.fi.it

CAO Yiqiang (Mr.), China Academy of Art, Hangzhou, China

yiqiangc@hotmail.com

XU Liwei (Mr.), Nanjing Normal University, Nanjing, China

emerson323@163.com

Please submit the abstract of your paper for this session to the chairs before June 30, 2015.

Art History, Media and Representation: Towards a Postglobal Canon?

The main issue we seek to address in this session is how the canon in art history was, is and potentially will be represented and consolidated, but also particularly how it can be challenged, changed and transformed through media. The notion of the canon as such has great epistemological value and it always serves as a reference in art history practice, whether it be for formal comparison, dating, iconographic analyses, etc. It is also invested with power as it defines what should be studied and what is or is not worthy of a researcher's or art recipient's attention.

We will consider records and visual representations of the canon and its contestants from both a historical and a contemporary perspective. Beginning with definitions of the Early Modern era, which can be considered as the birth of the modern 'age of the image' and its canonical order, we will move on to media such as survey books, photography, contemporary virtual repositories and even visions for future modes of representation in art history.

Considering particular case studies as well as larger theoretical issues, we seek to investigate the impact of representational media and techniques on perceptions of the canon worldwide, thus outlining an epistemological contribution to the definition and understanding of the Concepts of Art History between the discipline's tradition and its future beyond the 'global turn'.

Contributions to the session could address the following or related issues:

- The function of historical and new representation media in the process of the consolidation or changing of the canon.
- The canon and the tension between statics and dynamics. The canon is a fixed and defined element, but at the same time it is in constant motion. Each new interpretation of an artefact or each new object in a collection has the potential to change it, and even the most valued masterpieces may change their ranking position, or even lose their place in the canon. How does this relate to new participatory modes of communication and representation?
- The role of the diffusion and accessibility of representational techniques such as print, photography, new media etc.
- Representation vs. suppression in the canon
- Representing national, regional and 'world art' canons or alternative canons
- The canon and cultural heritage 'maps'
- Historiographies and agents of canon critique in art history

Developed by Dr Eva-Maria Troelenberg, Research Group Leader, Kunsthistorisches Institut Florenz – MPI, and Dr Magdalena Wróblewska, Institute of Art History, University of Warsaw