

‡ EDITOR'S INTRODUCTION

I am happy and proud to see the second issue of *Chiasma: A Site for Thought* published this year. We were established in September 2013 as an annual, double-blind, peer-reviewed journal to further the disruption, generation, and dispersion of that much decried, yet inescapable beast of the academy: theory. We continue to feature invited essays, peer-reviewed articles, and solicited reviews of books and of academic fields, and have this year also included a translation of academic work previously unavailable in English. Though housed in Western University's Centre for the Study of Theory and Criticism, *Chiasma's* editorial and advisory personnel, and our contributors, are drawn from a variety of disciplines in the arts, humanities, and social sciences. We are united in our commitment not to a methodology, a politics, a body of texts, or even an approach, but rather to a problem: what, how, and why do we think theory, and what does this *do*?

Our inaugural issue questioned "What the Doing of Thinking Does and Doesn't Do Today." When we sent out this year's Call for Papers inviting submissions on the 'problem' of the teaching of being, we were motivated by our interest in the possible consequences—philosophical, social, political, financial, ethical, and otherwise—of the prevailing academic interest in ontology. More specifically, we were interested in the possible consequences of the teaching of ontology, ontologies. Whatever else might have changed in and around the academy, this problem remains: with one eye on 2015 and the other on that abstract realm we call history (at other times, the future), we teach and we learn and we publish on how to understand what it is, what it means, to be. With this in mind, this year we ask, "What Now, Professor?" This particular problem is too formidable for any particular article to address, so we have collected articles and reviews that engage some of its aspects.

Eileen Joy returns to this issue with her article “Let Us Now Stand Up For Bastards,” which is at once a response to Johanna Drucker’s work on the digital humanities, a critical inquiry into the changing relationship between the public commons and the University, and something between a manifesto and a call to arms to all “bastards” against the tyranny of cultural Authority. In discussing the crisis of the digital humanities, Joy’s piece thus engages our “problem” on at least two fronts: that of the form in which new ideas and works exist and are made more or less accessible (and the social and financial consequences thereof), and that of the ontology of public-ation, which she defines as “the formation of publics and counter-publics,” in our digital age. In other words, Joy takes a meta-level survey of the industry of public(-)ation, of the production and teaching of knowledge and ideation, and urges us to side with the “bastards” and, in view of the possible consequences of recent trends in this industry, to “take care.”

Will Samson’s article, “On the *Neuro-* Turn in the Humanities,” was originally delivered as a Theory Session. The Sessions are the Centre for the Study of Theory and Criticism’s interdisciplinary forum for the lively exchange of ideas and research between resident and visiting students and faculty. In the spirit of these Sessions, following Samson’s piece we have also included a condensed version of Tom Wormald’s response. Samson’s article moves us out of Joy’s meta-industrial perspective, into Conflict of the Faculties territory. He examines the ongoing engagement of continental philosophy with neuroscience, and of phenomenology with naturalism, paying attention not least to the conflicting ontological claims of each. After returning to Dilthey’s distinction between explanation and understanding, Samson concludes by deftly negotiating a rapprochement between neuroscientific research and humanistic scholarship. Given that the dialogue between continental philosophy and neuroscience seems likely to continue—at the levels both of independent humanistic scholarship and neuroscientific research, and of university coursework and its teaching of being—Samson’s suggestions merit close consideration.

Levi R. Bryant’s “For an Apocalyptic Pedagogy” raises the stakes of the “problem” we posit in this issue, arguing that we need an “apocalyptic pedagogy” to effectively combat the perfidious “ontology of everyday life” (OEL)—that we need to practice apocalypse at a pedagogical level if we are to mitigate an apocalypse of the globe. Bryant advocates an ecological

approach to an ontology of flows, machines, and production, wherein the machine of pedagogy holds a powerful potential to unveil, apocalyptically, the world in which we dwell. Using the Bloemhof primary school in Rotterdam, Holland, as an example, Bryant argues that the implementation of apocalyptic pedagogy has the potential to demystify the actualism of OEL, to foster an ecological subjectivity, and to “directly intervene in the social and cultural ecologies of [...] students.”

Harvey L. Hix, in “Why *This* Poetry Matters,” begins by returning to the perennial question, “can poetry matter?” In order to make his case for the direct (and political) contemporary relevance of Fray Luis de León’s poetry, Hix hypothesizes and develops a theory that divides thinking into four “boxes,” based on the two axes of final versus provisional authority, and the ultimate immanence versus ultimate transcendence. He concludes that de León’s work “matters” because it belongs to box four, where authority is provisional and transcendence ultimate, the box which is “the most to be admired and the hardest to achieve and sustain,” not least because it is “the only box that legitimates civil disobedience”. Though Hix’s article is explicitly oriented to explaining the continuing relevance of de León’s poetry, working as it does through the history of ideas from Aristotle to the Patriot Act, Hix’s theory points to the direct, tangible social and political consequences of how we, and the authors we teach, think—and of what they teach us.

Noel Glover examines what the work of D. W. Winnicott has to offer pedagogy in his article, “Between Comfort and Disillusionment,” arguing that pedagogy has much to learn from Winnicott’s theories of play. Drawing on Winnicott’s therapeutic practices, Glover also advocates for pedagogical practices that give students the opportunity to experience their own formlessness and ignorance—where the goal would not be the formation of good neoliberal, self-sufficient subjectivities, but the experience of oneself “at play” with others, the opening up of the “self” we discover in the other, and the ‘self’ we creatively imagine ourselves to be. Glover thus uses Winnicott’s insights to imagine pedagogy as means of teaching another way to conceive of both an experience one’s self (one’s own ontology) and one’s relationship to others (both teachers and fellow students).

In their co-authored article, “Heidegger’s *Contributions* To Education (From Thinking),” Carolyn Thomas and Iain Thomson re-examine Martin

Heidegger's thoughts on ontotheology and his understanding of education as a practice oriented to readying human beings to think being. They interpret Heidegger's work as issuing a call for "a thinking catalyzed by a pedagogy practiced as relentless hermeneutic engagement with the ontotheological tradition," a thinking which repeatedly forces itself to encounter the shock of *aporia*, and moves us to "leap" away from ontotheology. Thomas and Thomson conclude with a suggestive description of post-metaphysical thinking as the "real education" of post-modern thinkers. In doing so, the authors, in a sense, respond to our "problem" in reverse—positing post-modern thinkers as a consequence of Heidegger's pedagogy, both continuing and breaking from the Western tradition.

Bernard Stiegler's article, "Annotation, Navigation, Electronic Editions," appears here in English translation for the first time, translated by John Oliver Beal. Read alongside Joy's article (and probably on the reader's computer), Stiegler's work provides valuable and engaging insight into the technological research, set of concerns, and theoretical background through which the digital humanities came into existence. We follow this with Jan Plug's review of Rodolphe Gasché's *Georges Bataille: Phenomenology and Phantasmology* and Kent L. Brintnall's review and evaluation of Calvin Thomas's *Ten Lessons in Theory*. Finally, in keeping with the theme of this issue, we have included participant reviews of two of the leading summer programs in critical theory. Asad Haider reviews his experience at the Duke-Bologna School on Global Studies and Critical Theory, and Aggeliki Sifaki her experience of Rosi Braidotti's course, *Critical Theory Beyond Negativity*.

Thanks are due as always to the students and faculty of the Centre for the Study of Theory and Criticism for their ongoing support of this project. Jon Doering in particular provided invaluable assistance. We also thank our outstanding Advisory Board, for their advice and encouragement; our contributors, for their generosity and enthusiasm; and the editors of this issue, for their commitment and creative industry. *Chiasma* is still a young publication, and as such it faces and overcomes many challenges each year; this issue would not have been possible without Ilya Merlin, Dru Farro, and Jeremy Colangelo, all of whom stepped up when it was most needed.