

ESF Exploratory Workshop on

**MYTHS OF THE CONTEMPORANEITY:  
PUBLIC REASON BETWEEN  
DECONSTRUCTION AND RECONSTRUCTION**

Cuneo (Italy), 19-22 September 2010

Convened by:  
**Alberto Martinengo**

---

**SCIENTIFIC REPORT**

---

*Co-sponsored by*



## 1. Executive summary

On 20 and 21 September 2010 the Exploratory Workshop « Myths of the Contemporaneity. Public Reason between Deconstruction and Reconstruction » was held at the Università di Torino (Cuneo site). The meeting, convened by Alberto Martinengo and included in the calendar of the ESF Exploratory Workshop 2010, was held through co-financing by the [gCentro Studi sul Pensiero Contemporaneo](#) (CESPEC, Cuneo) and by the Istituto di Storia dell'Europa Mediterranea of the Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche (CNR-ISEM, Torino). The workshop was attended by 20 scholars from 10 European Countries (including the convenor), with the presence of the Representative of the ESF Standing Committee for the Humanities and the Representatives of the two co-financing institutions, for a total of 23 people. Participation of the Representatives of the co-financing institutions, in the role of auditors, was agreed with the ESF Exploratory Workshop Office.

The project, presented to the ESF on April 29 2009, was funded on 30 November 2009. Starting from December 2009, informal contacts were made with the participants, to reach the final list which was presented to ESF. In a second phase, starting from March 2010, a series of official communications by the convenor were sent to the participants. In this way it was possible to define, at different times, the scientific contribution of each one (starting from the proposals of the convenor) and all the organizational aspects related to the presence of the scholars at the Università di Torino. At the same time, relations were carried out with the two sponsors, to ensure their effective involvement in the different phases of the project. This allowed an informal research team to be set up with the relevant – and necessary – duty subdivision: the case of the technical aspects, related to contacts with participants (for example, the translation of official communications, which the co-sponsors did through internal or external resources), and organizational aspects and scientific planning (which the convenor and Giulia Boggio Marzet, who also attended the workshop in the role of participant, worked on).

From an organizational perspective, it was possible to define well in advance (in July), the details of the participation of the attendees: flights/trains, accommodation, lunches, etc. This made it possible to keep costs under control and ensure compliance with the planned budget, even if having to redistribute some items of expenditure. More specifically, if on one hand the preliminary contacts linked with the publication of *proceedings* of the workshop highlights the need to elevate the level of funding provided for such an item, on the other it was possible to reduce (in some cases significantly) the other items of expenditure. For this purpose, the choice of local suppliers (hotels, restaurants, etc.), as well as the choice of transport solutions, was always accomplished by choosing the best offers. The purchase of air tickets well in advance by the organizers (with the agreement of the participants), led to a reduction in this very important item of expenditure and reduce the impact of increases in other expenses. For meals, reference was made to a single supplier, who oversaw lunches, dinners, and coffee breaks, and this allowed us to almost entirely meet the budget estimate. A more specific point should be made in regard of the venue of the workshop, which was linked to the need to ensure space and time, suitable to the actual comparison, even informally, among the participants. Since the preparation of the plan presented on April 29 2009, this implicated the preference of a local branch of the Università di Torino, because the available space in the city of Turin would not have guaranteed the same results. On the other hand, this choice led to a considerable financial and organizational effort to give everybody the best logistics solutions, especially for transfers from international airports and railway stations to the town of Cuneo. For this purpose, the displacement of almost all of the participants was guaranteed by a series of shuttles to/from Turin Airport, allowing substantial savings compared to individual transport solutions. Therefore this allowed to exceed the

allocated budget by the whole physiological percentage (linked in particular to the late arrival of some flights). The choice of venue of Cuneo also allowed to reduce in absolute terms the impact of expenditure on items related to accommodation, compared to rates of a large city; but at the same time, there was an increase in budget linked to the contemporary presence of another international event in Cuneo, which did not allow the use of economic accommodation for all participants.

In terms of content, the project presented to ESF in April 2009 had one of its strong points in the interdisciplinary approach to the problem of deconstruction, to measure the relevance and limitations in various fields in which it has been a point of critical comparison, in the second half of the twentieth century. For this purpose, from the early stages of development the need to involve scholars from at least three disciplinary contexts was taken into account: philosophy, legal studies and literary discipline. This aim could be said to be achieved and this was kept in mind in organizing the program and specific areas of discussion. The two days of work were in fact structured in two plenary sessions – with the participation of four keynote speakers – and a series of panels (with shorter presentations: 25 minutes, as opposed to 40 minute presentations in the plenary sessions). The chairs of the sessions ensured strict compliance with the time available and this allowed to offer very long discussion time during each session, or panel.

Just the role of discussions in turn deserves to be underlined, the density and depth of the ideas that emerged. As we will mention below, the atmosphere of cooperation and involvement of participants in all sessions and panels were crucial to achieving the objectives. The same structure of the panels, designed for disciplinary macro-scanning (*Aesthetics, Literature, Politics and Ethics, Politics and Law, Social Philosophy*) was effective and led to discussions that often lasted well beyond the official times. The many ideas that emerged during the two work days culminated in the Final round table, which also through the actions of the ESF Representative and the two co-sponsors set the goal to reflect on the follow-up activities, both on a scientific viewpoint and organizational profile.

In this regard, it is useful to explain in schematic form the scientific goals that the project placed and the overall conclusions. As was anticipated, the base of the project was an attempt to understand whether, in philosophy, literary and legal studies, a common ground from which to think about today's tools of deconstruction exists. The speakers were then asked to answer questions such as: what are the outcomes of deconstruction, understood as a general cultural phenomenon? What kind of contribution can still arrive, in your different disciplinary fields and in your different research perspectives, from that phenomenon? Is it a contribution that fully confirms the validity, or lets limits and criticalities emerge, even relevant?

The title of the workshop evidently contained certain key words that tried to suggest some answers: myth, public sphere, and reconstruction. The reference to myth drew together of all the contents (from religion to cultural traditions, from narrative devices to strictly said myths) that seem to form the background, the deep root, starting from which the processes of construction and transmission of meaning develop. The appeal to the public sphere above all refers to the idea of an inter-subjective horizon within which these processes take place. Finally, the reference to reconstruction indicated (and of course it was an indication that could not be taken as an assumption, but was to be put into question) an attitude that strives to think of the background in a recompositive viewpoint, as if in fact – rather than demystify it and expose it in its status of fiction – resemanticize it, to make it work, in the manner (to give just one example) of rewriting phenomena of classical myths to which one witnesses in literature.

On a whole, the participants' contributions were concentrated around a few key points, that

we are going to reduce to three titles, which we will go into depth later: 1) inclusiveness of the concept of deconstruction; 2) ambiguous relevance of the phenomenon in cultural terms; 3) the need to contextualize the deconstruction into a more general framework which meets the limits of the previous point. Clearly the most relevant theoretical stake fits into this last level. Inclusiveness and the ambiguous relevance of deconstruction do refer – positively or negatively – to the typical resources of any approach towards demystifying the cultural content of a given tradition: the demystification is the basic measurement unit through which the cultural event of deconstruction takes place. But many presentations have shown that, in the three disciplines involved, the horizon of deconstruction shows – now with less, now with more clarity – a general dissatisfaction with those outcomes: dissatisfaction of which other speakers have tried to draw a first map. A map that, at least for the majority, has highlighted in the critical comparison, its common reference with the “mythical-symbolic resources”.

## **2. Scientific content of the event**

The workshop “Myths of the Contemporaneity. Public Reason between Deconstruction and Reconstruction” opened on Monday, September 20 with the greetings of the convenor, Alberto Martinengo, who presented a summary of the content and objectives of the workshop, summarizing in a few minutes the materials already widely available to participants by e-mail. Following was the speech of the Representative of ESF Standing Committee for the Humanities, Ilie Parvu, who brought greetings from the European Science Foundation and presented the structure of the ESF Exploratory Workshops.

The first plenary session hosted speeches by Jorge Perez de Tudela Velasco and Jean Robelin. Perez de Tudela drew a picture of the current debate around the deconstruction in philosophy, from its origins in structuralism, on to the results in the interpreters of Derrida. Particular attention was paid to the comparison between the “first” and “second” Derrida, in order to highlight the continuities and discontinuities. Robelin focused his presentation around the theme of the personal identity in deconstruction, especially in the “first” Derrida. The limits of Derrida approach resulted as being particularly evident with regard to the social and political translatability of his speech about identity. The discussion that followed the speeches of the two keynote speakers touched on the particular link that Perez identified as the transition from the “first” to the “second” Derrida. In this context a debate took place on the ability or non ability, on the part of deconstruction, in measuring the social effects of its thesis, in the viewpoint already emphasized by Robelin. During the debate, again, Robelin widened the scope of the question, moving from concrete examples of “social rhetoric” , inspired to deconstruction.

On Monday afternoon, 4 thematic panels took place, organized into two parallel sessions. The panel on Social Philosophy featured speeches by Timo Kaitaro, Flavia Monceri and Jordi Maiso Blanco. Kaitaro presented a paper that moved from the literary reflection on surrealism, to emphasize the social significance, particularly in relation to the theme of identity. Surrealist poetry appeared – according to Kaitaro – ahead of its time as the formalization of an approach to social reality that plays on the fictitious dimension of the key-notions that it is composed of, above all in personal identity identity. Monceri also connected his speech to the reflection on personal identity. In a key defined as “radical constructivism” , Monceri drew a type of symptomatology of the identity within the social disciplines, framing the conditions of a possible “thought without identity.” The contribution of Maiso Blanco focused instead on the role of subjectivity in the reflection of Theodor W. Adorno, with particular reference to relations – stated or implied – with

Freudian psychoanalysis. In this respect, Maiso Blanco explained the possible contribution of critical theory, at least at the hand of Adorno, to the theme of the workshop. The discussion in this panel took place mainly under an epistemological profile: what does it mean to “think” outside the norms of identity? Do the two ahead of their time contributions to the theme – surrealism, and in a different way, the one of Adorno – dissolve the difficulties posed by Monceri’s speech? The solution seems prefigured, according to the same words by Monceri, from a greater emphasis on the performative scope of identity, in a way that can be easily restored to the spirit of reconstruction.

The panel on Politics and Law hosted the contributions of Alberto Andronico and Janos Frivaldszky. Andronico gave an overview of the debate on Critical Legal Studies, in which many of the reflections on deconstruction found their natural place. In this case, the limits of legal interpretation in deconstructive terms seem particularly relevant, in particular for the impossibility of reducing the resources that reading that – not by chance – is usually defined as restorative justice. Frivaldszky presented instead a broader historical path, in which he retraced the discussions on the establishment of law and – in dialogue with the presentation of Andronico – the problems associated with renouncing to a significant founding apparatus. Frivaldszky’s speech focused in particular on the implicitly substantialist assumptions, shared by some of the most authoritative voices in the philosophical-judicial discussion in the twentieth century. The debate at the end of the two presentations was mainly related to the theme of restorative justice in a confrontation that has called into question the philosophical contribution of Paul Ricoeur: a reference that duly thorough, would substantiate the role of reconstruction in a judicial context.

In parallel to the two panels on Social Philosophy and on Politics and Law, others were held on Literature and on Politics and Ethics. The panel on Literature hosted speeches by Kasia Czczot and Maria Spiridopoulou, which was followed by a reading by Alice de Charentenay of the written contribution of Evelyne Grossman. Kasia Czczot focused her interest on the debate initiated by the neo-Marxist critic – with special reference to Terry Eagleton – about the political potential of the deconstructive reading, widely celebrated as a sensitive reading to marginal narrations, to the voice of the excluded and the development of minorities. Czczot highlighted the risks of a reading in « continuous motion,” in search of a permanent aporia, unable to counter effectively dominant discourses and social relations, present in the text and behind the text. Maria Spiridopoulou illustrated the role occupied by Derridean thought in theory and praxis of translation. Tracing in a diachronic manner the semantic evolution from metaphor to translation Spiridopoulou proposed as an amendment the term metaphrase which according to its etymology, welcomes and values the sense of Derridean in-betweenness becoming syn praxis a mental act of communion and participation, plurality and equality at the same time. Spiridopoulou finally illustrated the grey areas and unspeakable cases through a comparative analysis of French translations of *Infinito* by Leopardi. In his contribution, Evelyne Grossman traced the thread of writers, philosophers and artists who throughout the twentieth century explored the painful contemporary experience of the “deconstruction” of physical, linguistic, cultural, political and social issues links. The reinterpretation of this production in the light of the movement of “deliaison” and “reliaison” led Grossman to moving her question no longer on the way out from the alleged aporia of deconstruction, but rather onto the ways of living with it, to the need and to the critical opportunity to access to works that rely on logic more than on the discursive bond and narrative rationality.

The panel on Politics and Ethics began with the presentation of Lukasz Nysler, who outlined three contemporary philosophical approaches to the religious tradition: 1) deconstructivist, which could be associated with work of Michel Onfray, or with the so called New Atheists; 2) reconstructivist, with John Dewey religious naturalistic humanism; and 3) restorative, with

Richard Swinburne natural theology as exemplary position. Attention focused in particular on the latter position and on metaphysical residue which it – according to Nysler – seems to show. Siemens presented a paper on political agonism, considered as a reconstructive reaction to deconstruction. The privileged point of view to face the problem was represented in particular by reflecting on the theme of pluralistic democracy in the 21st century. In this key, Siemens presented and mainly discussed the contribution of Chantal Mouffe. After some initial clarification on the position of Nysler, the discussion on the two papers focused in particular on the relationship between religious values and political institutions, with a questioning – shared by Nysler himself and, in other ways, by Siemens – of the position of Jürgen Habermas.

The second work day, Tuesday September 21, the plenary session was dedicated to the presentations of the two other keynote speakers, Emmanuel Cattin, and Frederick Vercellone. Cattin focused on the role of deconstruction in the reflection of Martin Heidegger, from *Sein und Zeit*, to the last phase of his thought. His contribution questioned the relationship between deconstruction and the overcoming of metaphysics, one of the more relevant conceptual junctions for the history of the concept in the twentieth-century debate. Vercellone instead brought the conversation to one of the possible developments of the deconstruction/reconstruction combination. Adopting a morphological perspective, in a key that is already highlighted in Italian discussions on philosophical hermeneutics, Vercellone suggested that the reconstruction can become a key concept to rethink the reason, in a post-hermeneutic manner. The debate developed in particular on the notion of “post-hermeneutic debate” which seems to collect the results of what many identified as the crisis in philosophical hermeneutics. From this point of view, the reference to Heidegger proposed by Cattin becomes strategic, not only in historiographic terms, to rethink the unresolved tensions and connections of his perspective.

The panels of Tuesday, September 21 were dedicated to Aesthetics and again to the discussion on Politics and Ethics. In the first theme the presentations by Clive Cazeaux and Teresa Oñate y Zubia were referred to. Cazeaux reflected on a specific aspect of the theme of the workshop – the co-belonging of reconstruction and deconstruction – using the model of the work of art as a case study. In a perspective that recalled the already advanced one by Timo Kaitaro, Cazeaux underlined the scope of art as a “place of social experimentation,” whose identity is probably the main case study. From his point of view, Oñate retraced the hermeneutic readings of the work of art, especially in the Italian philosophy of the second part of the twentieth century (Gianni Vattimo). This perspective not only confirms the idea of social experimentation, which we have said, but also the possibility of formalizing a model of truth, different to the metaphysical one: therefore not an abandonment of the notion of truth, but his reconstruction on the ashes of metaphysics. The discussion focused on some themes of contemporary poetry and illustrated the non-complete reducibility of art in social discourse: art remains, even today, a perspective on social reality characterized by disengagement. Therefore a talk on “art and society” needs to be more limited than what emerged in the two presentations.

The panel on Politics and Ethics was attended by Dan Lazea and Adrian Pabst, both of which submitted a contribution on the relationship between political and religious resources of the public discourse. Lazea reflected particularly on Jürgen Habermas and the post-secular notion. In this perspective, according to Lazea, the apparatus of a particular religious society operates as an active background on, but uninvestigated (and therefore legendary), for the production of the social bond. Pabst discussed similar problems, but from a more open judicial point of view, reflecting on the structures that liberal democracies have given to translate the mythical-symbolic contribution in the context of the standard. The debate focused on the problem of secularism in the current European context, with

interesting references to the Italian and French cases.

At the end of the two panels in the afternoon, the Final round table took place, led by the convenor. The Representative of the ESF Standing Committee for the Humanities, prof. Ilie Parvu, made the opening speech. He summarized the most promising ideas of the discussion and emphasized the possibility of advancing the project through other funding instruments of ESF, particularly those for Research Networking Programs and Research Conferences. The convenor then spoke, summing up in schematic points the issues and possible solutions that had been covered over the two work days. Then the debate on follow-up activities started. During the debate the Representatives of the co-sponsors also joined in, confirming their support for the initiative and suggesting some possible pathways. As anticipated, the debate took place around some thematic junctions, that the majority of those present expressed, their thoughts on: 1) inclusiveness of the concept of deconstruction; 2) the ambiguous actuality of the phenomenon; 3) the need to contextualize the deconstruction within a more general framework. Starting exactly from this point – and emphasizing the specific nature of an Exploratory Workshop – we tried to identify useful perspectives in pursuing the work: developments that should not necessarily involve all the participants in the same manner and can also foresee new entries, by other scholars.

### **3. Assessment of the results, contribution to the future direction of the field, outcome**

The workshop moved from the identification of the crisis of modern rationality as one of the central reasons of the philosophical and cultural debate of the second part of the twentieth century. One of the key points in this debate – probably the most significant from a cultural point of view – is represented by Derrida and the Deconstructionism, which remains one of the keywords of the intellectual discussions of the twentieth century. Beyond all considerations regarding the issues posed by Derrida, it may not be denied in fact that the progressive enlargement of Deconstructionism and of its influence has converted it from a strictly philosophical issue to a broader cultural one; but this phenomenon has revealed how difficult it is to consider the deconstructive approach, in its present common terms, as exhaustive.

The workshop analysed these issues from a multidisciplinary perspective in order to critically consider the cultural weight of Deconstructionism in the current context, where that sensitivity looks less meaningful than in the 1970s and 1980s. The statement of other reading keys of contemporary has in fact radically questioned the validity of the lexicon of deconstruction, up to the point of challenging its historical significance in many respects. This issue becomes urgent the more we shift our attention from the tenability of Deconstructionism as a philosophical approach, to its radical applicability in extra-philosophical fields, spanning from law to the history of culture, as well as to the expressive forms of literature and arts. For a lot of its opponents, the culture of suspicion, considered as the basis of the deconstructive sensitivity, produces an aestheticizing and definitively impolitic attitude which finally combines with the technical and administrative reason, that Deconstructionism itself intended to criticize. From a social and political point of view – to recall just one of the most concrete emergencies – the exaltation of multiplicity and fragmentation, together with the privatistic dimension of deconstructive knowledge, appears as an obstacle for the recognition of real people, of their stories and of any sort of public communicability of the identities which they bear. The idea of producing a moment of confrontation around Deconstructionism, involving scholars belonging to different disciplines – above all philosophy, legal studies and literature – was born exactly in this context. And the results on one hand, confirmed the theoretical assumptions on which the workshop took its moves; on the other, they highlighted a number of critical junctions that point to the need to continue the discussion, even along directions

that were only hypothesized previously.

Wishing to detail the framework that emerged from the workshop, it is useful to first convey the climate in which the work took place. It was not easy in fact to bet on the possibility of an actual comparison which held so many different disciplinary perspectives. However the spirit in which the discussions were held, which are often put off until after the official events, showed the possibility - and perhaps the need - of this pathway. As for the scientific profile of the issue, as anticipated, the outcome of the workshop can be traced back to three: 1) focus on the concept of deconstruction, its inclusiveness and its ability to identify some common assumptions in the twentieth century debate; 2) necessity to question on the current need of deconstruction, in the sense that it has been said above, or for the extra-philosophic consequences of the phenomenon; 3) the possibility of resolving the issues raised by the two preceding paragraphs, only through a broader contextualization of the phenomenon of deconstruction, clarifying precisely how that term appears problematic today, and if the theoretical assumptions contained in the combination of deconstruction/reconstruction is decisive in this respect.

1) Compared to the first point, the most relevant result was obviously the confirmation that behind the phenomenon of deconstruction, in the second half of the twentieth century, there is some flexibility of the concept that for such a manner has become a sort of pass for the three disciplines involved in the workshop. Through most of the presentations it was possible to clarify in what sense behind this plurivocality - though not being necessarily good data, under a cultural profile - it is however a shared assumption: the deconstruction is mostly a matter of *style of thought* in the sense of an approach which demystifies the tradition, which deconstruction draws from various theoretic *comparisons* (e.g. Nietzsche, Freud, or in other way, structuralism).

2) The second point highlighted the obvious issues, today connected with the reference to deconstruction. The *gluck* of the phenomenon in such diverse disciplines makes its single definition relatively complex, beyond the reference to demystification, referred to above. In this respect, the decision to measure the actuality of deconstruction must go through some case studies in specific disciplines. And the multi-disciplinary approach that was chosen appeared largely effective in answering the question, so much so that the most appreciated and debated presentations were those that renounced to a general view of deconstruction, to present very specific aspects, which could however also be interesting for scholars of other disciplines. To reduce the question to few titles, the contribution of philosophy was based mainly on measuring the social consequences of deconstruction that, as hypothesized, are the real crucial step to determine the sustainability or non sustainability of its model. From a judicial point of view, the results of the debate on Critical Legal Studies appeared above all to be central, as the form in which they were submitted undoubtedly constituted a point in favour of the theoretical assumptions of the workshop. Under the literary profile there has been some convergence on a recall toward responsibility and the need to exit from the aporia of the unspeakable, but without losing sight of the hermeneutic opportunity that deconstruction has opened, making peculiar forms of expression that have characterized the last century and the present, accessible.

3) The third question that leads us back to the outcomes of the workshop is of course the most complex and the one on which the opportunity to take the project forward is played. Inclusiveness and the ambiguous actuality of deconstruction refer in fact to the typical resources of any approach towards demystifying the cultural content of a given tradition: the demystification is the basic measurement unit through which carries the story of cultural deconstruction. But most of the presentations confirmed the hypothesis of the workshop, namely that in the three disciplines involved, the horizon of deconstruction shows - now with



less, now with more clarity – a general dissatisfaction with those outcomes. Of such dissatisfaction, the different contributions of the workshop have basically drawn a first map. Now, as part of the official panels and discussions, this map has necessarily taken different forms and not immediately super-imposable, due to the scan specification that was foreseen and for the reasons that were seen. But the effort of the Final round table was precisely to identify some factors of translatability between the disciplines, which would allow the identification of a common pathway. With a series of successive approximations, this pathway was identified in the role of “mythic-symbolic resources” in a context that cannot be reduced to the theoretical paradigm of deconstruction.

“Myth as a crisis point of the deconstruction:” with this formula, the sense of the discussions during that workshop could be summed up. Discussions that on one hand, confirmed the original plan, like the Exploratory workshop title already shows; but on the other they opened at least two new sides of the discourse. It is (a) the possibility to complete the map of the theoretical moments and figures in that, in each of the disciplines involved, report such recurrence during the twentieth century; and (b) the need of a methodological reflection on appropriate tools to think of this surplus of meaning, beyond the boundaries of deconstruction.

a) The map of the mythical-symbolic resources compete in each of the disciplines, all those we have identified as “reconstructive resources” of contemporary rationality.

In terms of philosophy, it becomes central, for example, the reference to concepts such as “fictitious identity” or “narrative,” which show the working process of translating the strong structures of tradition (in this case, the metaphysical tradition), within a context in which they could not be reproduced as such. To paraphrase Paul Ricoeur, these are resources that “give rise to thought,” or which contain and produce meanings that are not reducible to a categorization of a substantial nature. The reference to Ricoeur is strategic in this sense, as shown by the discussions of the first day of work. And, as is known, this is exactly the level at which it demonstrates the inadequacy of a purely demystifying approach to myth, also in Ricoeur.

In the legal studies, the resurgence of the myth is evident, for example, in the pathways that emphasize the role of extra-judicial resources for the social foundation of the rule, as the papers on the theme showed in many ways: a founding capacity which does not fall into the authoritative re-proposal of natural law, nor into a proceduralism merely transmitted by techno-bureaucratic rationality.

Finally, the literary side of the debate showed in some manner the processes of de-semantization and continuous re-semantization of which philosophy and legal disciplines talk about. With a significant emphasis, which emerged in the discussions: if it is true that de-semantizations and re-semantizations “assume” the existence of an origin from which to move such an origin, in reality, is not given literally from any part. They are transformation processes in which the box of origin is always empty, as in the case of the rewriting of ancient myths, which an original version is obviously never given, an absolute starting point.

b) Of course, the option of continuing the work of compiling a map that photographs the role of myth in contemporary culture would still not be enough, if at the same time it did not pose a fundamental question of method. In other terms, the objective that the workshop indicated at the beginning cannot be reduced to a kind of topographic task, compared to the rise of the myth along the borders of deconstruction; but it primarily poses the need for a method (or methods) that permit to think of the surplus of the myth. Deconstruction is said to have represented the effective formalization of a method through which to read and demystify the contents of tradition. In some way, to think beyond the deconstruction corresponds to the attempt to reopen questions of method that it had resolved (or supposed to have resolved).

The reference to the need to re-contextualize the discourse on the deconstruction that was mentioned before, goes exactly along these lines. If reconstruction is – as it seems – a good response to the end of the cultural dominance of deconstruction, it can be formalized as a method only if one brings it in its turn to the cultural context that marked the crisis of deconstruction. And it is the context referred to today as post-hermeneutic thought. The rethinking of hermeneutics, understood as the philosophical *koiné* of the late European twentieth century, and the redefinition of the role of myth beyond the deconstruction seem to go hand in hand in the sensitivity of the interventions that took place during the workshop.

In this respect, in conclusion, the *Final round table* of the workshop agreed to move along in two stages. First, the next few months will be dedicated to the preparation of proceedings of the works, as a fundamental step for the formalization of the presented contributions, with the aim of taking account of the discussions that have accompanied them. Secondly, the confrontation will continue between the participants, on the informal network level which had already seen the light in the months prior to the meeting. This second phase, according to the indications given by the Representative of the ESF Standing Committee for the Humanities, will have among his objectives, the identification of the steps to present a project in the Research Networking Programs sphere or, alternatively, of the Research Conferences. In both cases, it involves presenting projects in the calls of 2011.

#### **4. Final programme**

**20-21 September 2010**

**Università di Torino (sede di Cuneo)**

**Meeting Venue :**

"Mater Amabilis", Rooms 109, 110, 111 (1<sup>st</sup> floor), Via Ferraris di Celle, 2, Cuneo

**Sunday, 19 September**

**20.00 Dinner**

**Monday, 20 September : ROOM 109**

09.00-09.30 *Registration*

09.30-09.45 *Welcome by Convenor*

**Alberto Martinengo** (*Università di Torino, Italy*)

09.45-10.00 *Presentation of the European Science Foundation (ESF)*

**Ilie Parvu** (*Universitatea din București, Romania*)

**10.00-12.30 PLENARY SESSION - ROOM 109**

10.00-11.20 *Lectures*

**Jorge Pérez de Tudela Velasco** (*Universidad Autonoma de Madrid, Spain*)

**Jean Robelin** (*Université de Nice Sophia-Antipolis, France*)

11.20-12.30 *Discussion*

**13.00-14.30 Lunch**

**14.30-19.00 PANELS - ROOM 110**

**PANEL A: SOCIAL PHILOSOPHY**

14.30-15.45 *Presentations*

**Timo Kaitaro** (*Helsingin Yliopisto, Finland*)

**Jordi Maiso Blasco** (*Universidad de Salamanca, Spain*)

**Flavia Monceri** (*Università del Molise, Italy*)

15.45-16.45 *Discussion*

**16.45-17.15 Coffee / tea break**

**PANEL B: POLITICS AND LAW**

17.15-18.05 *Presentations*

**Alberto Andronico** (*Università di Catania, Italy*)

**János Frivaldszky** (*Pázmány Péter Katolikus Egyetem Pázmány, Hungary*)

18.05-19.00 *Discussion*

**14.30-19.00 PANELS - ROOM 111**

**PANEL C: LITERATURE**

14.30-15.45 *Presentations*

**Evelyne Grossman** (*Université Paris VII Diderot, Collège International de Philosophie, France*)

**Maria Spiridopoulou** (*University of Peloponnese, Greece*)

**Katarzyna Czczot** (*Polska Akademia Nauk, Poland*)

15.45-16.45 *Discussion*

**16.45-17.15 Coffee / tea break**

**PANEL D: POLITICS AND ETHICS 1**

17.15-18.05 *Presentations*

**Łukasz Nysler** (*Uniwersytet Wrocławski, Poland*)

**Herman Siemens** (*Universiteit Leiden, Netherlands*)

18.05-19.00 *Discussion*

**20.00 Dinner**

**Tuesday, 21 September**

**09.30-12.00 PLENARY SESSION – ROOM 109**

09.30-10.50 *Lectures*

**Emmanuel Cattin** (*Université Blaise Pascal Clermont-Ferrand II, France*)

**Federico Vercellone** (*Università di Torino, Italy*)

10.50-11.50 *Discussion*

**12.00-13.30 Lunch**

**13.30-15.45 PANELS - ROOM 110**

**PANEL E: POLITICS AND ETHICS 2**

13.30-14.20 *Presentations*

**Dan Lazea** (*Colegiul Noua Europă, Romania*)

**Adrian Pabst** (*University of Kent, United Kingdom*)

14.20-15.20 *Discussion*

**15.20-15.45 Coffee / tea break**

**13.30-15.45 PANELS - ROOM 111**

**PANEL F: AESTHETICS**

13.30-14.20 *Presentations*

**Clive Cazeaux** (*University of Wales Institute, United Kingdom*)

**Teresa Oñate Zubia** (*Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia, Madrid, Spain*)

14.20-15.20 *Discussion*

**15.20-15.45 Coffee / tea break**

**15.45-18.00 FINAL ROUND TABLE - ROOM 110**

*Chair: Alberto Martinengo (Università di Torino, Italy)*

Beyond Deconstruction? Discussion on follow-up activities and networking

**18.00 End of Workshop**

## 5. Final list of participants

Alberto Andronico (*Università di Catania, Italy*)  
Giulia Boggio Marzet (*Università di Torino, Italy*)  
Emmanuel Cattin (*Université Blaise Pascal Clermont-Ferrand II, France*)  
Clive Cazeaux (*University of Wales Institute, United Kingdom*)  
Alice de Charentenay (*Université Paris-Sorbonne Paris IV, France*)  
Katarzyna Czeczot (*Polska Akademia Nauk, Poland*)  
János Frivaldszky (*Pázmány Péter Katolikus Egyetem Pázmány, Hungary*)  
Timo Kaitaro (*Helsingin Yliopisto, Finland*)  
Dan Lazea (*Colegiul Noua Europă, Romania*)  
Jordi Maiso Blasco (*Universidad de Salamanca, Spain*)  
Flavia Monceri (*Università del Molise, Italy*)  
Łukasz Nysler (*Uniwersytet Wrocławski, Poland*)  
Teresa Oñate Zubia (*Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia, Madrid, Spain*)  
Adrian Pabst (*University of Kent, United Kingdom*)  
Jorge Pérez de Tudela Velasco (*Universidad Autonoma de Madrid, Spain*)  
Jean Robelin (*Université de Nice Sophia-Antipolis, France*)  
Maria Spiridopoulou (*University of Peloponnese, Greece*)  
Herman Siemens (*Universiteit Leiden, Netherlands*)  
Federico Vercellone (*Università di Torino, Italy*)

### Convenor

Alberto Martinengo (*Università di Torino, Italy*)

### ESF Representative

Ilie Parvu (*Universitatea din București, Romania*)

### Representatives of the co-sponsors

Antonella Emina (*Istituto di Storia dell'Europa Mediterranea, ISEM-CNR, Italia*)  
Graziano Lingua (*Centro Studi sul Pensiero Contemporaneo, Italia*)

## 6. Statistical information on participants

The workshop was attended by 20 scholars from different European Countries (including the convenor), with the participation of the Representative of the ESF Standing Committee for the Humanities and the Representatives of the two co-financing institutions, for a total of 23 people. The presence of the co-financing Representatives, in the role of auditors, was agreed with the ESF Exploratory Workshop Office.

The distribution for age and educational attainment was ensured by the presence of 4 PhDs or PhD students aged 27-32 (including the convenor), 5 researchers and 9 professors aged 35-65.

In addition to five Italian scholars (including the convenor), there were 3 French scholars, 3 scholars from Spain, 2 from the United Kingdom, 2 from Poland, 1 from Hungary, 1 from Finland, 1 from Romania, 1 from the Netherlands and 1 from Greece.

The gender distribution was ensured by the presence of 6 women and 14 men of the total 20 participants.