After a talk presented by a professor, I asked the professor a few questions about the ethical-statuses of certain hypothetical—but very much possible and therefore real—aesthetic objects. The professor's talk was on Ethics and Art. The talk was unremarkable and the professor said nothing interesting or unique. It was primarily a self-serving event for the professor. The professor is not acclaimed or renowned whatsoever.

The professor refused to answer any of my questions about the ethical status of the provided aesthetic objects—-the professor claimed that "because the objects to be considered neither have happened nor have explicitly specifically existed in a named or referenceable way" that the questions were moot and unanswerable.

The professor's argument is terribly flawed. The farce the professor provided was a maneuver to sidestep actual thought. Further, the professor showed a lack of any correct concept of an aesthetic object all while having tried to speak to a room full of people about these supposed artworks/events/performances/happenings—-with none of the art even present!

Aesthetics—the philosophy pertaining to art and its objects—has nothing to do with any specific work of art. Philosophy has nothing to do with any specific.

Thought about art: by this I mean the relation between objects and people and people and people about said objects. There are certain objects that we interact with in a specific way. When we interact with these objects we then act and react and conversate and think and even possibly produce and influence. To speak to specific objects as a means to talk about the effects is a kind of induction and is very difficult to speak to authoritatively and/or analytically. The professor's lack of analytic understanding of this fact still baffles.

What is to be said ~ PHILOSOPHIC ~ about an artwork? You can discuss direct production of other artwork (influence), acts surrounding the artwork (event), the evaluation of that artwork (affectation), or question the nature of art itself (thought about being): Aesthetics has at least two main branches of thought: thought about art and thought about being.

The thought about being in Aesthetics was solved by the phenomenologists. There is no question any more about the nature of art. Art is a mental object. Art is only a thought with experience of said art object as content. That is the definition—and this definition exactly defines the bounds of art, - past-present and - future. Because between Sartre, Heidegger, and Ingarden, the answer was obtained.

To use any specific object as a literal for example in an argument, if there is any move in the argument toward the general or to variable or to type or to kind, then the specific artwork is erased as necessary and was used only as a rhetorical device to aid the reader/listener/thinker in accessing the abstract object toward which they were being directed and about which they were being asked to consider.

So, when presented with an abstract object and asked to consider such object in suchsuchsuch mode of perception or mode of thought or mode of engagement, the professor should have easily been able to do so, for I easily could have constructed a source that lied about the existence of suchandsuch hypothetical literal, convincing the professor of the existence of soandso art objects and thus convincing the simple minded of its existence. For the simple minded are those who need the extra lower rung on the ladder toward understanding.

Any argument that denies soundness by claiming a lack of literal is fallacious and is only given by those who cannot think.