

# Aesthetic Taste Now: A Look Beyond Art and the History of Philosophy

MICHAEL R. SPICHER

---

## Abstract

Aesthetic taste rose to prominence in the eighteenth century, and then quickly disappeared. Since the start of the 2000s, scholars have slowly returned to the main traditional concepts in aesthetics—beauty, the sublime, and aesthetic experience. Aesthetic taste, however, has lagged behind. I focus on two explanations for this downturn: aesthetics is too often associated with art alone and taste is thought to have no connection with anything objective. In this paper, I suggest that theories of aesthetic taste are still valuable. While tastes will surely differ, individuals should explore the ways that their life and circumstances affect their taste and how they can become more intentional about developing their taste. Using prisons, engineering, and business, I show how theories of aesthetic taste can enter the contemporary scene by suggesting ways that it can influence their respective practices.

## Introduction

Theory and practice have a reciprocal relationship, and people (whether they realize it or not) assume theories of taste in their practices. Rather than applying aesthetic theories blindly, we would benefit from identifying and refining their use. What does it mean, for example, for someone to have taste? Does it matter whether someone likes clothes from Walmart or Bloomingdales? Does it tell us anything significant if someone likes pop music or jazz? People have strong opinions—very strong—about their preferences concerning music, clothing, movies, and so on. (Just tell a Beatles fan that they are overrated!) Even if they don't directly use the word 'taste,' in everyday discussions and interactions people continue to speak meaningfully about having "good" and "bad" taste. By contrast, academic and research contexts have shown little interest about what might count as taste.<sup>1</sup> Since it is so pervasive in popular culture, it seems strange to ignore it; we should not give up on working through theories of taste. Businesses, governments, and other organizations would be wise to consider the aesthetic in their products, practices, and policies. Being able to predict people's tastes would certainly be valuable to groups or organizations. While that perfect knowledge of people's preferences is not forthcoming, that fact does not preclude theories of taste from being beneficial for professional practices. In terms of theory, philosophers—for example, Edmund Burke, David Hume, and Immanuel Kant—made significant advances for taste during the eighteenth century. Following the prevalence during that century, theories of taste dropped out of intellectual discourse almost as quickly as they had arisen. By the nineteenth century,

aesthetic taste had been replaced by the notion of an aesthetic attitude as seen in the work of Edward Bullough and Arthur Schopenhauer. Since then, theories of taste have only surfaced here and there, but mostly with a nod to the history of philosophy.

There may be several causes for this downturn. Two are worth noting here: aesthetics is too often associated with art alone (which tends to be more about expression) and taste is considered to be merely subjective. I will explain each of these concerns and show why they are not as problematic and should be overcome. I will also offer an important aspect of how our taste develops, namely how our relations with other people influences our taste. While usually focused on art, aesthetic taste should extend into other areas of life, even some unexpected ones. Businesses, for example, can learn to harness aesthetic qualities to create dynamic experiences for their customers and provide them with a sense of a relationship with their company, which would provide another dimension to their business practices. Aesthetic excellence is becoming a more important factor as consumers want less stuff and more of an experience. I conclude this essay with some suggestions for how and why aesthetic taste could be useful for prisons, engineering, and business.

### **The Emergence of Taste**

For many thinkers prior to the modern era, taste was not a huge concern because beauty was objective and associated frequently with truth and goodness. If you understood the truth, for example, then you would be able to experience the higher or more perfect forms of beauty. In the *Symposium*, Plato writes that people first experienced the beauty of an individual, then multiple individuals, then finally, building on these earlier encounters, reached the higher beauties, “climbing up like rising stairs.”<sup>2</sup> It wasn’t until subjectivity became a possibility, and people became more central than an external, transcendent idea or being, that they began to develop *theories* of taste. George Dickie underscores this development in the title of his 1995 book about the eighteenth century, *The Century of Taste*. Writing in that century, Joseph Addison may have been the first to discuss taste as the beholder’s psychological response to a work of literature. He wrote about this idea for the *Spectator* in 1712. One question that emerged from this is whether taste is something innate that we access by experience or something that is developed through reason. Rather than recounting all of the theories of taste from the eighteenth century, it is sufficient to say that the modern era introduced two camps: those who believed that taste was innate and those who believed it was developed through reason.<sup>3</sup> As aesthetic taste is a metaphor based on the physical sense of taste, many have considered aesthetic taste to be a kind of internal sense, that it is innate. In a work of prose, called *The Moralists*, Shaftesbury’s main character Theocles makes the case for beauty being connected to goodness and discovered through the use of a moral sense. This helped promote the connection between being virtuous and the capacity for experiencing the beautiful. Regardless of whether this connection holds, the key idea here is that the ability to judge the beauty of something is innate. But this does not mean the capacity for aesthetic judgment is infallible; it needs to be developed through experience. Nor do we have to believe that being virtuous is a necessary precondition, as Shaftesbury did. All this view necessitates is a belief that the capacity for taste is something people are born with and develop.

To counter Shaftesbury’s notion of an innate sense of taste, Moses Mendelssohn wrote “On Sentiments,” which is told through a series of letters. As a staunch rationalist,

Mendelssohn has his Theocles<sup>4</sup> describe in a letter how he prepares himself to have an aesthetic experience. The experience of the aesthetic is not something that passively happens to someone, like placing food on the tongue; Mendelssohn asserts that the beholder has to take preemptive reasonable steps to be ready for the experience. Even though the subjectivity of taste had not taken over, as both Shaftesbury and Mendelssohn held onto some objective components of beauty, this division between an internal sense and an outward looking rationality set the stage for the objective-subjective debate.

While in many ways opposing, what connects Shaftesbury's emphasis on innateness and Mendelssohn's emphasis on rationality is that, in either view, *experience is always necessary*. Taste in an immediate situation might have more to do with our feelings than with our mind; however, this does not mean that we can't develop it, over time, through our choices. In other words, there is no reason we should be passive about what influences our taste. We may not be able to control some external influences, but we can control how we seek out new experiences and objects for our attention.

While useful for their integration of experience, these eighteenth century discussions on taste also brought beauty to the cusp of being understood as something wholly subjective. Philosophers took note of this. In his overview of beauty, Crispin Sartwell notes, for example, that both "Hume and Kant perceived that something important was lost when beauty was treated merely as a subjective state."<sup>5</sup> Why, then, has the same care not been afforded to taste? Even today it seems like no one has thought anything was (or is) lost if we think about taste as completely subjective.

### **The Disappearance of Taste**

Almost as quickly as they appeared, new theories of taste vanished from the scene. This is not to say that no one spoke about taste ever again. But even a cursory look reveals few sustained attempts at advancing theories of taste or its role in our lives. Part of this diminishing is the fact that people's interests change, and they move onto other theories or concepts. The more curious thing, for me, is why taste doesn't seem as significant (compared to its heyday) *even as a concept* in philosophy (especially aesthetics) any more. The main concepts in aesthetics—beauty, the sublime, and aesthetic experience—have cycled through being viewed as important and less important. However taste seems to have been omitted from even smaller this rise and fall. Since 2000, Roger Scruton, Nick Zangwill, Emily Brady, and Richard Shusterman have all contributed to the revitalization of beauty, sublime, and aesthetic experience.<sup>6</sup> By contrast, the only new direction aesthetic taste seems to have taken is through the relationship between it and gustatory taste, which Carolyn Korsmeyer<sup>7</sup> has written about. However, even here the focus seems to be on whether food and drink are like art, rather than what is the nature of aesthetic taste in itself. In other words, while gustatory taste may prove a new and interesting avenue of exploration, it is not focused on the theories of taste as such. So what happened to that once burgeoning concept? I suggest two things hinder the contemporary field of aesthetics from developing theories of taste: aesthetics is too often associated with art alone and taste is thought to have no connection with anything objective.

In the beginning of her book *Everyday Aesthetics*, Yuriko Saito explains that aestheticians claim that aesthetics extends beyond art, but in practice the majority of discussions still center around art. "An underlying assumption seems to be that art, however it is defined, provides the model for aesthetic objects, and the aesthetic status of things outside the

artistic realm is determined by the degree of their affinity to art.”<sup>8</sup> Bence Nanay has similarly written: “Aesthetics is not the same as philosophy of art. Philosophy of art is about art. Aesthetics is about many things—including art.”<sup>9</sup> Aesthetics includes experiences of nature, design, craft, and more. The discourse of aesthetics has already begun to change, but we need to continue to rethink (and explore) the possibilities of how aesthetics affects different areas. Perhaps unsurprisingly, there is almost universal agreement about nature in terms of taste. However, when it comes to art and other human-made objects, divergent tastes invariably emerge.<sup>10</sup> Since this is the case—that tastes differ to a greater degree about artifacts—then people may have deliberately, or even subconsciously, stopped devoting energy to unravel the nature of taste because it seemed like a futile exercise. It’s not a very stimulating observation to say that people agree about sunsets being beautiful, but almost nothing else. And, since contemporary definitions of art emphasize expression, institutions (i.e., the artworld), and history, aesthetic taste is not important for determining the value of a work of art anyhow. While art doesn’t seem as concerned with aesthetics anymore (though aesthetic theories of art would not agree), it is not as decisive as it first appears. First, there are some characteristics or conditions that are commonly found in the artifacts that are widely considered beautiful. For example, proportion has a long history of being associated with beauty. Other candidates might be wholeness, radiance, and fittingness.<sup>11</sup> Second, recent studies in perception have shown that the more often we encounter a work of art (whether visual or musical), the more we tend to like it.<sup>12</sup> So, disagreeing about some works of art can sometimes be the result of a lack of enough experience with the given work, genre, or cultural style. Listening to Indian hand drumming might be jarring at first to a Westerner, but hearing enough of it could change one’s mind about it. In other words, there is a sense that we have to be ‘used to’ something in order to like it. Even in cases where we see something for the first time and instantly love it, there are likely background experiences that led up to that liking. There is more agreement about the beauty of artifacts within a specific culture. Since there was such a focus on art and high culture in the eighteenth century theories of taste, it may be good that these discussions waned a bit, so that we can rethink taste in the twenty-first century. And this segues into the next concern about developing taste, despite its subjective underpinning.

### **The Development of Taste**

In these last two sections, I show that developing taste is possible and important for the individual, and then suggest three non-art contexts in which considering aesthetic taste would be beneficial for practical goals. To start, consider three overlapping spheres of experience that influence or develop our taste: objects, culture, and relations. These three spheres are conceptually separable, but they largely work in conjunction with each other. Although taste is no longer regularly theorized in academic contexts, people continue to talk meaningfully about good and bad taste, even if they do not always employ the word ‘taste.’ Think about the rise of reality television and performance-based TV shows. We have shows where ‘experts’ come in to fix up your home and where ‘judges’ rate contestants who perform and show off their talents. There is a tacit assumption that the judges or home renovators have a higher degree of taste (or are more specially equipped) than most of us, even if we sometimes disagree with their decisions. While it seems clear that we won’t uncover a magic formula for taste, this fact should not preclude

us from helpful ways to develop our own taste. By ‘develop,’ I do not necessarily mean upgrade, but rather deepen or expand one’s taste.

Taste, much like art and beauty, is a flexible concept. It is not completely fixed, even if we can find some recurring conditions of widely regarded objects. While we may appeal to proportion for a condition of an object demanding good taste, we need to realize that it is also highly contextual what determines good or bad taste, which is part of the reason we should not consider this discussion over. Each time period could add its own unique flavor(s) for the grander theory of taste, in a continuous expansion. But we also see how traditional concepts, like proportion, take on new applications, even if the core meaning remains the same. Another aspect of the context of taste involves the development of new objects or artforms. In the eighteenth century, having good taste in an automobile was simply not possible. Prior to the 1930s, one did not have to consider whether the electric guitar made aesthetically pleasing music, let alone genres that emerged because of this invention (heavy metal, grunge, punk, etc.).

Thus, in order to develop taste in a particular area, it is important to experience *objects* from that area. I use objects somewhat loosely to include sounds, smells, and others along with material objects like paintings. Even literal taste, which is something people possess from birth, must be developed in certain ways. Few people immediately like Scotch, for example. And even if someone’s first experience of Scotch was good, that person still must experience some different varieties to expand their palette to be able to perceive all the nuances in smell and flavor, such as sweet, smoke, and spice. And someone could not claim to be an aficionado of Scotch without a sufficient amount of experience tasting Scotch. Sometimes these aesthetic experiences may be deliberate, such as regularly going to art museums and galleries to see as many paintings as possible. Other times it may be more incidental. For example, in order to become an architect, one must be familiar with structure and design. In the process of rendering these elements, one would inadvertently (though it could also be deliberately) develop some level of taste about the built environment. One of the core ideas here is that taste is developed and expanded through habituation, in this case the habit of experiencing or becoming habituated to a certain kind of object.

Taste is not in itself an elitist concept, though it is certainly affected by one’s *culture*. While it is true that taste has been used for racist and classist ends, those misuses are not intrinsic components of the *nature of taste*. In general, it’s not surprising that people with more money have the opportunity to experience more art and nature than someone without as much means. And prior to the Internet, poorer people might not have had access to the knowledge that some works of art existed. Now even though Pierre Bourdieu<sup>13</sup> has shown that people of different social classes have different aesthetic preferences, this does not mean they are limited to these preferences. It is common for this to be directly related to one’s social and economic standing; in other words, one’s taste is determined by one’s economic class. But this is not necessarily a strict rule. Bourdieu coined the idea of cultural capital—assets like education that help people transcend their economic status. Developing taste is affected by one’s culture and cultural capital. One’s culture is chiefly accidental, but that should not stop someone from working to expand their cultural capital through education and other means.

Along with objects and culture, our *relationships* have an acute impact on our taste. We could easily imagine someone being born poor, and then in college befriend someone from a wealthier background. Perhaps, this person from poorer means had never been to

an opera, and they attend with their new friend to discover that they love opera. This friendship, even if it eventually ends, has expanded this person's aesthetic taste by introducing opera. But it can be even simpler than this example. Even our close friends of a similar socio-economic status can have different circles that influence their taste (and potentially ours). When we trust our friend's taste, then we give more weight to their opinions about aesthetic objects, like movies and music. If our friend happens to see a movie first and says it's terrible, we may decide not to see it. And we may even tell others that it's terrible. This is not to say that we will have the same tastes as our friends or other relations, but just that they have an influence over us. We can see this idea at work in the context of Google searches. When using a search engine, people might think that page rank is the most important factor, since an overwhelming majority of traffic comes from the first five results. However, brand familiarity not only helps to determine this placement, but positively influences, more so even than page rank, whether users will ultimately purchase a product.<sup>14</sup> So, familiarity (friends, family, even brands) will have more influence over our aesthetic preferences. While we cannot control many factors, we should at least be aware of the ways they may influence our taste. All of these spheres of experiences work together to develop our aesthetic taste. These kinds of development are largely focused on impacting the individual, so we turn now to see how aesthetic taste can be relevant for other areas of society that are more communal or collaborative.

### **The Relevance of Taste**

Primo Levi was a prisoner during the Holocaust in one of the most notorious concentration camps, Auschwitz. After being rescued and trying to get his life and health back together, he began to write about his experiences in Auschwitz. He recalled a time when he was walking with a fellow prisoner to pick up the daily ration of food for the group. While they were talking, it became apparent that his friend did not know much about Dante. So, Levi began reciting a portion from Dante. But he could not remember certain fragments of the text. In particular, he could not remember a crucial connecting line; he said he would have given up that day's soup, if only he could remember. Why? He wrote: "For a moment I forget who I am and where I am."<sup>15</sup> Perhaps, this would not be the specific thing you would long to remember, but it worked for Levi. I think this illustrates two main things. First, aesthetics matters for our well-being. People may attempt to claim that aesthetics is something added only after all our basic needs are met. Levi was in dire circumstances, but still turned to aesthetics to transcend (even for a moment) his surroundings. Second, we want to share our own aesthetic preferences with others, which will sometimes result in them sharing our preferences or rejecting them. Aesthetics matters for the community, whether it be friendship, business partners, fellow prisoners, or other collaborators.

Taste is a pervasive concept in our social interactions, and it can impact areas such as prisons, engineering, and business. In light of the story about Primo Levi, it should be no surprise that prisons could benefit from some aesthetic considerations. Aesthetic experience is a fundamental drive for people. Part of what is deprived of incarcerated persons in the United States is any aesthetic consideration in the design of prisons, which seem to be concerned only with function. Why should this matter, someone may suggest, they are prisoners? Well, among other reasons, recidivism rates are far lower in countries that do not have such dismal, anti-aesthetic conditions in their prisons. For example,

Norway boasts a twenty percent recidivism rate, one of the lowest in the world.<sup>16</sup> At least part of Norwegians' overall success is that they do not rob incarcerated persons of basic aesthetic considerations. Instead of bleak and dismal cells that work to dehumanize, their minimum security prisoners often have actual furnished rooms. This basic aesthetic arrangement helps them maintain their humanity,<sup>17</sup> rather than pushing them toward animalistic drives. The aesthetic features of their surroundings, along with other things, can work to restore the prisoner for a future back in society, rather than pushing them down further.

Engineering may seem like the application of math and science to solve practical problems, such as building bridges. But as we have seen, aesthetics permeates human existence. These practical problems that engineering seeks to solve are not devoid of social context, they are to satisfy human needs. And humans also need an aesthetic component to their surroundings.<sup>18</sup> In the context of engineering education, Per Boelskifte identifies the separation of aesthetics as a problem, showing how aesthetics was gradually removed from engineering textbooks.<sup>19</sup> He argues for reintroducing aesthetics into engineering education and at earlier stages of the design process. Boelskifte writes: "If aesthetics is understood as having to do with a high level perception of quality, it becomes evident that most engineering decisions may affect the aesthetics of a solution be it a product, a building, a ship or a system."<sup>20</sup> If aesthetics affects engineering outcomes and engineering decisions affect aesthetics, engineers ought to know about aesthetics. Toward this goal, they should have an understanding about aesthetic taste, relating to the culture and individuals in which their product or structure will be presented.

In the context of business, it would obviously be great to know people's tastes so that we could better attract and retain customer loyalty. We are not likely to gain perfect knowledge of everyone's tastes, but this does not mean theorists and practitioners couldn't develop some guiding principles and be willing to alter them as necessary. Taste does not develop in a vacuum. When giving a speech, instructors will point out that you need to know your audience. This advice applies to knowing your customers as well. However, knowing your customers is not only about knowing what services or products they want. This would limit you to function only, when the form (or aesthetics) of your product, practice, and user experience matter as well. Pauline Brown, in her book *Aesthetic Intelligence*, suggests that aesthetics will be a defining aspect of successful businesses in the coming years. An example that helps to illustrate how aesthetics can impact your business comes from Starbucks.<sup>21</sup> All of our senses come into play when experiencing the aesthetic aspect of an object, place, or event. When Starbucks first introduced their breakfast sandwiches, these treats possibly tasted good, but they had an all-too-dominant smell. Starbucks began to lose sales, so they quickly halted the sale of these sandwiches. It was (and is) important for Starbucks customers to smell the coffee, not sandwiches. Now it may seem obvious that people would prefer the coffee smell, but no one considered how the sandwiches would affect the coffee smell. After all, coffee has a fairly strong odor, which was the aesthetic experience the customers wanted.

If relationships are important for individuals to develop their taste, then businesses should also consider relationships (of a kind) with their customers or clients. Part of that includes the obvious idea of building relationships directly with people. But a global company, for example, could not possibly build relationships with all of its individual customers worldwide. Businesses can also connect with their clients or customers by giving them an experience, rather than a mere transaction. In *The Art Firm* by Pierre

Guillet de Monthoux, he claims, "Art had to work as a total experience."<sup>22</sup> More than ever, people are looking for experiences. And giving them one will help to differentiate your business from other similar businesses. How do you do it? Well, of course, it depends on your specific business. But one important aspect will be to see how you can appeal to as many senses as possible in your customers' experience. It is what could set you apart from your competition, especially if you otherwise offer similar services and comparable quality. This fuller experience is a way to give the customer or client the feeling of a relationship.

### **Conclusion**

What has been shown here? While aesthetics has, to varying degrees, always had a place in philosophic inquiry, theories about aesthetic taste in particular have markedly declined since the eighteenth century. In order to show why theories of taste are still beneficial, I recounted two key beliefs concerning where taste begins, whether innately or by reason. In light of their historical context, these theories may seem far-removed from anything beneficial for practices in the current times. But theory (whether articulated or not) still grounds practice. As a way to exemplify this influence and bring the discussion into the present, I showed three ways that individuals can develop taste within three spheres of experience: objects, culture, and relationships. Because taste is not wholly an individualistic enterprise—it has a communal and cultural impact as well—I also introduced wider contexts that warrant further consideration: prison, business, and engineering. Space did not permit a complete presentation for how taste might impact these three contexts. My hope was more modest than that. Drawing on experts and fields outside of art and philosophy, I began to show that attention to aesthetic taste can help us make better decisions, create more equitable policies, develop higher quality products, and even attract more customers. It is my hope that this essay helps inspire people to reconnect and reconsider theories of taste as a viable project.

*Boston Architectural College & Massachusetts College of Art and Design, USA*

(I would like to thank Hannah Rose Goff Spicher for invaluable help in offering edits on this essay.)

## Notes

- <sup>1</sup> A recent book by Peter Kivy, *De Gustibus: Arguing about Taste and Why We Do It*, (Oxford University Press, 2015) is one of the few recent examples. However, despite using the word ‘taste’ in the title, he frames the discussion mostly around art and why we argue for our preferences in that context. So, I think he illustrates one of the problems with taste, that we, as I suggest in this article, need to move aesthetic discussions beyond art.
- <sup>2</sup> Plato, *Symposium*, 211c.
- <sup>3</sup> For more on the history of taste and its different theories, see Michael Spicher, “Aesthetic Taste,” in *The Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, <https://iep.utm.edu/a-taste/>.
- <sup>4</sup> In an example of a philosophical dis, Mendelssohn provides an introduction to the letters in which he claims that his Theocles travelled to a country (presumably Germany) where they valued accurate thinking over simply free thinking.
- <sup>5</sup> Crispin Sartwell, “Beauty,” in *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Winter 2017 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2017/entries/beauty/>>.
- <sup>6</sup> For example, Roger Scruton, *Beauty* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009); Nick Zangwill, *The Metaphysics of Beauty* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2001); Emily Brady, *The Sublime in Modern Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013); Richard Shusterman and Adele Tomlin, editors, *Aesthetic Experience* (New York: Routledge, 2008).
- <sup>7</sup> Carolyn Korsmeyer, *Making Sense of Taste: Food and Philosophy* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1999).
- <sup>8</sup> Yuriko Saito, *Everyday Aesthetics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 14.
- <sup>9</sup> Bence Nanay, *Aesthetics: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), 4.
- <sup>10</sup> Edward A. Vessel, Natalia Maurer, Alexander H. Denker, and G. Gabrielle Starr, “Stronger shared taste for natural aesthetic domains than for artifacts of human culture,” in *Cognition*, 179 (2018), 121-131.
- <sup>11</sup> Jacques Maritain, *Art and Scholasticism with Other Essays* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1930), 28.
- <sup>12</sup> Bence Nanay, *Aesthetics*, 82.
- <sup>13</sup> Pierre Bourdieu, *Distinction* (New York: Routledge, 1986).
- <sup>14</sup> Rebecca Sentance, “\*2% of Searchers Choose a Familiar brand for a First Click [Study]” in *Econsultancy*, October 29, 2018, <https://econsultancy.com/82-percent-searchers-choose-familiar-brand-search/>
- <sup>15</sup> Primo Levi *If This is a Man and The Truce*, translated by Stuart Woolf (London: Abacus, 2009), 119.
- <sup>16</sup> Christina Sterbenz, “Why Norway’s Prison System is so Successful,” *Business Insider* (December 11, 2014), <https://www.businessinsider.com/why-norways-prison-system-is-so-successful-2014-12>
- <sup>17</sup> For a discussion about aesthetics in prison, see Nicole R. Fleetwood, *Marking Time: Art in the Age of Mass Incarceration* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2020).
- <sup>18</sup> See, for example, Rolf Faste, “The Role of Aesthetics in Engineering,” in *Japan Society of Mechanical Engineers (JSME) Journal* (Winter, 1995).
- <sup>19</sup> Per Boelskifte, “Aesthetics and the Art of Engineering,” in *Artifact*, Volume III, Issue 2, (2014), 2.1-2.10.
- <sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, 2.1.
- <sup>21</sup> Pauline Brown, *Aesthetic Intelligence: How to Boost It and Use It in Business and Beyond* (New York: Harper Business, 2019), 47.
- <sup>22</sup> Pierre Guillet de Monthoux, *The Art Firm: Aesthetic Management and Metaphysical Marketing* (Stanford: Stanford Business Books, 2004), 120.