

## EDITOR'S WORDS

### **ON CONSTRUCTIVE-ENGAGEMENT CHARACTER OF COMPARATIVE STUDIES OF CHINESE PHILOSOPHY TOWARD WORLD PHILOSOPHY: IN VIEW OF ISCWP'S TWO-DECADE DEVELOPMENT**

BO MOU

In this “Editor’s Words” writing for the special issue of journal *Comparative Philosophy* on the theme comparative studies of Chinese philosophy toward world philosophy via celebrating the twentieth anniversary of *the International Society for Comparative Studies of Chinese and Western philosophy* (ISCWP), I intend to make some reflective remarks on the mission and direction of the ISCWP in view of its past two-decade constructive development, whose methodology and strategic direction are fundamentally shared by the Journal as shown by the latter’s subtitle “An International Journal of Constructive Engagement of Distinct Approaches toward World Philosophy”. I will do this from the point of view of this writer both as the founding president (2002-2005) of the ISCWP and as the founding editor (2010-) of the Journal and in view of my way of coordinating several multiple-year collective research projects of the ISCWP while carrying out relevant personal research projects since the ISCWP’s inception two decades ago. I will do this also with consideration of a larger background of the recent developments of philosophy, of the world situation, and of the new challenges and need.

These remarks are made in a modest way in this sense: it is intended to be neither a comprehensive review on the addressed subject nor a collective report on behalf of others but based on this writer’s own relevant thoughts when drafting and revising some relevant documents, relevant observations, first-hand participating experience, and reflections from a certain vantage point as explored in the past two decades.<sup>1</sup> My strategy is this. First, in Section 1, I briefly highlight the ISCWP’s mission and direction

---

<sup>1</sup> In this way, I make the following disclaimer: with this limited purpose and focus, the cited references are basically restricted to this writer’s relevant ones that report and analyze the addressed personal observations, experience, and reflections; this limited coverage of the references means neither ignoring nor dismissing other authors’ relevant writings in the literature. For a relatively inclusive survey by this writer, see Section 0.2 (also notes 3 through 8) of the “Introduction” chapter in Bo Mou (2020), *Cross-Tradition Engagement in Philosophy: A Constructive-Engagement Account* (New York: Routledge).

as shown in the original version of its Constitution and as illustrated by its several collective projects roughly in its first decade's development. Second, in Section 2, I briefly highlight how the ISCWP has further developed in its cooperation with the two subsequent academic channels [i.e., the international journal *Comparative Philosophy* since 2010 and the *International Society for Comparative Philosophy toward World Philosophy* (CPWP) since 2021] in its recent decade's development. Third, in Section 3, I give an account of the methodological basis of the "toward world philosophy" direction of comparative philosophy (regarding *how* to advance toward world philosophy) through explaining an enhanced account of the "adequacy" conditions under which to adequately look at the relation between distinct (eligible) perspectives of different approaches (from different philosophical traditions understood broadly). Fourth, in Section 4, I make a further explanatory note on the holistic and engaging character of the direction dimension of cross-tradition-engagement-oriented comparative studies of Chinese philosophy: why it is primarily "toward world philosophy", instead of merely "contribution to world philosophy" or merely 'toward world'.

## 1. ISCWP: THEORY AND PRACTICE

The mission and goal of the ISCWP<sup>2</sup> are highlighted in the approved original version of the ISCWP Constitution in 2002<sup>3</sup> as follows:

2. ISCWP is a non-profit, independent philosophical society in the international academic arena. The Society aims at (1) promoting *comparative studies of Chinese philosophy and Western philosophy*, (2) facilitating academic contact and exchange of ideas and information among interested philosophers in various regions, and (3) providing channels to bring together Chinese and Western philosophers for learning from each other and joint endeavor to contribute to the common philosophical enterprise.

With the preceding general purposes, the Society emphasizes (but is not limited to) *the constructive engagement between Chinese philosophy and Western mainstream philosophy (analytic tradition as well as continental tradition in the West in their broad senses)*; the Society *stresses the sensitivity of such comparative studies to contemporary development and resources of philosophy and their mutual advancement*; and, through the characteristic path of comparative studies of Chinese and Western philosophy, the Society *strives to contribute to philosophy as common human wealth as well as to respective studies of Chinese philosophy and Western philosophy*. The Society also emphasizes *building up a channel and outlet for the academic exchange and communication between the homeland of Chinese philosophy and the Western world in philosophy*.

---

<sup>2</sup> The basic ideas about the mission and goal of the ISCWP were suggested by this writer with consultation of the Preparatory Committee for the ISCWP that consists of the following colleagues: FANG Wan-Chuang, FUNG Yiu-ming, LIU JeeLoo, WANG Qingjie, and ZHANG Xianglong who is also the founding Vice President of the ISCWP 2002-2005 Board.

<sup>3</sup> The original version of the ISCWP Constitution was approved in May 2002, which is posted at the ISCWP old website <iscwp.org>.

Around twenties years ago (2002) when the ISCWP was established, due to some relevant academic and situational considerations (such as personal constitutions, research focuses, some relevant characteristic features, ...), the ISCWP's manifest coverage and focus is on *comparative studies of Chinese and Western philosophy*, as indicated in the name of the ISCWP.

However, its genuine nature is more inclusive, and its direction is toward world philosophy, as suggested (explicitly or implicitly) in the cited clause of the ISCWP 2002 Constitution and as illustrated by the theoretic exploration and reflective practice of a range of international collective projects by/within the ISCWP. For example as illustration, those collective projects to which this writer is a contributing coordinator include these: *Davidson's Philosophy and Chinese Philosophy: Constructive Engagement* (2002-2006)<sup>4</sup>; *Searle's Philosophy and Chinese Philosophy: Constructive Engagement* (2004-2008);<sup>5</sup> *Constructive Engagement of Analytic and Continental Approaches in Philosophy: From the Vantage Point of Comparative Philosophy* (2008-2013);<sup>6</sup> *Philosophy of Language, Chinese Language, Chinese Philosophy: Constructive Engagement* (2003-2018).<sup>7</sup> These international collective projects have shown the "inclusive" character and "toward world philosophy" direction of the ISCWP (specifically speaking) and the constructive engagement movement in contemporary studies of Chinese philosophy worldwide (generally speaking). This "inclusive" character and "toward world philosophy" direction are addressed and emphasized in a summary characterization of the "constructive engagement" movement in the development of Chinese philosophy by this writer as follows<sup>8</sup>:

(11) As far as its fundamental nature and direction are concerned, the movement is part of world philosophy instead of a mere local one associated with Chinese philosophy alone; it is part of comparative philosophy in general within a global context. Methodologically speaking, and in view of its fundamental philosophical concern, the constructive-engagement movement in modern Chinese philosophy is not limited to its constructive engagement with Western philosophy but also engages with other philosophical traditions as well as between various movements within Chinese philosophy. To this extent, the constructive engagement between Chinese and Western philosophy can serve as a

---

<sup>4</sup> For its result, see Bo Mou (ed.) (2006), *Davidson's Philosophy and Chinese Philosophy: Constructive Engagement* (Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers).

<sup>5</sup> For its result, see Bo Mou (ed.) (2008), *Searle's Philosophy and Chinese Philosophy: Constructive Engagement* (Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers).

<sup>6</sup> For its result, see Bo Mou (co-edited with Richard Tieszen) (2013), *Constructive Engagement of Analytic and Continental Approaches in Philosophy: From the Vantage Point of Comparative Philosophy* (Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers).

<sup>7</sup> For its result, see Bo Mou 2(ed.) (2018), *Philosophy of Language, Chinese Language, Chinese Philosophy: Constructive Engagement* (Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers).

<sup>8</sup> See this writer's contributing chapter to the reference book *History of Chinese Philosophy* edited by this writer (Mou 2009), i.e., Chapter 18, "Constructive engagement of Chinese and Western philosophy: a contemporary trend *toward world philosophy*" (my emphasis here in italics). The addressed characteristic feature is listed as one (the last one but not least) of the eleven distinct characteristic features of the constructive-engagement movement toward world philosophy in the development of Chinese philosophy (*op.cit.*, 599-600).

methodological template for the constructive engagement between any two (or more than two) seemingly competing approaches in philosophical inquiries toward world philosophies, say, between Chinese tradition and other non-Western philosophical traditions such as Indian and African. Indeed, this is one distinctive feature and direction of the constructive-engagement movement, as it is characterized in terms of ‘a trend toward world philosophy’ in the title of this chapter, especially in view of its methodology and its fundamental concern. First, its methodological strategy is general in nature in this sense: it is expected to be applicable to the comparative engagements between seemingly competing approaches (either from distinct traditions or within an array of different views of the same tradition) in philosophical inquiries as well as between Chinese tradition and other non-Western philosophical traditions. Second, one fundamental concern of the constructive-engagement movement is to inquire how, via reflective criticism and self-criticism, distinct modes of thinking, methodological approaches, visions, insights, substantial points of view, or conceptual/explanatory resources from various philosophical traditions and/or different styles/orientations of doing philosophy, can learn from each other and make a joint contribution to the common philosophical enterprise and/or series of common concerns and issues of philosophical significance.”

The above “toward world philosophy” characteristic feature of the ISCWP (together with its several collective research projects roughly in the first decade of its development) as one substantial part of the constructive-engagement movement in modern Chinese philosophy has set its own direction, provided one weighty methodological template of doing philosophy through cross-tradition engagement toward world philosophy, and made its (more or less) substantial impacts on the contemporary development of philosophy in relevant connections, though some of its long-term significance and impacts still need people to wait and see.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Such significance of the ISCWP together with its major collective projects means a priority for me that bears on my arrangement of my own time and energy between doing those ISCWP collective projects that were initiated and coordinated by this writer and doing my personal research projects during the first decade of the ISCWP development. As I see it, timely completing these collective projects are more significant and pressing in several relevant connections than then completing my personal research projects. This is one primary consideration for which I first focused on coordinating and contributing to these collective projects while postponing completing my personal research projects. There is another substantial consideration: coordinating and participating in these collective projects can, and did, allow me to not only have more time but also engage with more distinct cases in further carefully thinking about those addressed general theoretic and methodological issues and specific engaging issues as examined in my personal research projects. In this sense and to this extent, if these long-planned personal research projects had been completed earlier than those collective projects, they would not reach the level of enhancement and refinement as shown in their current complete versions [especially the three recent monograph books of mine, *Semantic-Truth Approaches in Chinese Philosophy: A Unifying Pluralist Account* (Lexington Books, 2019), *Cross-Tradition Engagement in Philosophy: A Constructive-Engagement Account* (Routledge, 2020), and *Cross-Tradition Engagement on the Laws of Logic: Approaching Identity and Reference from Classical Chinese Philosophy to Modern Logic* (Routledge, 2024)]. In so saying, instead of treating the above personal situation as a purely private matter, I intend to present this personal case of mine as one illustration of how those ISCWP collective research projects can and did bring about substantial impacts on one individual person’s scholarly work (such as mine) in view of the above second consideration.

## 2. FURTHER CROSS-TRADITION ENGAGING STUDIES OF CHINESE PHILOSOPHY AND OTHER TRADITIONS: FROM THE VANTAGE POINT OF COMPARATIVE PHILOSOPHY TOWARD WORLD PHILOSOPHY

As intrinsically or naturally developed, further cross-tradition engaging studies of Chinese philosophy and other traditions from the vantage point of the constructive engagement toward world philosophy have been implemented and enhanced through two subsequent academic channels, to be explained below.

In 2010, the international philosophy journal *Comparative Philosophy: An International Journal of Constructive Engagement of Distinct Approaches toward World Philosophy* was established, whose orientation and emphasis are highlighted in the opening passage of its “About This Journal”:<sup>10</sup>

“*Comparative Philosophy* is a peer-reviewed, open-access/non-profit international journal of philosophy. With comparative philosophy understood as a general way of doing philosophy through cross-tradition engagement toward world philosophy, the Journal emphasizes the constructive engagement of distinct approaches and resources from different philosophical traditions (whether distinguished culturally or by style/orientation) for the sake of their joint contribution to the contemporary development of philosophy and society worldwide; the Journal also stresses general theory and methodology of comparative philosophy.”

In the past fourteen years, the Journal has published many peer-reviewed research articles and contributing papers to a range of special-topic sections and “constructive-engagement dialogue” sections by the authors worldwide concerning comparative philosophy as a general way of doing philosophy through cross-tradition engagement toward world philosophy.

In 2021, *the International Society for Comparative Philosophy toward World Philosophy* (CPWP, <[www.cpwponline.org](http://www.cpwponline.org)>) was established to meet the following challenges and expectations. (1) Generally speaking, there is the need for an international association with *its distinct identity and emphasis on comparative philosophy (whatever one would like to label) as a general way of doing philosophy through cross-tradition engagement toward world philosophy and for the sake of contemporary development of philosophy and society*, whose coverage is *not limited to, say, the East (the Asian, the Chinese, etc.) and the West but more inclusive*. (2) Moreover, the world of tensions and conflicts at deep levels as evidenced by a range of events in the previous years (especially since the burst of COVID-19) augments *the need for the due role comparative philosophy toward world philosophy can play via its methodological and theoretic resources concerning how to enhance dialogues and mutual understanding and learn from each other (in a constructively engaging way) between contraries/groups in a more widespread social setting*. (3) This new academic

---

<sup>10</sup> It is cited from the “About This Journal” document as posted at the journal website <[www.comparativephilosophy.org](http://www.comparativephilosophy.org)>).

association is to share the same fundamental aim as that of the international journal *Comparative Philosophy* (as shown by the journal's subtitle: "*An International Journal of Constructive Engagement of Distinct Approaches toward World Philosophy*"); both can be strongly complementary to each other in fulfilling the goal by providing each other with an effective academic-exchange channel and critical discussion platform. (4) It is known that the current available philosophical associations have this/those limits/boundaries to meeting the above needs either because of emphasis difference or because of coverage boundaries or because of some other restrictions.

The CPWP sets out to meet the foregoing challenges and needs as shown in the following relevant passages cited from the CPWP Constitution (emphasis in italics is given here)<sup>11</sup>:

2.1 The Society aims at: (1) *promoting comparative philosophy as a general way of doing philosophy through cross-tradition engagement toward world philosophy, which seeks dialogue, mutual understanding and learning, complementarity, and joint contributions by distinct approaches and resources from different philosophical traditions worldwide for the sake of the contemporary development of philosophy and society*; (2) *facilitating academic exchange and discussion of ideas among interested philosophers in various regions worldwide, and providing them with effective channels and platforms in view of the foregoing goal.*

2.2 *The Society emphasizes (but is not limited to) the constructive engagement of distinct approaches and resources from different philosophical traditions (whether distinguished culturally or by style/orientation) or from (ancient) philosophical tradition and contemporary scholarship (philosophy or other intellectual pursuits): inquire into how they can talk to and learn from each other and make joint contributions to the contemporary development of philosophy through treating a range of (perennial, existing or newly identified) issues of philosophical value and significance that can be jointly concerned and approached via appropriate philosophical interpretation and from a higher and/or broader philosophical vantage point.*

2.3 *The Society also pays attention to the suitable role that comparative philosophy toward world philosophy can play via its relevant methodological and theoretic resources concerning how to enhance dialogue, mutual understanding, and complementary engagement between contraries on various issues, in a more widespread social setting, for the sake of contributing to the contemporary development of society worldwide.*

The CPWP also sets out to be constructively complementary to, and friendly open for academic cooperation with, other academic associations that (more or less) share the same goal and concerns and/or have distinct complementary emphases/coverages (such as ISCWP), as specified in the CPWP Constitution:

2.4 *The Society emphasizes building up channels, outlets and platforms (including powerful virtual channels and open-access means) for the academic exchange and dialogue between interested philosophers from different traditions and/or from different regions*

---

<sup>11</sup> The CPWP's Constitution (its approved version of May 2021) is posted at the "About" part of the CPWP website <cpwponline.org>.

worldwide on a range of jointly concerned issues as specified above. The Society is also constructively open for academic cooperation with some other institutions or associations that more or less share the same goal and concerns and have distinct but complementary emphases and/or coverages.

In 2022, the international conference on the theme “Comparative Philosophy toward World Philosophy”, co-organized by the CPWP and the journal *Comparative Philosophy* and co-sponsored and hosted by the Center for Comparative Philosophy, San Jose State University, USA, was successfully held virtually (19-23 April 2022). The contributing participants in this event include many ISCWP members. The selected research papers from this international conference (after further revisions in response to critical discussions) are published in the July 2022 issue (Vol 13 No 2) of *Comparative Philosophy*, which consists of two “Special Theme” sections and one “Constructive-Engagement Dialogue” section. This writer’s contributing essay to its “Special Theme” section on theme “comparative philosophy as a general way of doing philosophy through cross-tradition engagement toward world philosophy” has given an elaboration of the theme.<sup>12</sup>

So to speak, the reflective identity of comparative philosophy *as a general way of doing philosophy through cross-tradition engagement toward world philosophy* (‘comparative philosophy toward world philosophy’ for short) marks a momentous accumulating point of the significant development of comparative philosophy with “a general way of doing philosophy” as its “nature” dimension, “through cross-tradition engagement” as its “approach” dimension, and (especially stressed here) “toward world philosophy” as its “direction” dimension.

These further cross-tradition engaging studies and events from the vantage point of comparative philosophy toward world philosophy constitute the due background and bring about the due sentiment and need to (more) explicitly stress the “toward world philosophy” direction of the ISCWP.

In the foregoing background and context of the development of comparative philosophy as a general way of doing philosophy through cross-tradition engagement toward world philosophy, the ISCWP has recently revived itself through a range of remarkable events. In August 2023, the ISCWP co-coordinated the 2023 workshop of “Comparative Philosophy Forum—Beijing” on the theme “Comparative Studies of Chinese Philosophy toward World Philosophy”. In October 2023, the ISCWP further amended its Constitution<sup>13</sup> more explicitly specifying the nature and coverage of comparative studies of Chinese and Western philosophy in Clause 2 as follows:

ISCWP is a non-profit, independent philosophical society in the international academic arena. The Society aims at (1) *promoting comparative studies of Chinese philosophy and Western philosophy (possibly including relevant resources from other philosophical*

---

<sup>12</sup> Bo Mou (2022), “Comparative Philosophy as a General Way of Doing Philosophy Through Cross-Tradition Engagement Toward World Philosophy”, *Comparative Philosophy* 13.2: 4-22 <[https://doi.org/10.31979/2151-6014\(2022\).130205](https://doi.org/10.31979/2151-6014(2022).130205)>.

<sup>13</sup> The ISCWP’s further amended version of its Constitution (its approved version of October 2023) is posted at the “About” part of the ISCWP’s current website <[iscwponline.org](http://iscwponline.org)>.

*traditions whenever in need) toward world philosophy, (2) facilitating academic contact and exchange of ideas and information among interested philosophers in various regions, and (3) providing channels to bring together philosophers from Chinese, Western and other philosophical traditions for learning from each other and joint endeavor to contribute to the common philosophical enterprise.*

With the preceding general purposes and with the understanding of comparative philosophy as a general way of doing philosophy through cross-tradition engagement toward world philosophy, the Society emphasizes (but is not limited to) the cross-tradition constructive engagement between distinct approaches and resources from Chinese, Western and other philosophical traditions (distinguished culturally or by orientation/style); the Society stresses the sensitivity of such comparative studies to contemporary development and resources of philosophy and their mutual advancement; and, through the characteristic path of comparative studies of Chinese and Western philosophy, the Society strives to contribute to philosophy as common human wealth as well as to respective studies of Chinese philosophy and Western philosophy. The Society also emphasizes building up a channel and outlet for the academic exchange and communication between the homeland of Chinese philosophy and the Western world in philosophy.

The Society is also constructively open for academic cooperation with some other institutions or associations that more or less share the same goal and concerns and have distinct but complementary emphases and/or coverages.

In August 2024, the ISCWP and the Journal jointly coordinated the Roundtable panel (6 August 2024) at the 25<sup>th</sup> World Congress of Philosophy (1-8 August 2024, Rome, Italy) further examining the theme “Comparative Studies of Chinese philosophy Toward World Philosophy”. Indeed, through the foregoing remarkable efforts and relevant collective efforts, the ISCWP has substantially revived in its healthy and constructive development.

### 3. “TOWARD WORLD PHILOSOPHY” AS ONE STRATEGIC DIRECTION OF CROSS-TRADITION ENGAGING STUDIES OF CHINESE PHILOSOPHY: A CONSTRUCTIVE-ENGAGEMENT ACCOUNT OF (ADVANCING) TOWARD WORLD PHILOSOPHY

What is (more or less) jointly shared by the co-sponsoring parties (ISCWP, CPWP, and the Journal) of the 2023 workshop of the Comparative Philosophy Forum – Beijing (1-2 August 2023) is essentially one representative strategy (type) of doing *comparative philosophy as a general way of doing philosophy through cross-tradition engagement toward world philosophy*, which can be, and actually is often or sometimes, labeled ‘constructive-engagement strategy’ or ‘constructive-engagement account’ (again, how to label it is relatively unimportant; one can label it in whatever label one would prefer). This strategy can be briefly summarized in this way:

One strategic goal and methodological strategy of comparative philosophy is to inquire into how, by way of reflective criticism (including self-criticism) and argumentation and

with the guidance of adequate methodological guiding principles, distinct approaches (even though not derivable from or reducible to each other) from different philosophical traditions (whether distinguished culturally or by style and orientation) or respectively from some (ancient) philosophical tradition and contemporary society ('from different traditions' for short) can talk to and learn from each other and jointly contribute (in a complementary way) to the development of philosophy and of contemporary society on a range of reflective issues of philosophical (or intellectual) value and significance, which can be jointly concerned and approached through appropriate philosophical interpretation and from a broader philosophical vantage point.

The constructive-engagement strategy holistically addresses all the three dimensions of comparative philosophy as a general way of doing philosophy through cross-tradition engagement toward world philosophy, explicitly or implicitly: i.e., its "nature" dimension as "a general way of doing philosophy", its "approach" dimension as "through cross-tradition engagement", and its "direction" dimension as "toward world philosophy". The constructive-engagement strategy has seven emphases that are closely related, briefly highlighted as follows. (1) It emphasizes *critical engagement for the sake of truth pursuit* ("truth" as conceived in people's pre-theoretic "way-things-are-capturing" understanding of truth understood broadly from which even often-subjective-oriented "aesthetics" cannot be escaped at a deep level, neither "anything goes" nor merely intellectual game pursuit). (2) It emphasizes *constructive joint contribution* of distinct approaches in critical engagement through their learning from each other (through their reasonable/appropriate parts if any: either eligible perspectives, or adequate guiding principles, or effective instruments) and making joint contribution to jointly concerned issues/topics (either actually/explicitly or potentially/implicitly addressed ones) *in a complementary way*. (3) It emphasizes *philosophical interpretation* of the addressed thinkers' texts instead of mere historical descriptions. (4) It emphasizes the *philosophical-issue-engagement orientation* that aims at *contribution to the contemporary development of philosophy* on a range of philosophical issues that can be jointly concerned and approached through philosophical interpretation and from a broader philosophical vantage point. (5) It emphasizes *being open-ended and adequately inclusive* regarding various (eligible) perspectives from distinct approaches in different traditions, *being sensitive to dynamic development of an object of study and thus a due coverage of eligible perspectives*. (6) It emphasizes the *constructive social impact* of unifying the joint force of valuable resources from different traditions for the sake of healthy and constructive development of the human society. (7) It emphasizes that the foregoing engaging exploration needs to be *guided by adequate methodological principles* in a holistic way and with a higher/broader vision.

In the past two decades, one of my own theoretic explorations is to give a theoretic elaboration (token) of the constructive-engagement strategy (type), whose explanatory potency has been tested, enhanced, and enriched by the reflective practice of several collective research projects of which I have been contributing coordinator (as aforementioned above). It is noted that my own account is not pretended to be the exclusive one of the "constructive engagement" strategy but only one elaboration; so

‘a’ (instead of ‘the’) is used in the sub-title of my 2020 monograph book *Cross-Tradition Engagement in Philosophy: A Constructive-Engagement Account*.

There would be distinct theoretic ways to elaborate the foregoing constructive engagement strategy together with its previously mentioned emphases. One core part of my theoretic elaboration can be presented as a theoretic account of a set of adequacy conditions of how to maintain adequate methodological guiding principles in looking at the relationship between distinct approaches and resources from different traditions (‘different tradition’ understood broadly, to hit the point of such “adequacy” conditions concerning general methodology in treating any different approaches to any object of study). It is closely or intrinsically related to the methodological point of “toward world philosophy” as the direction dimension of comparative philosophy (regarding how to advance toward world philosophy): so to speak, at the meta-methodological level, such an account of adequacy conditions bridges the “approach” dimension and the “direction” dimension of comparative philosophy as a general way of doing philosophy through cross-tradition engagement toward world philosophy.

This writer’s exploration of such an account of the adequacy conditions has undergone its dynamic development (enhanced and enriched as a whole) in the past decades, though with distinct emphases and different degrees of manifestations of some of those emphases for distinct purposes. What is presented below is this writer’s most recent version of this account, which is new in some connections (related to the purpose and emphasis on “toward world philosophy”) while other parts not new (to those colleagues who are more or less familiar with my previous relevant writings on the issue). In my 2001 essay,<sup>14</sup> I explicitly examine four adequacy conditions only; In the conclusion chapter of my 2020 monograph book,<sup>15</sup> I examine eleven adequacy conditions; in my 2022 essay,<sup>16</sup> I examine twelve adequacy conditions; in my 2023 essay,<sup>17</sup> I examine fourteen adequacy condition. In the following, I examine fifteen adequacy conditions. Among others, sensitive to some characteristic features of “toward world philosophy”, the second and twelfth adequacy conditions are newly added: the former is to provide a solid “horizontal-vertical” basis in *understanding the world* in a cross-tradition engaging way, while the latter is to point to a powerful “vertical-horizontal” social impact in transforming the world through a unified cross-tradition joining force.

---

<sup>14</sup> Bo Mou (2001), “An Analysis of the Structure of Philosophical Methodology: In View of Comparative Philosophy,” in Bo Mou (ed.), *Two Roads to Wisdom? ---Chinese and Analytic Philosophical Traditions* (Chicago, Ill.: Open Court), 337-64.

<sup>15</sup> Bo Mou (2020), “Toward Constructively Engaging” (the “conclusion” chapter), in Bo Mou, *Cross-Tradition Engagement in Philosophy: A Constructive-Engagement Account* (New York and London: Routledge), 371-382.

<sup>16</sup> Bo Mou (2022), “Comparative Philosophy as a General Way of Doing Philosophy Through Cross-Tradition Engagement Toward World Philosophy”, *Comparative Philosophy* 13.2: 4-22.

<sup>17</sup> Bo Mou (2023), “Cross-Tradition Philosophical Engagement and Cross-Culture Dialogue: From a Holistic Vantage Point with Enhanced Explanatory Resources”, *Culture and Dialogue* 11: 122-149 <doi:10.1163/24683949-12340131>.

(1) *The adequacy condition of recognizing the same object as a whole* (“the same-object-whole-recognizing condition” for short). A methodological guiding principle is considered adequate in this connection if, *given an object of study*, it enables the agent to recognize that there is a way through which the object goes objectively such that people can all talk about that same object as a whole even though they may say different things about the object (distinct perspectives pointing to its distinct actual and potential aspects), neither resulting in “anything goes” nor in radically different objects of their own. Otherwise, the principle is considered inadequate in this connection.

This adequacy condition is intrinsically and directly related to one of the two normative bases for cross-tradition engagement, i.e., the “same-object-whole-recognizing” norm. Simply put, this adequacy condition is one significant variant of the “same-object-whole-recognizing” norm in addressing how to adequately look at distinct approaches (distinct eligible perspectives) to an object of study. This adequacy condition is the most basic among all the addressed adequacy conditions, for all the other adequacy conditions presuppose that people can all talk about that same object as a whole even though they may say different things about it.

(2) *The adequacy condition of distinguishing eligible perspectives from ineligible perspectives* on a given object of study in view of the “way-things-are-capturing” normative basis and of referentially based eligibility (“the referentially-based-eligibility condition” or the “way-things-are-capturing” condition for short). A methodological guiding principle is considered adequate in this connection if, on a given object of study, it can distinguish eligible perspectives from ineligible ones among the currently available perspectives on the object based on the “way-things-are-capturing” normative basis and the referentially based, truth-apt eligibility. Otherwise, the principle is considered inadequate.

In view of the very nature of *eligible* perspectives, this adequacy condition may be also called the “way-things-are-capturing” condition. In comparison and contrast to the preceding adequacy condition, this adequacy condition is intrinsically and directly related to the other of the two normative bases for cross-tradition engagement, i.e., the “same-object-whole-recognizing” norm. This adequacy condition is one significant variant of the “way-things-are-capturing” norm in addressing how to adequately look at distinct eligible perspectives to an object of study. This adequacy condition is also presupposed by the remaining types of adequacy conditions for the sake of capturing the way the object is (or is to be), given that the truth pursuit (i.e., the “way-things-are-capturing” pursuit) is one strategic goal for any reflective pursuits of “how things are” (instead of “anything goes” or “mere intellectual game playing”). The preceding and this adequacy conditions jointly constitute the basis and common ground for the remaining types of adequacy conditions due to the intrinsic connection between the “same-object-whole-recognizing” norm and the “way-things-are-capturing” norm. This point is highlighted through the adequacy condition (2), which is explicitly added to the further refined list of the adequacy conditions for how to look at distinct, eligible perspective in cross-tradition philosophical engagement and in those truth-concern-sensitive and critical-engagement-sensitive inquiries in cross-culture dialogue.

This adequacy condition is significant in understanding of the identity of the world philosophy: it gives a “horizontal-vertical” guidance in the sense that “eligibility” identities of distinct perspectives regarding one object *O* at the “horizontal” inter-theoretic level are normatively unified by they “vertically” point to distinct aspects of the same object *O*; in other words, in this adequacy condition, we start at the “horizontal” level to look at various reflective/theoretic resources from different traditions in seeking their unifying basis and end at the “vertical” direction with the foregoing bottom-up unifying basis.

(3) *The adequacy condition of recognizing the eligibility of multiple eligible perspectives* (“the multiple-perspective-eligibility-recognizing condition” for short). A methodological guiding principle that is presupposed by the agent who uses a certain eligible methodological perspective as her/his current working perspective is considered adequate in this connection when this guiding principle renders other eligible methodological perspectives (if any) also eligible and somehow compatible with the application of the current working perspective. Otherwise, the principle is considered inadequate in this connection. This adequacy conditions may be called a “minimal” condition in the sense that it is to be minimally presupposed (or pursued) by the subsequent types of adequacy conditions and that it is minimally needed by any adequate methodological guiding principle.

(4) *The adequacy condition of being sensitive to the agent’s purpose* (“the agent-purpose-sensitivity condition” for short). A methodological guiding principle is considered to be adequate in this connection if it has the choice of a certain working perspective, among eligible methodological perspectives, that is sensitive to the agent’s purpose and focus, thus rendering the perspective that (best) serves that purpose the most applicable or the most appropriate. Otherwise, the principle is considered inadequate in this connection.

(5) *The adequacy condition of granting equality status* (“the equality-status-granting condition” for short). A methodological guiding principle is considered to be adequate in this connection if it renders all the eligible methodological perspectives (perspective simplexes) equal, equally partial, and equally needed for the sake of a complete account of an object of study. It is noted that, being sensitive to a specific purpose of a project, one eligible perspective can be rendered more needed or in focus than others relative to its associated purpose. Thus, none of them are *indiscriminately* or *absolutely* superior (or inferior) to the others in the above senses. Otherwise, the principle is considered inadequate in this connection.

(6) *The adequacy condition of recognizing new eligible perspectives* (“the new-eligible-perspective-possibility-recognizing condition” for short). A methodological guiding principle is considered to be adequate in this connection if it takes an open-minded attitude towards the possibility of a new eligible perspective concerning an object of study, which points to some genuine aspect of the object but has yet to be realized by the agent because of the “unknown identity” status of that aspect. Otherwise, the principle is considered inadequate in this connection.

(7) *The adequacy condition of being sensitive to the dynamic development of an object of study and thus the due coverage of eligible perspectives* (“the dynamic

development-sensitivity condition” for short). A methodological guiding principle is considered adequate in this connection if it guides the agent to be sensitive to the dynamic development (*if any*) of an object of study for the sake of realizing and understanding which aspects are (still or currently) genuinely possessed by the object, and thus which methodological perspectives are still eligible, and which previous aspects would be lost and thus which previous perspectives would become no longer eligible. Otherwise, the principle is considered inadequate in this connection.

(8) *The adequacy condition of capturing concordant complementarity* (“the concordant complementarity-capturing condition” for short). Given that multiple distinct yet eligible methodological perspectives concerning an object of study turn out to be (or able to be) mutually supportive and supplementary in a manifest consistent way (thus called “concordantly complementary”), a methodological guiding principle is considered adequate in this connection if it guides the agent to capture (or seek and promote) such concordant complementarity of these perspectives for the sake of their working together and make joint contribution. Otherwise, the principle is considered inadequate in this connection.

(9) *The adequacy contradiction of capturing restrictive complementarity* (“the restrictive-complementarity-capturing condition” for short). Given that there are two (multiple) different methodological perspectives concerning an object of study that are eligible (i.e., capturing distinct aspects of the object) but that are genuinely contradictory (i.e., the captured distinct aspects are genuine internal contradictory aspects possessed by the object), and that this object with its internal contradictory constituent aspects still exists in a constructive way (rather than in destructive tension up to sublation), a methodological guiding principle would be considered adequate in this connection if it guides the agent to first recognize the genuinely contradictory state of the involved aspects of the object and thus the eligibility of these “contradictory” perspectives that capture these aspects, and second capture the “restrictive” complementarity of these contradictory yet eligible perspectives with their recessive mutual support for the sake of a complete understanding of the complete identity of the object. Otherwise, the principle is considered inadequate in this connection.

(10) *The adequacy condition of seeking sublation and post-sublation complementarity* (“the post-sublation-complementarity-seeking condition” for short). Given that two (or more than two) seemingly competing contraries as a whole (say, two contrary approaches to a jointly-concerned issue, either one of which or both are “guiding-principle-associated perspective complexes) somehow cannot be mutually supportive and supplementary (neither in a manifest way nor in a recessive way) and need their sublation (understood broadly, to be explained below) so that reasonable and valuable elements need to be sublated respectively from the two contraries and incorporated into a new unity and that they can be mutually supportive and supplementary (either in a concordant way or in a restrictive way), a methodological guiding principle is considered adequate in this connection if it guides the agent to first sublimate these reasonable and valuable elements from the two original contraries, incorporates them into a new unity as new contraries, and second understand and

capture their post-sublation complementarity (in a concordant or restrictive way). Otherwise, the principle is considered inadequate in this connection.

(11) *The adequacy condition of seeking critical/constructive-reflection-generating complementarity* (“*the critical/constructiv-reflection-generating-complementarity-seeking condition*” for short). Given that two contrary approaches to a jointly-concerned issue turn out to be that one contrary contains *some reasonable and valuable element(s)* (say, including either some “eligible” perspective in its “perspective” dimension or some “adequate” guiding-principle element in its “guiding-principle” dimension), and the other contrary as one mistaken approach includes neither eligible perspective nor adequate guiding principle (even if the latter contrary as part of the natural world would have its *raison d’être* of a certain kind), a methodological guiding principle is considered adequate in this connection if it guides the agent to generate critical but constructive reflections on why the latter contrary can occur and how it can be overcome and avoided in the future (in plain words, through critical reflection, the agent can constructively learn from the latter contrary’s mistakes and lessons). Otherwise, the principle is considered inadequate in this connection.<sup>18</sup>

(12) *The adequacy condition of seeking constructive social impact of the joint force of overall-complementary perspectives on the human society as a whole* (“*the constructive-social-impact-seeking condition*” for short). Given that there are multiple distinct yet eligible methodological perspectives concerning an object of study that are mutually supportive and supplementary and thus complementary regarding their joint social impact, a methodological guiding principle is considered adequate in this connection if it guides the agent to realize, seek and enhance such social import, thus constructively contributing to a better human society for the sake of well-being of the human society as a whole. Otherwise, the principle is considered inadequate in this connection. This adequacy condition is significant in emphasizing the social impact (social transformation power making the human society better) of joint force of eligible perspectives from different traditions: it gives a “vertical-horizontal” guidance in the sense that, with the aim of top-down “vertical” social impact of reflective or theoretic valuable resources from different traditions on the human society horizontally in various aspects, these valuable resources (either distinct eligible perspectives or adequate guiding principles or both) from different traditions are to be guided and unified into the joint force in making the human society better (in other words, transforming the world through cross-tradition joining force for the sake of the well-being and healthy/constructive development of the human society as a unity whole).

(13) *The adequacy condition of overcoming excessiveness and achieving constructive balance* (“*the excessiveness-overcoming condition*” for short). Given that there are multiple distinct yet eligible methodological perspectives concerning an object of study that are mutually supportive and thus complementary, whether in a

---

<sup>18</sup> In this way, even facing a mistaken approach that would include neither eligible perspective nor adequate guiding principle, an adequate methodological guiding principle in this connection can guide the agent to treat it in a constructively complementary way that would generate critical reflections on why this approach is mistaken and unconstructive and on how to learn from its mistakes and lessons.

manifest way (thus concordantly complementary) or in a recessive way (thus restrictively complementary) and whether such complementarity is achieved directly by recognition or indirectly through sublation, a methodological guiding principle is considered adequate in this connection if it guides the agent to maintain already-achieved complementarity by overcoming what is excessive (if any) and supplementing what is insufficient (if any) in treating these distinct eligible perspectives, thus bringing about their constructive balance (either in the form of “harmonious” balance for concordant complementarity or in the form of “restrictive” balance for restrictive complementarity). Otherwise, the principle is considered inadequate in this connection.

(14) *The adequacy condition of holding a thorough open-minded and self-critical attitude towards the agent’s own approach* (“The open-mind-oriented self-criticism condition” for short). A methodological guiding principle is considered adequate if it guides the agent to have a thorough open-minded and self-critical attitude towards the agent’s own approach. Otherwise, the principle is considered inadequate in this connection.

(15) *The adequacy condition of holding an overall-holistic vision that coordinates the preceding adequacy conditions in distinct connections into a whole and captures the due relationship between them* (“the overall-holistic-vision-capturing condition” for short). A methodological guiding principle is considered adequate in this connection if, given an object of study, it guides the agent to strive for a (more) complete understanding of various aspects of the object together with its intrinsically related normative bases, its relevant background, and its possible development, thus guiding her/him to have an overall-holistic vision that reflectively coordinates the preceding meta-methodological adequacy conditions [(1) through (13)] in distinct connections into a whole and to capture the due relationship between them. Otherwise, the principle is considered inadequate in this connection.

It is important to note that the foregoing overall-holistic-vision-capturing condition (at the meta-meta-methodological level) means neither requiring or demanding taking a comprehensive perspective complex of multiple-perspectives (simplexes) to be a current working perspective nor treating any current working (eligible) perspective (simplex) in a specific project with its specific purpose and focus as a flawed one that fails to capture or distort the way things are; rather, the foregoing overall-holistic-vision-capturing condition that would be met at the “guiding-principle” dimension of one’s methodological approach to an object of study in one’s specific project is not only compatible with but fundamentally complementary [in the sense as specified in (15)] to such an eligible single perspective as one’s current working perspective at the “perspective” dimension of one’s methodological approach.

Though “adequate” condition (15) comes last, it is not least. If the preceding adequacy conditions (1) through (13) are meta-philosophical in nature, this adequacy condition, like the adequacy condition (14), is meta-meta-methodological in nature because it is about how to look at these meta-methodological adequacy conditions. The significance of this adequacy condition is to be explained below.

Several notes are due at this point. First, it is important to note that a methodological guiding principle as held by one agent, generally speaking, might be adequate in one

or several connections while inadequate in some other connection(s). This is the reason why the modifying phrase ‘in this connection’ (“a methodological guiding principle is considered adequate in this connection if...”) is used in the foregoing characterization and presentation of the adequacy conditions.

Second, as already explained, given an object of study, the adequacy condition (1) (i.e., the same-object-whole-recognizing condition) and the adequacy condition (2) (i.e., the referentially-sensitive-eligibility condition) are meta-methodological due to the “presupposition” relation between the adequacy conditions (1) and (2) together with the adequacy condition (3) and the other meta-methodological adequacy conditions (4) through (11) on how to look at the relation between various (methodological) perspectives. In this way, the apparent holistic character of the adequacy conditions (1), (2) and (3) is thus at the meta-methodological level. In contrast, the overall-holistic-vision-holding condition is overall-holistic in character at the meta-meta-methodological level, which is to guide the agent to see, say, the previously addressed intrinsic relation between the adequacy conditions (1) and (2) and the two normative bases in cross-tradition engagement in philosophy, or, the “presupposition” relation between the adequacy condition (1) and the other meta-methodological adequacy conditions (2) through (1), etc.

Third, in the previous presentations of some of those preceding “adequacy” conditions (1) through (13), I have made certain meta-meta-methodological remarks regarding their status and relations with some other adequacy conditions. These remarks, however, are not parts of these adequacy conditions *per se*; rather, actually they are implied parts of the overall-holistic vision addressed in the current overall-holistic-vision-holding condition.

Fourth, Condition (15), the overall-holistic-vision-holding condition, and Condition (14), the open-mind-oriented-self-criticism condition, are intrinsically complementary. On the one hand, the addressed open-minded self-criticism attitude needs to closely work with the holistic condition as one solid compass. Being open-minded does not mean flowing at random absolutely without guidance; rather, it needs a holistic vantage point from which to realize due coverages and limits of the preceding meta-methodological adequacy conditions in distinct connections. On the other hand, a holistic vision does not mean indiscriminate inclusion; rather, a holistic vision *in philosophy* intrinsically points to a reflective or self-critical attitude toward itself. To this extent, the two meta-meta-methodological adequacy conditions are mutually supportive, supplementary, and interpenetrating. They are thus complementary in jointly guiding and regulating how to look at the preceding adequacy conditions.

Fifth, with the joint guidance of the adequacy conditions (14) and (15), one substantial point regarding the set of meta-methodological adequacy conditions is as follows. Any condition on the meta-methodological “adequacy-condition” list *per se* is open to criticism, instead of being dogmatically imposed, and should be guided in an overall-holistic vision. Indeed, the set of meta-methodological adequacy conditions (1) through (13) has been suggested to serve two purposes. For one thing, it is to explain how it is possible to have adequate methodological guiding principles in cross-tradition philosophical inquiries. For another thing, it is to provide readers with an engaging

starting point or an effective steppingstone, which *per se* is not intended to be dogmatically imposed on readers but expected to be a target of critical examination in their own reflective explorations of the issue. The set of adequacy conditions (1) through (13) are thus open-ended with an overall-holistic-vision guidance in two connections: first, any of these adequacy conditions *per se* is open to be further criticized, modified, or enhanced; second, this set of adequacy condition is open to be further expanded to cover more well-established ones if in need.

Sixth, it is arguably the case that the methodological resources of this account of further expanded set of adequacy conditions for maintaining adequate methodological guiding principles together with the further refined characterization of eligibility of methodological perspectives whose original version is suggested for cross-tradition engagement in philosophy, are not merely applicable to those critical-engagement-sensitive studies in cross-culture dialogue but (can) have their more general methodological implication and significance. They can be applicable to critical-engagement-sensitive studies in other intellectual pursuits of “how things are” with their strategic truth-pursuit goal, not merely for natural sciences in a manifest way but also for social sciences and humanities in an either manifest or recessive way.

Seventh, especially regarding the identity, nature and development of world philosophy or advancing toward world philosophy, the “enhance” character of the suggested enhanced “constructive-engagement” account of cross-tradition engagement lies in two further explicitly given adequacy conditions, i.e., the “way-things-are-capturing” condition and the “constructive-social-impact-seeking” condition. These two adequacy conditions respectively address the two important dimensions of world philosophy. The “way-things-are-capturing” condition is significant in understanding of the identity of the world philosophy: it gives a “horizontal-vertical” guidance in the sense that “eligibility” identities of distinct perspectives regarding one object *O* at the “horizontal” inter-theoretic level are normatively unified by they “vertically” point to distinct aspects of the same object *O*; in other words, in this adequacy condition, we start at the “horizontal” level to look at various reflective/theoretic resources from different traditions in seeking their unifying basis and end at the “vertical” direction with the foregoing bottom-up unifying basis. In contrast, another adequacy condition is also significant in emphasizing the social impact (social transformation power making the human society better) of joint force of eligible perspectives from different traditions: it gives a “vertical-horizontal” guidance in the sense that, with the aim of top-down “vertical” social impact of reflective or theoretic valuable resources from different tradition on the human society, these valuable resources from different traditions. In other words, in this adequacy condition, we start at the “vertical” direction with a top-down aim of social impact to be brought about by valuable theoretic resources and end at the “horizontal” level of effectively unifying the joint force of distinct valuable resources from traditions (either distinct eligible perspectives or adequate guiding principles or both). The former is to provide a solid “horizontal-vertical” basis in *understanding the world* in a cross-tradition engaging way, while the latter is to bring about a powerful “vertical-horizontal” social impact in transforming the world through unified cross-tradition joining force.

#### 4. CROSS-TRADITION ENGAGING STUDIES OF CHINESE PHILOSOPHY FROM A HOLISTIC VANTAGE POINT WITH PRIMARY DIRECTION “TOWARD WORLD PHILOSOPHY”

With the preceding exploration of the identity and characteristic features of the methodological basis of the “toward world philosophy” direction of comparative philosophy (regarding how to advance toward world philosophy) through examining the addressed “adequacy” conditions, it is the time for further clarifying the due status and holistic character of the “toward world philosophy” direction of comparative philosophy. In this final section, I intend to make a further explanatory note on the holistic and engaging character of the direction dimension as “toward world philosophy” of comparative philosophy as a general way of doing philosophy through cross-tradition engagement toward world philosophy through the case of cross-tradition-engagement-oriented comparative studies of Chinese philosophy. I present this explanatory note in an engaging while constructive way in view of two other world/world-philosophy-related slogan-like phrases ‘contribution to world philosophy’ and ‘toward world’ that appear in oral discourses and in the literature.<sup>19</sup>

There are several points for why the *primary* and *holistic* goal of cross-tradition engaging studies of Chinese philosophy in the context of world philosophy is not merely “contribution to world philosophy” but primarily “toward world philosophy” with its holistic-engaging character of bi-directional learning and critical engagement including self-critique in doing philosophy, though “contribution to world philosophy” is one important dimension of the holistic strategic aim. First, comparative studies of Chinese philosophy (or doing Chinese philosophy comparatively) is to aim not merely at contributing to world philosophy in a one-directional way but also at mutually learning from and constructively engaging with other philosophical traditions, self-criticizing/overcoming its own weakness/lack, and thus improving/enhancing itself in advancing “toward world philosophy”.

Second, the strategic holistic goal of “toward world philosophy” is what *doing* Chinese *philosophy* comparatively (through *cross-tradition engagement*) intrinsically demands, instead of being merely optional or preference if evaluated from a holistic vantage point of doing philosophy through cross-tradition engagement.

Third, focusing on “contributing to world philosophy” as one working perspective is eligible (as there are significant contributions that Chinese philosophy can make to world philosophy) and thus can and need to be significant part of “doing Chinese philosophy comparatively” as a whole (thus can be one focus by one specific project).

---

<sup>19</sup> What is focused on here is the semantic *literal senses* of these slogan-like summary phrases and what they explicitly deliver on their own, though they might pragmatically imply partial meaning of the ‘toward world philosophy’ in some of their actual uses (for example, one speaker might say that he/she uses the phrase ‘contribution to world philosophy’ would implicitly mean the addressed bi-conditional engagement). As this writer is not to carry out a comprehensive examination of such situated uses of them in view of the main purpose here and space limit, the references of their appearances in the literature are not given here; I intend to constructively explain how the addressed three slogan-like terms literally point to distinct strategic goals and focuses.

Fourth, eventually and strategically, the holistic goal is not *merely* “[one directional] contribution to world philosophy” but “*toward* world philosophy” with its defining character of advancing toward bi-directional learning and critical engagement (including self-critique) in the holistic context of cross-tradition engagement.

There are also several points for why the *primary* and *holistic* goal of cross-tradition engaging studies of Chinese philosophy in the context of world philosophy is not merely “toward world” but primarily “toward world philosophy” with its holistic-engaging character of bi-directional learning and critical engagement including self-critique in doing philosophy, though “contribution to world” can be, and is in fact given as, one local aim. First, comparative studies of Chinese philosophy (or doing Chinese philosophy comparatively) is to aim not merely at treating a variety of world affairs but primarily at advancing toward world philosophy and thus mutually learning from other philosophical traditions, self-criticizing/overcoming its own weakness/lack, and thus improving/enhancing itself through its advancing “toward world philosophy”.

Second, the strategic holistic goal of “toward world philosophy” is what *doing* Chinese *philosophy* comparatively (or through *cross-tradition engagement*) intrinsically demands, instead of being merely optional or preference if evaluated from a holistic vantage point of doing philosophy through cross-tradition engagement.

Third, on the other hand, focusing on “toward world” as one working perspective is eligible (given that there are significant contributions from Chinese philosophy to treating world affairs) and thus can be part of the “doing Chinese philosophy comparatively” as a whole (thus can be one focus by one specific project).

Fourth, eventually and strategically, the holistic primary goal is not *merely* “toward world” but “toward *world philosophy*” which points to primarily advancing toward bi-directional learning and critical engagement (including self-critique) in the holistic context of cross-tradition engagement in *doing philosophy* before the resources from studies of Chinese philosophy can be adequately and effectively applied to treating a variety of world affairs from a higher and broader vision of doing philosophy.

In this way, though each of the goals “contribution to world philosophy” and “toward world” can be, and is in fact given as, one significant aim in some specific projects in an eligible way, the foregoing explanatory lines of why the primary and holistic (prescriptive) goal of cross-tradition engaging studies of Chinese philosophy in the context of world philosophy is neither merely “contribution to world philosophy” nor merely “toward world” jointly constitute an explanatory line of why the primary strategic goal of cross-tradition engaging studies of Chinese philosophy in the context of world philosophy is primarily to advance “toward world philosophy” with its character of bi-directional learning and critical engagement including self-critique in doing philosophy.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> An outline of earlier versions of Sections 1, 2 and 3 of this writing was presented at the 2023 Workshop of the “Comparative Philosophy Forum – Beijing” on the theme (1 August 2023, Beijing, China); an outline of an earlier version of Section 4 of this writing was presented at the previously mentioned Roundtable on the theme at the 25<sup>th</sup> World Congress of Philosophy (6 August 2024, Rome, Italy). I am grateful to the audiences at the foregoing two events for their helpful engaging discussion and commentary feedback.