Interview of Professor Liu Chuang

Philosophy Community (Zhe Xue He Zuo She)

DOI: 10.47297/wspciWSP2515-469906.20200401

[Guest Profile]

Liu Chuang, Ph.D. of the HPS Department of University of Pittsburgh, is currently a distinguished professor at the School of Philosophy, Fudan University, and the director of the Fudan PSI Center. He was a professor at the Department of Philosophy of the University of Florida and a chair professor of "Yangtze River Scholars" and "Shanxi Hundred Talents Program". His research mainly includes philosophy of science, philosophy of physics, philosophy of intelligence, etc. In addition, he has won the National Science Foundation, US (NSF) and National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH), and the first prize of Humanities and Social Sciences of the Ministry of Education of China.

[Interview content]

Part 1 General Questions

Personal experience and style:

1. You majored in physics in the undergraduate period, then why did you change your major into philosophy

of science?

I liked philosophy before I went to college; I was the first batch of college students after the Cultural Revolution (77 ji first Gao Kao), but before that I got interested in philosophy and read some of Marxism on my own; but when Gao Kao was revived, I prepared like most competitive young people of my age for physics and mathematics. I loved and read philosophical writings of such physicists as Mach, Einstein, Bohr, and Heisenburg all through my college years and when I read for the first time Thomas Kuhn's *The Structure of Scientific Revolution*, I immediately knew that was what I wanted to study further. I wasn't sure whether I wanted to study in a graduate program of *Natural Dialectics*, but when an opportunity of studying philosophy of science in the US came up, I jumped at it and was luckily admitted by the HPS department of University of Pittsburgh.

2. The reason why you changed your major is probably because you expected to find something you care about most(or more) . Then, have you found it? What kind of fun and pain(if any) has philosophy brought to you?

Yes and no. I certainly found what I would have never found if I had stayed in physics, which is a secure and recognized professional environment in which I can pursue the questions I am interested in without any distraction. If I had stayed in physics, I would have to study the questions on the side without any professional help and recognition, not to mention with very limited time. So, yes, I found what I was looking for. However, have I found any satisfactory answers to the questions I wanted answers for? The answer of course is "no, not yet." Comparing to other disciplines, philosophy suits me the most and is therefore for me the most fun to do. I might have equally enjoyed doing highly theoretical works in physics or mathematics, but one is not always lucky enough to be able to do such works on the highest order. In philosophy of science, there is little or no division of labor in the way you find in the sciences; therefore one gets to enjoy the same sort of fun or endure the same sort of pain that the greatest contemporary philosophers enjoy or endure. There is no parallel in philosophy to what one often finds in the sciences where most graduate students and postdocs do the tedious work that the masters are unwilling to do.

I can truly say that I have enjoyed every aspect of my career since I switched to philosophy of science; that is one of the best decisions I have made in my life. I wouldn't have been enjoying what I have been doing this much if I had been in any other discipline. However, that doesn't mean that I have never suffered in doing it. No, in fact, the suffering is constant and ever present; and this is probably a special curse for doing philosophy. Partly because of what I have just said about the lack of division of labor in philosophy, there are no routine jobs in philosophical investigation that one can carry out day by day and see an accumulation of results and thereby feel satisfied. Whenever I can't take the pressure of not being able to produce, which is very, very often, I wish I had chosen a practical profession, such as being a medical doctor so that I can fill my day with busy work that help others. Creative philosophical writing, for me at least, is a lot like being a writer; when you can't produce, you can only helplessly watch patches of your life, of yourself, falling away from you completely wasted. That's very painful indeed at times. Both of my parents, medical doctors in a medical university, had warned me against choosing something like philosophy for a profession (my mother refused to acknowledge my choice and whenever her colleagues asked her what her son does in America, she would say emphatically "theoretical physics!"). I resented them at the time but I now begin to see the wisdom in their objection.

3. Which aspect of philosophy most disappoints you?

Philosophy, like religion, is one of the oldest cultural phenomena of mankind, and as it often happens in an old enterprise, it tends to become large and complex and filled with things that don't really belong to it. There are too many popular charlatans in philosophy, especially when it is entangled with cultural and religious matters.

4. Could you introduce some philosophers you admire? Like whose works and style you love? Outside of books about philosophy or philosophy of science, what other kinds of books do you like?

My taste for philosophers and philosophical works has undergone changes over the years. Early on, I greatly admired such philosophers as Ramsey, Carnap, Quine, and Putnam. The Carnap-Quine debate on ontology occupied me for a

while; Quine on ontological relativity and Putnam's internal realism interested me greatly in the early stage of my career. Kuhn, though widely misunderstood, influenced my thinking a great deal. I also admired and still admire Nelson Goodman. In more recent years, I read less of philosophy as I did some concentrated works on small problems in foundations and methodology of physics. For scientist philosophers, the greatest are of course Newton and Einstein. The scientific works of Descartes and Leibniz are also amazingly philosophical and clever. Russell has been a constant source of inspiration: his structuralism and phenomenalism are truly profound (perhaps unlikely to be true). I love David Lewis's works but could rarely find any use of them in my work; the same is probably true of Peter Strawson (but I like to imitate the ways they construct arguments). I also like to study the works of such philosophers as Parfit, Williams, and Nagel, but I never had the time or energy to make original contributions to problem they deal with. I have read quite extensively of such philosophers as Wittgenstein and MacDowell and wanted to like their works, but found that they are overrated. Crispin Wright has a critique of MacDowell I find very to the point and convincing.

Outside of philosophy or philosophy of science I am a hopeless dilettante, like to read or study all sorts of writers. I love to read such writers as Nietzsche and Schopenhauer but can't stand continental philosophy in general. I am a bit obsessed with Shakespeare and even a bit of a buff of Shakespeariana, collecting and reading Shakespeare studies with some devotion. I was for a time foolish enough to seriously consider believing that William Shakespeare from Strafford-on-Avon did not write the alleged Shakespearean plays and there was a deep conspiracy to conceal the identity of their real author. Another great writer I read frequently is Marcel Proust; I read Proust's *In Search of Lost Time* the way some people read the Bible: picking it up from time to time and open to whichever page and read as much or as little as I have time to. The cloud parts and life is tolerable again after such readings. I had loved Thomas Mann, read almost all of his writings but I rarely touch his books now; I also love Iris Murdoch's novels, not her philosophical writings, (naming my daughter "Iris" partly after her): her psychological insight and compassion are rare and great. Another great writer I admire and read frequently is Michel de Montaigne, whose *Essays* exhume such wisdom and humanity

that the more I read him the more incredible he becomes. I also love to read poetry; there is Shakespeare of course, but I actually like the poems of John Donne, Shakespeare's younger contemporary, more. I also love, *inter alia*, Dante, Keats, Yeats, and Elliot (*Old Possum's Book of Practical Cats*!). For some reason I never liked the Victorians, for example, people find it hard to believe that I have never read such writers as Dickens, Austin, or Tennyson.

Learning and teaching:

1. Teaching or doing independent research, which one do you prefer? And why?

Teaching is much more enjoyable for me than doing research in philosophy of science, but if I ever stop doing research, no amount of teaching could possibly fill in the hole. Independent research work on the frontier, on however small or peripheral a spot of it, is the necessary condition for my professional existence; the day I stop research, it is the day I cease to be a philosopher, for nothing else can replace that. However, I do love teaching and some students regard me a good teacher; but I know that I am actually not. I mostly pay attention to the best students in my classes and make sure that they learn as much as I can teach them and enjoy it as much as I do, leave average and lower than average students behind, and feel no guilt at all when they fail. And worse of all, I have an ability to somehow convince such students that their failure is entirely their own fault, which is of course not nearly as true as it seems. I am fully aware that they could have succeeded if taught by a good teacher. Many of the students I have taught are quite successful, but then they would have been successful without me, and I needed them more than they needed me.

2. Back in the days when you were a student, what was the most important thing you had learned? And how did you learn it? (Or what kind of abilities and qualities, do you think, are needed for students nowadays?)

I started my study of philosophy of science in the HPS department at the University of Pittsburgh. The years I spent there were so important to me that I feel if I hadn't gone through those years at Pitt (and to a great extent also at CMU), I

would never have achieved a fraction of what I have achieved so far. My innate philosophical aptitude is probably not very low to begin with, and so what I have learned in my graduate studies at Pitt is a solid background in philosophy of science and philosophy in general (I've taken almost equal number of courses in the Philosophy Department as from HPS). This background includes a knowledge part and a skill-set part. Taking courses from the masters do benefit one more than one is perhaps willing to admit, and having competitive fellow students when learning from the masters is perhaps also crucial to one's training. I could be wrong about this of course, but going through a top-ranking graduate program and thoroughly enjoying the learning experience there are probably more important than anything in one's career of becoming a professional researcher in philosophy. Even though I have been doing my own research more or less on a solo path (besides a long-term partner in mathematical physics I have not really collaborated with anybody else in any substantive ways), I am a firm believer of a healthy competitive and exciting academic community as a necessary condition for good research work. It is more important to be concerned with how to get into such a community or work towards building such a community than worry about how to train or improve oneself to be an excellent researcher.

3. Is the history of philosophy important to study analytic philosophy? There is a popular view that "doing philosophy is equivalent to doing history of philosophy". How do you think of that?

Studying the history of philosophy is probably more important than anything else in making a good philosopher; no great philosophers that I know and/or respect become such without a deep understanding of history of philosophy. Contemporary philosophy, especially philosophy in the largely analytic tradition, is a continuation of the history of western philosophy. How many hot topics if any now in metaphysics or ethics or epistemology are not from Hume or Descartes or Kant? So, for students in philosophy today, if they ignore the study of history of philosophy and do nothing but following contemporary philosophers, they do that at their own peril. In fact, a cursory perusal of the works of major contemporary philosophers will reveal to serious students the importance of the mastery of histo-

ry of philosophy. With that said, I am totally against the idea that doing philosophy is constituted in doing history of philosophy. This would be tantamount to saying being a writer is to be a literary historian and critic. History of philosophy as a research discipline is a venerable part of philosophy; I'm not disputing that and many historians' works contribute greatly to the body of philosophy; but to say that's the only way of doing philosophy is obviously confused. I may be totally wrong on this, but the only way to do Chinese Philosophy today does seem to be to do history of Chinese Philosophy. But I think that is just due to an unfortunate historical fact: the fact that the continuous development of Chinese Philosophy was interrupted by the forced political, economic, and cultural infusion from the West in recent centuries. I would like to see a world in which ancient Chinese philosophy makes permanent contributions to contemporary philosophical researches just as ancient Greek philosophy does.

4. How do you think of the domestic education in philosophy(undergraduate and postgraduate education) ?Is there anything to improve?

Here I am on very shaky ground because I really don't know enough about how students in philosophy or philosophy of science are educated in China. My experience is limited to very few top programs in the country, such as Tsinghua, Beida, Renda, and Beishida, to name a few. So please forgive me if what I say sounded outrageously unfair.

I don't think I see any problems with the education in philosophy or philosophy of science, at least not anything that I don't see in various degrees in other places. The undergraduate education in China may be more problematic but apart from hearing a lot of complaints about it I actually don't have any personal experience. Graduate education in places I have taught are formally sound and practically quite rigorous and demanding. I have seen worse programs in the US and UK (of course not in their top programs). To be perfect honest, if standard professional English were used throughout, the top programs in China might have already been internationally competitive.

With that said, I do see two major problems. The main problem actually comes from the discipline of philosophy itself in China. I think that there is very

little real philosophy being produced in China today, and if I am right about this, how can the educational programs produce good young professionals while not many existing professionals are for real? Anywhere in the world, it is always true that the best philosophical training grounds are where the best philosophy is practiced and produced. I am the kind of person who firmly believes that to be properly educated is to be with the masters. If one has seen how people such as Hempel, Salmon, Sellers, MacDowell, and Belnap do philosophy, one will know what is good philosophy and how not to produce anything less than good philosophy later in his or her own career. Talented students in China today have to rely on texts written by the leading philosophers as if studying the texts from gods; that's no way of learning philosophy. So, my conclusion, perhaps an unrealistic one, is that there will be no good educational programs in China until there are great philosophers here.

The second problem is related. Students and professors in China talk more about what are needed to do philosophy and how to do philosophy than philosophy itself; the latter, the content of philosophy, seems to be less important or to be relegated to more formal settings, such as in a class or in a dissertation defense. The conditions of studying and doing philosophy in many places in the West are now worse than those in China, believe me; but one still finds professionals there talk about philosophy at lunch or dinner rather than about the bad conditions of doing it.

5. More specifically, what suggestions do you have for the domestic teaching in philosophy of science? Could you recommend some related basic reading materials(textbooks, collections, etc) to the learners?

Which philosophers students need to study or what books or articles are best to study is actually more or less commonly shared knowledge by now. Students in China today don't need more suggestions of this sort. If one is good at philosophy and cares about philosophical issues, any decent books or collection of articles would do to get one started. The key is to really get into the issues and think critically and creatively. Stop worrying about how to be good students; it's time to worry about how to be good philosophers.

Reading and writing

1. Many students have trouble in reading professional literature. They can't focus on it for a long time; they will forget it easily and have no inspirations after reading. Do you have any suggestions or guidance based on your experience for that? Do you have any fixed time for literature reading everyday? How do you make yourself focus on the literature?

Yes, this is also my biggest difficulty and challenge for which I have suffered long and hard and am still suffering from it. Believe me, I am not alone on this, and when I compare my ability to read and absorb literature to that of my American or British colleagues, I am painfully aware of how far behind I am on this matter. I could be totally wrong on this, but I believe that we Chinese are inherently disadvantaged in reading professional literature (it is not only a matter of our having to read in English because I don't think the Germans or Italians who have to use English have this problem in general). There is nothing one can do on this other than spending more time reading and re-reading (yes, I also forget easily of what I have read). Because of this problem, it is probably necessary when one begins to do research to take on smaller and more technically oriented topics, which could partially alleviate the problem of not being able to absorb quickly large amount of relevant literature. Another way is to work with a small and competitive group, which does not necessarily reduce the amount of reading but the competitiveness may force one to get the job done more effectively. Problem-driven, targeted reading is also more effective than general reading. Reading does become faster and easier if what you read later is closely connected to what you have read before.

2. It is important, but also difficult to have original views in a philosophical essay. Most of the time, our essay is just a synthesis of the existing opinions. Sometimes, we have some ideas on certain question, but those are more often than not vague. How can we find opinions with original and solid proof and theoretical support? Could you share your own experience on this?

When it comes time for my students at the University of Florida, whether graduate or undergraduate, but it mostly concerns the undergraduate students, to do their essay assignment, I always tell them that it is never acceptable to write a

book-report type essay (which means a synthesis of the views and arguments they read in the articles they are assigned to); whatever essay they come up with, it has to be one with an original argument for an original point. I am afraid that I have to say regrettably that some of the articles I have read in top-ranking philosophy journals in China would be unacceptable in just that sense for my classes. From my experience with teaching students in China over the years, I think this problem of either writing something no more than a synthesis, however clever and complex a synthesis, or writing something very original but implausible or badly supported is due to a cultural difference; the sort of writing style that one sees in mostly European cultures not only in philosophical writings but most commonly in jurisprudence (court arguments and law reviews) has rare or no counterpart in traditional Chinese culture. Dismissing the possibility that the international practice in philosophical writing will eventually switch to the traditional Chinese style of philosophizing, students have to learn from the first step in philosophy to think and write in the international style. The best way to learn is to begin by imitating the best western writers; I always advise my students to read and imitate Aristotle. If one can learn to argue for everything, not just philosophical matters, in Aristotelian style, one will be at home in philosophy and doesn't have to worry about producing writings, however trivial, that are either syntheses or idle speculations. I do want to emphasize that this is not just a matter of professional writing; it is a matter of adopting a style of reasoning that one must integrate into one's thinking and use to even argue with one's family members and friends about everyday affairs. No one can really write decent philosophical discourses if all he or she talks about outside of "work" are, for instance, rumors and speculations about the current and/or future state of China or the US or the world.

The Current and Future

1. What is your recent research plan? Is there any philosophical branch or research focus you would like to be engaged in if you had time and mental energy?

The focus of my research is in two areas, (i) foundations of quantum theory,

and (ii) scientific methods regarding idealization and models.

The things I would like to do if I had time and mental energy are (i) evolutionary explanation of rationality, social contract, morality; (ii) the connection between free will and quantum measurement.

2. What do you think is the next tide or hot topic in analytic philosophy?

I really don't know. In philosophy of science, I think the first area in the above "what I like to do" list is becoming more and more attractive.

3. Do you think that the core fields of contemporary analytic philosophy (especially metaphysics) have the trend of "scholasticism" ? (In general, "scholasticism" refers to be disconnected from reality, and to create some wordy, trivial concepts or arguments, etc.)

Contemporary philosophy does feel to the practicing professionals a little stagnate. There are many reasons for this feeling, which may not at all be real; the content I think is the least contributing factor. I don't think for instance logical positivist philosophy is any less "scholastic" content wise than any of the current products in philosophy, but no one at the time regard it as such. On the other hand, many students in China feel frustrated by the seemingly endless complications in recent arguments for certain philosophical positions is somewhat justified partly because there is less control today over what can see publication and what cannot; a lot of tentative arguments, which formerly wouldn't see formal publication, are now published; and if one does not know the relative importance of these things, one may be mislead into thinking that some of these are major contributions, which they are not (I have in mind, for example, some of Keith DeRose's arguments for his brand of contextualism). This goes back to my previous point, to learn and do philosophy, one has to go to the "hot beds" where philosophy is "happening" and "alive," or one creates such hot beds in one's local environment with one's friends and colleagues. Learning and doing it afar only deprives one of all the fun and stuck one with the pain and complication.

One word about this notion of the usefulness of philosophy or the social significance of it: this is a completely mistaken or out-of-date notion. Of course philosophy is useful and socially significant; otherwise people won't want to learn

and do it. It is important to people because learning and doing it enrich people's soul and make their lives worth living. People like me wouldn't know how to continue to exist without doing philosophy, isn't that socially significant enough, if I am not the only one? Philosophy is about creating culture and enriching people's mental life; in this sense it is fundamentally different from religion and that's a good thing. If some day academic philosophy becomes so socially significant that it turns into something like a religion, we should all be sad and gravely worried.

Exchange and Interaction

1. When talking about your views about Chinese philosophy in an interview, you said that some elements in Chinese philosophy could be selected and integrated into other philosophy fields(like analytic philosophy). Moreover, you mentioned that "I am trying to introduce some resources in Chinese philosophy into my current study on philosophy of science and analytic philosophy." Could you go further in this topic? Like some examples?

There is some misunderstanding in that transcribed and translated discussion, which I don't have time to correct. My main point there is the following: ancient Chinese philosophy should eventually be regarded as one of the major sources in the world philosophy, which of course includes contemporary analytic philosophy. I would like to see some day people find philosophical inspiration in Lao Zi or Zhuang Zi the same way they find it in Plato or Aristotle. I teach a course with the title of "Chinese Philosophy," but all I do is to guide students through reading parts of Lao Zi and Zhuang Zi, nothing else, just as my colleague specializing in ancient philosophy teaches Plato and Aristotle does. Most of my students don't get it but hopefully their children or rather their great, great, grand children will get it when someone then teaches them *straight* Lao Zi and Zhuang Zi. I wrote an article sometime ago entitled "Carving Nature at its Joints," which is about a theory of idealization I was developing at the time. The idea is from the story in Zhuang Zi, Pau Ding Jie Niu. The integration is very shallow, I admit, but it is a start.

2. In the above-mentioned interview, you said that "there are no schools, but questions in philosophy". However, the general impression is that analytic

philosophers and continental philosophers care about different things.(For example, "analytic philosophy is more closely related to natural science; while continental philosophy focuses more on social life.") What's more, analytic philosophy and continental philosophy have different argument style. (For example, "the argument style of the former is clear and strict; while that of the latter is more poetic and literary.") This has led to difficulties in exchanging. What's your opinion?

As I said above, good continental philosophy, such as Nietzsche and Schopenhauer, I love but regard not as philosophy; and there are bad continental philosophical writings as there are bad analytic ones; but there is one difference. Some pretty bad writings in analytic philosophy still serves a function, clearing grounds, while bad continental philosophy is just a waste of paper (or disk space).

3. Even though more and more Chinese students are studying philosophy abroad now, it's still hard for Chinese scholars to publish articles in mainstream foreign magazines and to get a role in teaching analytic philosophy in North America. Do you have any suggestions? And what kind of abilities needed to be trained for Chinese scholars if they try to claim a place in the English philosophical world?

The international philosophical world has been and still is a very unfair world, especially to those of us who are primarily educated in a totally different culture and don't use English as the native language. I don't mean to say that it is any living person's fault (although one could well argue that some dead people are indeed responsible for such unfairness in the world), and I don't advocate any "affirmative action" type measures to bring people like us into the international philosophical community.

The philosophical community in North America is a very tough place, tougher than anywhere in the world; it is tough not just for people from China or Asia, it is tough for everybody including the North Americans. It is also a relatively fair place, I say "relatively" for it is far from being fair but probably fairer than other similar places. I have no idea what one has to do to claim a place for oneself in such an environment. For myself, determination, hard work, and a bit of luck

seem to have been the cause of my current professional state of being; and I suspect that would be the recipe for anyone who wants to make it in the North American Philosophical Market. If I have one advice, it will be this: stop taking it too seriously that you are a Chinese and you grew up and were educated very differently and your English sucks; befriend as many international students (non-Americans) as possible, for they are like you (their English often sucks as well) except they don't have your cultural crutches (or each's crutches are useless to the other), and work very, very hard. The rest is on the Wheel.

Part 2 Science–Philosophy Related Issues

1. Science vs. Philosophy of science. How's the exchange and interaction between the philosophy of science circle and physics circle? Do the mainstream physicians pay heed to, or will their jobs be affected by results of philosophy of science, especially those who are engaged in theoretical physics? Or, is it that there are basically no exchanges in these two circles?

Oh yes, the major physics journals such as *Physical Review* regularly publish articles in philosophy of physics. A recent Noble Laureate (2003 Physics), Anthony J. Leggett, has binding interests in philosophy of physics. In China, people like Puchang Sun(孙昌璞院士), member of CAS, are regular contributors to such areas as many-world interpretation of quantum theory. Whether any works in physics are directly influenced by results in philosophy of science is a much more difficult question to answer. I don't know of any such direct causal connections in the recent frontier of physics; but I don't follow the recent development of physics nearly closely enough to make a definite judgment.

2. Science vs. Metaphysics. Now the study on metaphysics becomes much more "scientific", for example, the discussion about time and space, causality and fundamentality which prevails at present. And many philosophers in this field have scientific background. But the domestic division for philosophy makes it inclined to an "art" major. Does it mean that students who have ma-

jored in liberal arts from high school have no acquired advantages in the study on metaphysics or philosophy of mind or other areas? Could you share with us some methods to improve our scientific knowledge and qualities?

Yes, I agree that more and more math or science majors eventually get into analytically oriented philosophical programs or research in recent decades. I have a suspicion that many "lazy" North Americans have been driven out of sciences into philosophy by the "diligent" Asians in the science majors; just a speculation of my own, not from any rumor or anything like that.

I don't know, for making up basic scientific knowledge is easy from my point of view, but I was a physics and math major in college, so I'm not the one to answer this question. I hope someone who has done this from a pure philosophical background could provide some personal experience and/or method. I am a strange case, a product of my time not of my will. I in fact like "Wen Ke" stuff far more than scientific stuff, and yet I was trained in college exclusively in the sciences and to some extent it continued in graduate school.

I actually think that scientific stuff is hard to learn and internalize if you are not really into it.

3. How do you think about the emerging "experimental philosophy"? Do you think philosophy will become more positivistic and scientific?

Don't know enough to say anything useful. I don't think philosophy has become more positivistic; no, it is more anti-positivistic. It may be more willing to enlist scientific results for philosophical purposes.

4. Recently, Judea Pearl studying on computer science and Andy Clark in the Department of Philosophy of CMU have proposed some kind of causal model. How do you think it will affect the future of AI and philosophy?

This is one of the noteworthy developments in recent intersection between philosophy and science; it provides an implementable conception of causality that connects well with Woodward's interventionist (philosophical) theory of causation. Causality is important to AI because human perception, learning, and intelligence depend on causality. In AI, neural network, deep learning, etc. are all causal models of artificial intelligence; but most important of all, animal perception, learn-

ing, and intelligence depend on causality and (unconscious) causal inference.

5. What do you think of the interdisciplinary research in recent years, especially that in philosophy and science?

Our time is a time for interdisciplinary research. Philosophy can contribute to science as just much as science can contribute to philosophy. Similar to the turn of 20th century when new science (relativity and quantum mechanics) stimulated the growth of philosophy, today the rapid development in neuroscience, artificial intelligence, and cognitive science are creating new problems or challenges for philosophers to confront. Ours is the exciting time for intelligence related interdisciplinary work between science and philosophy.

6. What do you think of the relationship between cognitive science and philosophy? Any suggestions for our periodical?

The relationship between cognitive science and neuroscience and the many already intertwined interdisciplinary experimental research provides a fertile soil for philosophical work. Conceptual clarification, questions about scientific methodology, including criteria for model-building and the use of analogy, and many more are food for thought for today's philosophers. The Journal is well poised to stimulate discussions in these areas. It is very difficult to run a good academic journal in today's environment, only clear vision and persistence can help. Perhaps it is a good idea to run special issues with well-chosen guest editors or publish important conference or workshop papers. I wish the Journal all the success.