



apa

THE AMERICAN
PHILOSOPHICAL ASSOCIATION

Proceedings and Addresses

of The American Philosophical Association

CONTAINS:

Presidential Addresses

Romanell Lecture

Fulbright 50th Anniversary

Distinguished Lecture

APA Membership List

**Pacific Division Call For Proposals For
"Table Sessions"**

**Revised Eastern Division Placement
Information**

The American Philosophical Association
University of Delaware
Newark, Delaware 19716

Web: www.udel.edu/apa

philosophers because philosophy departments at major universities are the most racially segregated of any academic departments. This is only my second year as a philosophy professor, so the extent of this situation really amazes me.

At this point, I am not sure what to tell my community college students. I know African-American colleagues of mine like to tell young black men in high school who are involved in athletics to get an education first, because their chances of being a professional baseball, basketball, or football player are so slim. Which indeed they are. However, I am afraid that line of reasoning most certainly won't work when it comes to trying to be an African-American philosopher in the United States. These young men's chances are considerably better in professional athletics.

As for Native American youth, I'd probably tell them they might as well set a much higher goal and try becoming Vice President of the United States. Considering the fact there has been only one of those in U.S. history, their chances of achieving either goal are about the same.

Robert L. Perea
Central Arizona College

To The Editor

I am writing, with a heavy heart, because I think it necessary to bring to the attention of the profession an unfortunate situation that has arisen at my university that is inimical to the interests, not only of our Philosophy Department, but of the profession as a whole.

In the course of a controversy concerning the promotion of a colleague—a promotion supported unanimously, and strongly, by the senior members of the Department of Philosophy—the Dean of the Division of Humanities has enunciated a policy that rules out, as a basis for promotion, any publications other than "a book ... accepted by a major press" or "articles [published] in independently peer-reviewed journals." In an exchange of memoranda with the chairman of the department, the language used by the dean has varied somewhat: at one point, the stipulation was that the "independent peer-reviewing" must be "blind." It remains somewhat unclear whether refereeing that is not "blind" would meet the dean's standard of "independence"; it is also unclear—supposing "blindness" not an unalterable demand—whether the procedures of journals whose decisions to accept or reject a paper are made principally by their own editors (for instance, *The Journal of Philosophy* and *The Philosophical Review*) would be acceptable by the dean's lights. It is entirely clear that the dean intends to exclude from consideration any papers published as invited contributions to symposia or other academic functions. The faculty member in question has—beside his published work—five

major papers in that category, already committed to publication but not yet published. He has requested the dean's assistance in securing some way to allow these papers to count towards his promotion (e.g., by *additional* refereeing). The dean has absolutely refused this request; and has likewise rejected the department chairman's remonstrance to the effect that the invited paper is a standard, and highly regarded, mode of publication in our field.

The situation this creates is a manifest injustice to the faculty member involved; and in view of the fact that the department has been informed by a member of the university's central administration that no avenue of appeal is available, it raises a serious issue of academic due process. But my reason for bringing the matter to the attention of the APA, and requesting publication of this letter in the *Proceedings and Addresses* thereof, is that, apart from these issues (of justice in an individual case and of academic procedure), the policy in question seriously infringes the right of the members of the profession to *conduct their own professional affairs on their own standards*. If this policy is maintained, it will be necessary for the Department of Philosophy of The University of Chicago to warn all its members who have not yet achieved tenure, or who have tenure but have not achieved the rank of full professor, to *refuse* to participate in invited conferences or to give invited addresses if their papers are to be published in connection with those events—and also to refuse to contribute invited papers to scholarly collections—unless they are willing to have such work ignored as far as the furtherance of their careers at this university is concerned.

In protest against this policy, and against its enforcement in the case of a faculty member whose relevant work was committed to publication *before the policy was even stated*, I have requested of the Provost that my own rank be reduced to that of associate professor. The Provost has replied that there is no mechanism available to him for a formal reduction in rank, but that he has no objection to my calling myself by that title if I wish to. I accordingly subscribe myself, Sir,

Howard Stein
University of Chicago

To The Editor:

I am writing because I am disturbed by the apparent policy of many mainstream philosophy journals toward Chinese and comparative philosophy. The assumption seems to be that such work should be confined to the handful of specialist journals. I believe that this is an antiquated and counter-productive policy. Philosophers have recognized for a long time that any well-educated ethicist needs to know something about Aristotle, Kant, and the secondary work published on them.

Because of changes in our society and in the world as a whole, the time has come for us to recognize that an ethicist should also know something about Mo Tzu, Hsün Tzu and Chu Hsi.

Too often, philosophers and editors brush off this fact with objections that can be easily rebutted. For example, to the objection, "Why can't they just publish in their own journals?" one can respond by pointing out that segregation is bad editorial policy for the same reason it is bad social policy: separate is not equal. Specifically, while I do not wish to overgeneralize, journals on Chinese philosophy seem less receptive to analytic treatments of Chinese and comparative philosophy than to other approaches. Opening up mainstream journals to this work would be a boon for both mainstream and non-Western philosophy. "We don't have anyone who can evaluate manuscripts or books for review in these fields." There are now a number of senior scholars in the philosophy departments of respected institutions (including Stanford and Berkeley) who can supply expert guidance. "Work on comparative philosophy is not always up to the level of quality of work in mainstream philosophy." If an article isn't up to rigorous standards, don't publish it; if a book is not up to snuff, don't review it. This is why journals need responsible referees and editors who are knowledgeable about Chinese and comparative philosophy. "We don't publish or review historical works." Fine, but let us be consistent. Journals that do publish historical articles and reviews of *Western* philosophy should also publish responsible work on Chinese philosophy. "Chinese philosophy is so different from Western philosophy." Plato is vastly different (in his claims, methodology, cultural context and style) from Hume, who is equally different from Nietzsche. Yet work on all of them would be published or reviewed in mainstream journals. "Few of our readers know Chinese." A specialist on Descartes must know Latin, but that does not mean that only people who read Latin want to read articles on and book reviews of Cartesian scholarship.

Consider the following list of outstanding recent works on Chinese and comparative philosophy, all of which have been completely ignored by the leading review journals in mainstream philosophy. The late A.C. Graham's classic *Two Chinese Philosophers*, which was recently republished by Open Court Press, gives an exceptionally clear presentation of "medieval" Neo-Confucian metaphysics and ethics. Philip J. Ivanhoe's *Confucian Moral Self Cultivation* (Peter Lang) is a brief, informative overview of views on human nature and self-cultivation over more than two millennia of the Confucian tradition. Ivanhoe's *Ethics in the Confucian Tradition* (Scholars Press) presents a clear and accessible discussion of the metaphysical and ethical differences between the early Confucian Mencius and his Neo-Confucian interpreter, Wang Yang-ming. *Culture and Modernity: East-West Philosophic Perspectives*, edited by Eliot Deutsch (University of Hawaii Press) is a fascinating collection of essays on many aspects of both the Western and non-Western philosophical traditions. Finally, Lee H. Yearley's *Mencius and Aquinas: Theories of Virtue and Conceptions of Courage* (SUNY Press) received

only a book note in *Ethics*, although it is well worth the attention of anyone seriously interested in virtue ethics.

There are several books that have been published or are forthcoming this year that promise to be first-rate studies of Chinese or comparative philosophy, including *Mencius and Early Chinese Thought* (Stanford University Press), by Kwong-loi Shun, *Essays on Skepticism, Relativism, and Ethics in the Zhuangzi* (SUNY Press), edited by Paul Kjellberg and Philip J. Ivanhoe, and two volumes (both from Open Court) on the work of David S. Nivison (a past president of the Pacific APA). I edited *The Ways of Confucianism: Investigations in Chinese Philosophy*, which is a collection of Nivison's essays, and Ivanhoe edited *Chinese Language, Thought, and Culture: Nivison and His Critics*, which is a collection of critical essays on Nivison's work. I hope the time has come when mainstream journals will review informative and responsible works like these, and publish articles on similar topics.

In closing, I would like to make a more general observation about the political and cultural climate in which we live. Although I would certainly not endorse everything that has ever been done in the name of "multiculturalism," there are increasing (and justified) demands for greater intercultural awareness and study in academic circles. Philosophers can begin to include non-Western materials in their courses and research now, and do so on their own terms, or they can wait until their departments are eventually forced to hire non-Western specialists (perhaps at the cost of existing tenure-track lines) by administrators under intense political pressure. Philosophers would do well to heed the Stoic adage: The fates drag those who do not come willingly.

Bryan W. Van Norden
Vassar College

To the Editor:

I have gotten letters, and there was some discussion in these pages, about a letter I wrote re: the prospects for white men in the current job market. Because of the response, and because the conversations I have suggest no general loss of interest in the topic, I want to clarify the point I was making and add another. The clarification: I did *not* claim that women, non-whites, and non-white women don't have a special appeal for possible employers (an appeal which at least helps get interviews, and, for all I know, real appointments) due to pressure on departments to diversify. I *did* and will continue to claim that this appeal is *not* what is leaving so many white men high and dry. There are simply too few of us to displace so many. My *aim* in making this point was to get people—yes, white men in