



ISCWP

国际中西哲学比较研究学会

International Society for Comparative Studies of
Chinese and Western Philosophy

From the editor

Greetings fellow members of ISCWP. Contained within this issue are announcements and summaries of a number of newsworthy events with which the Society is associated. As you will see, ISCWP has become a major sponsor of comparative philosophy worldwide. We welcome your continued support and participation (to this end, please see the end of this newsletter for information on dues and donations). This and past newsletters are available on our web site at the following address:

<http://sangle.web.wesleyan.edu/iscwp/news.html>

Any inquiries or feedback regarding this issue are welcome. Please send them to Hagop Sarkissian:
h.sarkissian@baruch.cuny.edu

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Volume 10, Issue 2, August 2012

- I. Letter from the President
- II. Report on the 2012 Beijing Roundtable
- III. Call for Papers: 2013 Beijing Roundtable
- IV. ISCWP Sponsored Panels: APA Eastern Division 2012
- V. Call for Papers: APA Pacific Division 2013
- VI. Dues and Donations



A Letter from the President of the ISCWP

The ISCWP celebrated its tenth anniversary this year with a special Tenth Anniversary panel at the Pacific Division APA meeting in Seattle. Two past Presidents, Mou Bo, Stephen Angle, and myself presented papers in this panel – we were unfortunately not able to contact the second President, Professor Zhang Xianglong. The topics ranged from naturalism, Daoism and Quine's philosophy, to Chinese debate about metaphysics and science, to whether engaging the Analects in terms of moral theory is constructive. After a lively discussion at the conference venue, we took the discussion to a nearby pub and continued our celebrations over drinks. The event was intellectually stimulating and most convivial in spirit. There was a second ISCWP panel on "Moral Psychology in Early Chinese Philosophy," at the Pacific APA that was also very well attended. Many thanks to Carl Dull, Tim Connolly, Ryan Nichols, and Deborah Mowers for their very interesting papers.

There will be a special issue in the on-line journal, *Comparative Philosophy*, to mark ISCWP's tenth birthday. We had received encouraging response to the call for papers, and the special issue is scheduled to appear in Jan 2013. We are most grateful to those who are contributing to the issue, and to the support and hard work of Mou Bo, who have made this project possible.

At the coming Eastern Division APA meeting in Atlanta, three of our members have been invited by the program committee to present papers at a Symposium in the main program, on the contributions of Confucianism to Contemporary Political Philosophy. This is a valuable opportunity to increase awareness of the kind of philosophy ISCWP is interested in. At the symposium, Stephen Angle will talk about his latest project of *Progressive Confucianism*, focusing on social criticism and values of

deference; Erin Cline's topic is "Parents, Children, and Politics in Early Confucianism and Feminism"; and my presentation will examine the engagement between Confucianism and contemporary philosophies of democracy. In addition, Hagop Sarkissian will be part of an invited special session in the main program on the topic "Cultural Diversity and the Rules of Reasoning," which will explore the philosophical implications of putative cognitive differences between East Asians and Europeans. There will also be two other ISCWP panels at this meeting (see page 6). We received more submissions than we could accommodate, and we expect these panels to be of even higher quality than usual. We also hope to see ISCWP members submit papers that get accepted on the main programs of APA meetings. We could help to inform fellow members and promote those sessions if we are informed before the relevant meeting.

Through the ISCWP sponsored APA panels, the society has also been steadily increasing its membership. We hope members would introduce the society to those interested in comparative Chinese and Western philosophy who do not yet know about us. We especially would like to expand our membership in Asia, and hope that this will increase the opportunity for interaction and future collaboration between philosophers based in different regions. Just send the names and email addresses to the Secretary who will invite them to join and at the same time they will be included in the ISCWP list. We look forward to a growing ISCWP and thriving activities in the coming year.

Sor-hoon Tan
National University of Singapore



REPORT:

**2012 BEIJING ROUNDTABLE ON
CONTEMPORARY PHILOSOPHY**

2012年北京

“當代哲學”國際圓桌學術研討會

Theme / 討論主題:

Philosophical Methodology: From the Vantage
Point of Comparative Philosophy
哲學方法論：從比較哲學的觀點看

22nd June 2012

Peking University, Beijing, China

Workshop Host & Co-sponsor:

Center for Comparative Philosophy &
Institute of Foreign Philosophy,
Peking University, Beijing, China

東道主/共同贊助方:

北京大學比較哲學研究中心
北京大學外國哲學研究所

Initiator & Academic Organizer:

International Society for Comparative Studies of
Chinese and Western Philosophy (ISCWP)
發起方/學術組織方: 國際中西哲學比較研究學
會

Co-Sponsor:

Center for Comparative Philosophy, San Jose
State University, California, USA
共同贊助方: 美國加州聖荷塞州立大學比較哲
學研究中心

The 2012 term of ISCWP's "Beijing Roundtable on Contemporary Philosophy" workshop / symposium series, co-sponsored by Center for Comparative Philosophy & Institute of Foreign Philosophy, Peking University (host) and Center for Comparative Philosophy, San Jose State University, was a half-day workshop held at Peking University, Beijing, China, on June 22,

2012. The theme is on "Philosophical Methodology: From the Vantage Point of Comparative Philosophy". Its aim is to have an in-depth critical examination of how the vantage point and methodology of comparative philosophy can effectively serve as one general methodological approach in philosophy for the sake of development of contemporary philosophy and in view of the reflective practice of the ISCWP in the past decade since its 2002 inception.

The core participants in the workshop consist of the following colleagues:

BEHUNIAK, Jim
Colby College, USA

CHU, Zhaohua 儲昭華
Wuhan University, China

HAN, Linhe 韓林合
Peking University, China

LIN Chung-I 林從一
National Chengchi University, Taiwan, ROC

LIU, Yuedie 劉悅笛
Chinese Academy of Social Science, China

MEI, Jianhua 梅劍華
Capital Normal University, China

MOU, Bo 牟博
San Jose State University, USA

SHAW, Bill William
San Jose State University, USA

SHAW, Carolyn
University of California at Santa Cruz, USA

SUN, Wei / 孙伟
Beijing Academy of Social Sciences, China



SUN, Weimin 孫衛民

California State University at Northridge, USA

WILLMAN, Marshall

New York Institute of Technology, Nanjing
Campus

ZHANG, Xianglong 張祥龍

Peking University, China

ZHOU, Yuncheng 周允程

Tsinghua University, China

The workshop began with Xianglong Zhang's opening speech; then a précis of the "constructive-engagement" methodological strategy, as carried out in several ISCWP collective projects in the past decade, was presented by Bo Mou as the target of critical reflection. Then six presenting critics, Jim Behuniak, Linhe Han, Chung-I Lin, Weimin Sun, Marshall Willman and Xianglong Zhang, who either have their own writings on relevant methodological issues or have recently focused on the issue under examination, present their respective critical pieces, via evaluating the achievements, examining theoretic challenges, further elaborating significant methodological points, and expanding exploration in need. Each of the presenting critics' presenting sessions was followed by a critical discussion session. The workshop ended with Linhe Han's closing speech.

To help the participants be well-prepared for the workshop and have a quality discussion on scene, the speakers' presentation paper drafts and some other relevant background materials were sent to the core participants for warming-up one week ahead of time. The workshop emphasizes critical discussion on scene. The participants had in-depth engaging discussion on a series of related theoretic issues.

(Prepared by Bo Mou, July 2012)

CALL FOR PAPERS:

征稿通知

2013 TERM / WUHAN

"BEIJING ROUNDTABLE ON CONTEMPORARY
PHILOSOPHY"

2013年-武漢

北京當代哲學國際圓桌學術研討會

Theme / 討論主題

Philosophical Issues Concerning Chinese

Language and Development of

Contemporary Philosophy of Language

關於漢語的哲學問題與當代語言哲學發展

Time: Around mid-June 2013

時間：2013年6月中旬

Location: Wuhan University, Wuhan/China

地點：武漢大學, 武漢/中國

Discussion language: English and/or Chinese

學術討論語言：英文/中文

Academic Organizer: International Society for
Comparative Studies of Chinese and Western
Philosophy (ISCWP)

學術組織方：國際中西哲學比較研究學會

Host & Co-sponsor: Department of Philosophy &
Center for Comparative Philosophy,

Wuhan University, China

東道主/共同贊助方：武漢大學哲學系及
比較哲學研究中心

Co-sponsor: Center for Comparative Philosophy,
San Jose State University, USA

共同贊助方：美國加州聖荷塞州立大學
比較哲學研究中心



The 2013 Term of the ISCWP's "Beijing Roundtable on Contemporary Philosophy" workshop /symposium series is a two-day symposium on the theme "Philosophical Issues Concerning Chinese Language and Development of Contemporary Philosophy of Language", which will be held in Wuhan University, Wuhan, China, around mid-June 2013. [Note: As it has been planned before, the "Beijing Roundtable" workshop series might be held in some other locations than Beijing in case relevant conditions would allow, for this effective academic-exchange/co-operation opportunity and engaging critical-discussion forum is intended to expand its coverage instead of its prospective hosts being limited to the academic institutions in one geographic area in China (though typically still in Beijing for some substantial considerations); in this situation, the label 'Beijing Roundtable' is thus rendered symbolic and still kept for its constructive emblematic use in relevant ISCWP documents, though host parties can choose their own preferred workshop titles.]

It is known that the development of philosophy of language has played its significant role in the development of contemporary philosophy; it has also made substantial contribution to the contemporary studies of Chinese and Chinese-Western comparative philosophy, not only in those directly related areas like language, mind and logic but also in other major areas like ethics. Largely due to historical reason, reflective elaborations of relevant phenomena of natural languages in studies of philosophy of language have been typically pointed to the observation of the apparent semantic, syntactic and some other relevant phenomena of phonetic languages like English, which are supposed to be universally (at least at a deeper level) shared by all natural languages. However, in quite a few connections or cases (such as the semantic-syntactic structure of names, the way of predication, the structure of logical inference as presented in natural language,

the propositional-attitude expressions, the structure of sentences, the metaphors, ...), the apparent linguistic phenomena between a phonetic language like Greek or English and an ideographic language like Chinese are distinct and reflectively interesting; their elaborations might guide or bear on our philosophical reflections on relevant issues in distinct directions or manners.

In this symposium, we will discuss: (1) on the one hand, how reflective elaboration of some features of Chinese language can bear on the development of philosophy of language and our understanding and treatment of some language-related issues of the philosophy of language; (2), on the other hand, how relevant resources in contemporary philosophy of language can contribute to our understanding and treatment of our philosophical elaboration of reflectively interesting issues concerning Chinese language. The relevant issues include but not limited to these: the issue of semantic-syntactic structure of nouns and its related ontological issues, the issue of reference, the issue of truth [concerning the relation between language, thought and objects] as presented in Chinese classics, the issue of predication, the issue of logical inference as presented in Chinese language, the issue of propositional attitudes; the issue of the nature of language, the issue of metaphors.

As the Beijing Roundtable workshop/symposium series has emphasized in-depth critical discussion on well-prepared research fruits on the target issue, submissions are expected to address the relevant issues with well-explained and clearly-presented approaches. Papers (up to 5,000 English word equivalents in English or Chinese) together with 150-250 word abstracts (in English) may be submitted electronically (MS Word file, single-spaced) by 1st May 2013 to the review team c/o Bo Mou, ISCWP coordinator for the 2013 "Beijing Roundtable" symposium, at bo.mou@sjsu.edu. [Note: for the sake of encouraging a submission



that really needs sufficient words to present well-developed, carefully elaborated approach to the issue, it is allowed to be up to 5,000 words for the review/in-depth discussion purpose; but the author of the accepted submission needs to effectively present the essence of the material in no more than 20 minutes so that sufficient time (at least 20 minutes) can be reserved for critical discussion—for this purpose, some efficient means that have been effectively adopted by this workshop series will be suggested to the author-presenter.]

The accommodation of the speakers of the accepted papers during the symposium period will be covered by the symposium host party.

Any interested ISCP members and other interested colleagues are welcome to participate in this symposium. For further information concerning its academic coordination, contact Bo Mou; for further information concerning its host organization, contact Prof. Zhaohua Chu, the Host representative, at:

chuzhaohua80@yahoo.com.cn

Special Note:

The journal *Frontiers of Philosophy in China* (ISSN 1673-3436 / in English) plans to publish a special issue on the same topic; any interested authors are encouraged to submit your quality papers, whether or not you would plan to participate in the foregoing symposium.

ISCP PANELS AT 2012 APA Eastern Division Meeting

Panel #1: Virtue as Knowledge: Dialogues cross Traditions

Matthew D. Walker (Yale-NUS College)
“Confucian Criticisms of Aristotle’s

Intellectualism”

Yong Huang (Kutztown University)
“Virtuous Knowledge in Neo-Confucianism and the Problem of Moral Responsibility”

Bradford Cokelet (University of Miami)
“Virtue as Unprincipled Knowledge of Ethical Goodness”

Bronwyn Finnigan (Marquette University)
“The McDowell-Dreyfus Debate: Disputing the nature and function of *phronēsis*”

Panel #2: Virtue, Social Role, and Moral Cultivation: Comparative Perspectives

Sean Drysdale Walsh (University of Minnesota-Duluth)
“Mencius Plato and Aristotle’s Social Role Ethics”

Shirong Luo (Simmons College)
“Why Are Confucius’s and Aristotle’s Lists of Virtues So Far Apart?”

Mathew A. Foust (Lander University)
“Confucius and Emerson on the Virtue of Self-Reliance”

Eirik Harris (Yonsei University)
“Xunzi’s Reformation Model of Moral Cultivation and the Worry of Fanaticism”

Abstracts: Panel #1

Matthew D. Walker (Yale-NUS College)
“Confucian Criticisms of Aristotle’s Intellectualism”
Recent years have seen a blossoming interest in the comparative study of Aristotelian and Confucian ethics. While the extent to which Aristotle and Confucius are both virtue ethicists remains controversial, one point of emerging consensus is that Confucius would reject Aristotle’s intellectualism, i.e., Aristotle’s thesis that (i) the



virtuous exercise of both theoretical and practical reason is central to the best life, and that (ii) such intellectual activity is somehow required for (or specially conducive to) the most complete exercise of ethical virtue. Against (i), Confucian critics charge Aristotle with overvaluing intellectual activity at the expense of family life and ritual activity. Against (ii), Confucian critics argue that Aristotle overlooks less intellectualist modes of ethical cultivation that do not put as much emphasis on abstract theorizing of the human good. In this paper, I consider how Aristotle might respond to such worries.

Yong Huang (Kutztown University)

“Virtuous Knowledge in Neo-Confucianism and the Problem of Moral Responsibility”

In neo-Confucianism, there is a distinction between virtuous knowledge and knowledge of hearing and seeing. In contrast to the latter, which is intellectual knowledge, the former is not merely knowledge of virtue but virtuous knowledge, in the sense that anyone who acquires it will act virtuously, and anyone who does not act virtuously lacks the necessary knowledge. I have discussed the distinction between these two types of knowledge in previous publications. In this paper, I discuss the problem of moral responsibility that such a conception of virtuous knowledge seems to be inflicted with. Normally we hold a person morally responsible, in both positive and negative ways, only if the person knowingly chooses to do or not to do something. Now, on the one hand, if a person does not to act virtuously or even act viciously simply because the person lacks knowledge, then how can we hold the person responsible, as the person acts unknowingly? On the other hand, if a virtuous person always acts from their heart's desires, as Confucius does after he turns to 70, then what is the reason for us to regard such action as admirable, since (as Phillippa Foot said) we normally regard a person's action as admirable only if the person does

something difficult, while the virtuous person does virtuous things effortlessly. I attempt to provide a neo-Confucian account for both in this paper.

Bradford Cokelet (University of Miami)

“Virtue as Unprincipled Knowledge of Ethical Goodness”

To make sense of the claim that virtue is knowledge, one must explain why less than virtuous agents lack full-blown knowledge of what is good or bad. Moreover, one must specify the specific kind of value or goodness that the virtuous grasp in a knowledgeable way. Options here include the kinds of goodness referred to in claims about the apparent goodness of intentional actions, claims about what is good or bad for agents, and claims about what is good or bad in a moral or ethical sense. After discussing the differences between these deliberative, eudaimonistic, and ethical kinds of goodness, I argue that the doctrine that virtue is knowledge is most plausibly understood as a claim about the virtuous agent's knowledge of what is good or bad in an ethical sense. In addition, I show how this interpretation of the claim that virtue is knowledge can help us (i) clarify what separates Kantians and virtue ethicists and (ii) advance recent debates about whether Confucianism and Buddhism should be understood as forms of virtue ethics.

Bronwyn Finnigan (Marquette University)

“The McDowell-Dreyfus Debate: Disputing the nature and function of *phronēsis*”

Current work in virtue ethics emphasizes the possibility and merit of virtuous actions being performed spontaneously and directly without recourse to conscious activities of deliberation and choice. A similar emphasis can be found in some Eastern philosophical traditions as well as recent work in phenomenology inspired by Heideggerian traditions of thought. Comparative work on this issue tends to converge on the idea that the possibility of non-deliberatively virtuous action can be explained by the engagement of *phronēsis*



(practical wisdom or the practical intellect) or its functional correlate in some Eastern theory of mind. There is little consensus, however, on how best to analyse the nature and function of *phronēsis*. In this paper, I will examine a recent debate between Hubert Dreyfus and John McDowell that is concerned with this issue and that is gaining much critical attention. While this dispute does not settle exegetical questions regarding the proper interpretation of *phronēsis*, it helpfully illuminates certain conditions that need to be satisfied by an adequate account of *phronēsis* qua perceptual capacity that enables non-deliberative modes of appropriate engagement. I shall analyse the conditions proposed in this dispute and provide arguments in support of those that I believe must be satisfied for an adequate explanation of such a capacity. I shall conclude by providing reasons for thinking that, in the final analysis, adherents of at least one prominent school of Buddhist thought would find Dreyfus' position more compelling.

Abstracts: Panel #2

Sean Drysdale Walsh

"Mencius Plato and Aristotle's Social Role Ethics"

Mencius has been understood to be a type of role ethicist, but Plato and Aristotle are generally not. Mencius speaks of being a true parent, son, minister, and king (ruler). These are social roles that have their own moral excellences. I will argue that Plato and Aristotle have something like Mencius' role ethics. In the *Republic*, Plato speaks of the moral excellence in the social roles that seeks the good of others in the life of the true physician, ruler, ship's captain, horse breeder, and shepherd. Aristotle speaks of social roles of the true politician (ruler), physician, parent, and friend. Plato and Aristotle speak of social roles within and sacrificing for the wellbeing of the whole, just polis. I will argue that playing those roles well is the goal of a good human as such. For Aristotle, human activity is

best when shared in relationships and social roles. Aristotle's famous "function argument" is itself a social role argument, in which if one is an X, one's function is to be a good X. So, if one is a friend, one's function is to be a good friend. I will argue, using Peter Geach's account in "Good and Evil," that Mencius, Plato, and Aristotle are using a similar conceptual frameworks for grounding the normativity of social roles. Geach argues that "good" is both descriptive and normative, in that by understanding what it is to be an X, we can understand what it is to be a good X. I will argue Mencius, Plato, and Aristotle are using social role terms this Geachean way. For them, humans as such cannot and should not (descriptively or normatively) escape those social roles, and thus that human ethics as such is social role ethics.

Shirong Luo

"Why Are Confucius's and Aristotle's Lists of Virtues So Far Apart?"

Nowhere do the contrasts between the virtue ethics of Confucius and Aristotle manifest themselves more starkly than in the kinds of virtues the two thinkers recommend. The moral virtues that Aristotle discusses at length in his *Nicomachean Ethics* are justice, friendship, courage, and temperance. By contrast, Confucius teaches in the *Analects* five important virtues: respect, tolerance, trustworthiness, diligence, and generosity. Although this list of five virtues is not Confucius's only enumeration, to concentrate on the issue at hand, let's suppose it is. As we can see, the two lists do not seem to overlap. The question then arises as to why they are so far apart. It may be tempting to explain the contrast in terms of the degrees of complexity of a virtue: having more than one dimension/aspect, some virtues seem more complex than others. A good example is Confucius's *ren*, a virtue so complex that it is often called the "all-encompassing" virtue with multiple constituents. In fact, Confucius subsumes all the aforementioned virtues under *ren*. Aristotle's friendship also seems to fall into the category of



multi-dimensional virtues. Some might argue therefore that despite their apparent dissimilarities, if we analyze Aristotle's virtue of friendship into its constituents, we may find trustworthiness, respect, tolerance, etc. While such an explanation seems have a certain plausibility to it, I submit that there may be better alternatives one of which I will defend by introducing the notion of pertinence of virtue. The idea is that virtues taught by Confucius and Aristotle have certain conditions attached to them, which we tend to overlook. In the case of Confucius, one such condition is their pertinence to certain kinds of people in his society. If we examine with care many remarks made by or attributed to Confucius, we can see that the virtues he talks about seem more relevant to political leaders of his time, either incumbents or aspirants, than to others. Another condition attached to Confucian virtues is their pertinence to the kind of society in which Confucius lived than to other types of societies, e.g. the one in which Aristotle lived. While the approach relying on the idea of complexity of virtue seems to narrow the distance between the two lists, my approach acknowledges their differences and attempts to bring to light the often overlooked but crucial aspects of those virtues by introducing the concept of pertinence of virtue.

Mathew A. Foust

"Confucius and Emerson on the Virtue of Self-Reliance"

Records from the Boston Athenaeum show that R.W. Emerson borrowed Joshua Marshman's *The Works of Confucius: Containing the Original Text with a Translation* from February 16–March 1, 1836. Excerpts from Emerson's Journals written days later reveal the deep impression that Confucius made on Emerson, with dozens of "Sentences of Confucius" quoted. In 1843, upon further contact with Confucius via a complete translation of *The Four Books of Chinese classics*, Emerson again quotes Confucius prolifically and

professes his admiration of the great sage.

Despite this clear connection little attention has been paid to the Confucian influence upon Emerson's thought. The attention that has been paid to this influence has tended to focus on metaphysics (e.g., Li-jen Chen's "The Concept of Heaven in Confucianism and Emerson's Transcendentalism" [Intergrams, 2003]). In this presentation, I argue that Emerson's ethical thought carries a deep affinity with that of Confucius, focusing on the virtue of self-reliance for which Emerson is well known – and which Confucius, too, emphasized as vital to the self-cultivation of the junzi (gentleman, excellent person). While it is true that relationships are crucial to Confucian ethics, the importance of xin (integrity) and yi (righteousness) indicate a need for the quality of character which I interpret as embodied in Emerson's notion of self-reliance.

This presentation adds to the growing body of comparative philosophical scholarship on Confucianism and American philosophy (e.g., the work of Roger Ames, Sor-Hoon Tan, Joseph Grange, Jessica Ching-Sze Wang, and the forthcoming June 2012 issue of *Journal of Chinese Philosophy* dedicated to the theme, "Chinese and American Philosophies: New Comparisons"). It would be a logical inclusion in a panel devoted to this area, or to a panel dealing with virtue(s).

Eirik Harris

"Xunzi's Reformation Model of Moral Cultivation and the Worry of Fanaticism"

Xunzi is well known for what others have called a re-formation model of moral cultivation. This model includes among its preliminary steps, acting in accordance with virtue for prudential reasons. However, it importantly necessitates a stage where the focus of action shifts from prudential reasons to acting from virtue due to its intrinsic value. A recognition of this shift is not merely seen in Xunzi but is, rather, investigated in the Western tradition as well, by MacIntyre, among others. However, there is a worry that an analogous shift is exactly



what turns individuals into fanatics. That is, there are instances in which the shift from acting in a particular way due to its prudential benefits to acting in a particular way because it is seen to be intrinsically valuable, is a component of what makes a fanatic a fanatic. If this is the case, then unless we can provide principled reasons for differentiating a fanatic from a virtuous individual, then Xunzi's virtue-based ethical and political theories will be much less viable and attractive. As such, I here analyze whether Xunzi has the resources to meet this challenge to his virtue theory, allowing us to distinguish between the fanatic and the virtuous individual.

Call for Papers or Panels APA PACIFIC DIVISION 2013

The International Society for Comparative Studies of Chinese and Western Philosophy (ISCWP) plans to sponsor one or two panels at next year's Pacific Division Meeting of APA, which will be held in San Francisco, March 27-31, 2013. We hereby invite submissions.

Our Goal: We would like to encourage submissions of individual papers that are comparative, as well as panels which combine philosophers working primarily in Chinese traditions with those working primarily in Western traditions, aimed at promoting more in-depth engagement between the two groups. We have not stipulated any specific themes for the panels, but would welcome suggestions. *We have not stipulated any specific themes for the panels, but the Board might organize a panel on "The Idea of Justice: Dialogues cross Traditions." We especially welcome paper proposals on this topic.*

Eligibility: We continue to welcome non-ISCWP

members to propose papers to be included on an ISCWP-sponsored panel, or even propose a panel that is related to the ISCWP's aims, so please feel free to send this notice to philosophers who might be interested even if they are not ISCWP members yet.

Please send all submissions by **September 15, 2012**.

1. To submit a **paper proposal**, please provide a 250-300 word abstract. The abstract needs to include the presenter's name, institutional affiliation, paper title, and email address.

2. To submit a **panel proposal**, please provide an overall abstract of the panel topic of 250-300 words, including due justification. It must include the following for each chair, speaker, and commentator on your panel:

- name as it is to appear in print
- affiliation
- email address
- paper title (for presenters)

3. You may submit a partial panel proposal – the earlier the better – and ask for help in filling it out. We may help build panels based on partial panel proposals received early in the process.

4. Announcement of papers and/or panels selected for presentation will be made by late October.

5. Address all submissions and inquiries to:

Yang Xiao

xiaoy@kenyon.edu

Dues and Donations





ISCWP's dues are voluntary but much needed. The suggested contribution is \$20 for regular members and \$5 for student members. Larger contributions are welcome. Regular contributions of dues are crucial if we are to maintain the impressive momentum the Society has built heretofore.

As you can see from the events reported in this newsletter, the Society has managed to use its modest budget to great effect, having sponsored some of the most high-profile events in comparative philosophy.

The Society stands out in having cross-regional philosophical exchange as its basic mission, and in pursuing this with great success.

If you wish to support this distinctive mission we hope you will contribute. Donations from academic centers and foundations are also welcome.

We offer two ways of contributing dues:

By check

Please make your check payable to ISCWP and send it to the following address:

Prof. Hagop Sarkissian
Department of Philosophy
City University of New York, Baruch College
Box B5/295
One Bernard Baruch Way
New York, NY 10010
United States

On-line (preferred):

For the convenience of our members, we have established a Paypal account, which enables members to contribute dues by credit card. To use this method, please go to the Home page of ISCWP's website and click the "donate" button. ISCWP's Home page can be found at

<http://sangle.web.wesleyan.edu/iscwp/index.html>
or simply by Googling "ISCWP Homepage."

Many thanks,
Hagop Sarkissian
Secretary-Treasurer