

Comparative Philosophy Volume 3, No. 1 (2012): 1-2
Open Access / ISSN 2151-6014
www.comparativephilosophy.org

EDITOR'S WORDS

The current issue consists of three types of articles. They respectively address and illustrate three major concerns of comparative philosophy, as understood in a philosophically interesting and engaging way, and thus present three major types of coverage of the journal *Comparative Philosophy*.

The first type, as attended to in the first article “How is this Paper Philosophy?” by Kristie Dotson, addresses the fundamental meta-methodological/meta-philosophical issue of how cross-tradition constructive engagement between distinct approaches from different traditions is possible (in other words, it tackles a general theory and methodology of comparative philosophy). Though such a concern is also involved (more or less) in various areas of philosophy, comparative philosophy is especially and intrinsically concerned with the issue, as discussions on the topic explore the foundation and rationale that undergird and guide the second and third types of explorations in comparative philosophy to be indicated below. Dotson’s article addresses a series of principal issues concerning the identity and nature of philosophy and its methodology; the author challenges what she calls ‘a culture of justification’ in professional philosophy while arguing for the case of “culture of praxis”. Though the members of our review team disagree to some of the claims presented in the article, we render the paper philosophically interesting and engaging, and we recommend that the voice of this paper be heard. Indeed, it is part of the constructive-engagement emphasis and expectation of the journal that a highly provocative but philosophically engaging paper like this is to arouse healthy discussion in the field.

The second type addresses the issue of how distinct approaches from different (culture/region-associated or style/orientation-associated) philosophical traditions can learn from and constructively engage with each other to make joint contribution to a series of issues and topics in philosophy, and all for the sake of the development of contemporary philosophy. This is the central point of the special topic section in this issue, “Dharmakīrti’s Buddhist Philosophy and Contemporary Philosophy”, which includes two articles, “Dharmakīrti, Davidson, and Knowing Reality” by Lajos Brons and “How to Avoid Solipsism While Remaining Idealist: Lessons from Berkeley and Dharmakīrti” by Jeremy Henkel. Both articles are neither out of purely historical interest nor merely engage in intellectual games for their own sake; rather, they are intended to explore how a significant thinker in Buddhist philosophical tradition, Dharmakīrti, and two important thinkers in the Western philosophical tradition, respectively Donald Davidson in contemporary philosophy and George Berkeley of modern philosophy, can make their joint contributions to the development of

contemporary philosophy in such important areas as metaphysics, epistemology, philosophy of language, philosophy of mind, etc. The contents of the articles are thus intrinsically relevant to the philosophical interest of whoever explores the related issues in these areas, no matter which philosophical tradition he/she focuses on.

The third type addresses the concern of how, in the setting of one cultural and philosophical tradition, relevant resources from some other tradition(s), through their philosophical interpretation via relevant (philosophical or other intellectual) resources of the home tradition, can contribute to the development of contemporary society, which includes other intellectual, professional or social areas/parts than philosophy (as one academic discipline). Surely the philosophical enterprise as a whole is not limited to pure theoretic explorations only but also consists of their interaction with contemporary society (including their impact on, and their enrichment from, social development). This is one connection in which comparative philosophy is also especially valuable as it can play its distinct role in constructively bringing in relevant resources and distinct visions from other traditions through philosophical interpretation. The last article, “Benevolent Government Now” by Howard Curser, attends to this concern through the author’s creative interpretation and application of relevant resources from Mencius’ Confucian account in classical Chinese philosophy to explore how his resources of benevolent government can contribute to the current debate between American liberals and conservatives on governmental responsibilities and duties.

Indeed, the foregoing three types of coverage of this issue, specifically speaking, and of this journal and the constructive-engagement emphasis in comparative philosophy, generally speaking, have been highlighted concisely in the opening statement found on the journal’s website: this journal goes “with emphasis on the constructive engagement of distinct approaches to philosophical issues, problems, themes from different philosophical traditions (generally covering both culture/region-associated and style/orientation-associated philosophical traditions), for the sake of their joint contribution to the common philosophical enterprise and the development of contemporary society, and on general theory and methodology of comparative philosophy.”

Bo Mou
January 2012