

APA Newsletters

NEWSLETTER ON ASIAN AND ASIAN-AMERICAN
PHILOSOPHERS AND PHILOSOPHY

Volume 11, Number 1

Fall 2011

FROM THE EDITOR, DAVID H. KIM

ARTICLES

A. MINH NGUYEN

“Teaching Chinese Philosophy: A Survey of the Field”

FALGUNI A. SHETH

“Report on ‘(Mis)Recognition: Race, Emotion, Embodiment’ Panel”





Asian and Asian-American Philosophers and Philosophies

David H. Kim, Editor

Fall 2011

Volume 11, Number 1

FROM THE EDITOR

David H. Kim

University of San Francisco

The value of Chinese Philosophy—not to mention Asian Philosophy generally—warrants much greater recognition in the profession than it currently receives. The teaching of Chinese philosophy, then, is a significant matter, and this edition of the *Newsletter* begins with an important service to the profession, a survey article by Professor Minh Nguyen on current teaching of Chinese Philosophy in various parts of the world and in North America particularly. From May 2009 to December 2010, Professor Nguyen distributed and processed questionnaires on the nature, challenges, and rewards of teaching Chinese Philosophy. The results are organized and presented here. I would like to thank Professor Nguyen for giving us much to consider.

At the 2010 Eastern Division Meeting of the APA, the Committee on Asian and Asian American Philosophers and Philosophies sponsored two panels: 1) “The Philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi” and 2) “(Mis)Recognition: Race, Emotion, Embodiment.” A report on the first of these has been offered by Minh Nguyen and Josef Velazquez in the previous *APA Newsletter* (vol. 10, no. 2, Spring 2011). In this edition of the *Newsletter*, a brief report is given on the second panel, the theme of which is especially salient to our current condition in which various peoples of Asian, Middle Eastern, or Muslim backgrounds face special obstacles to social inclusion in the U.S. and elsewhere. Thanks go to Falguni Sheth for the report.

Finally, since the members of this committee serve terms that begin in July of a given year, this *Newsletter* offers an opportunity to acknowledge changes in committee membership. I am honored to begin my term as Chair of this committee. Having been Associate Chair over this last year, I have watched our outgoing Chair, Gary Mar, expertly fulfill his role, and it gives me great pleasure to thank Gary for his wonderful leadership over the last three years. Also rotating off of the committee are Bo Mou and Minh Nguyen. I would like to thank them on behalf of the committee for their excellent service to the profession. Much appreciated, Bo and Minh! Lastly, I would like to extend a warm welcome to two new members, Professor Halla Kim and Professor JeeLoo Liu.

Halla Kim is an Associate Professor in the Department of Philosophy and Religion at the University of Nebraska at Omaha, with an emphasis in German Idealism and East Asian philosophy. He is also a coordinator for the East Asian Study Group on campus. His main research interests are traditional Korean philosophy and contemporary Japanese philosophy. He is co-authoring “Introduction to Korean Philosophy,” a primer

on this philosophical tradition in progress (with Professor Bang at Kyungpook National University, South Korea) and translating Chong, Yak-Yong (丁若鏞)’s “Four Commentaries on Yi-Jing” (周易四箋) (also with Professor Bang).

JeeLoo Liu is Associate Professor of Philosophy at CSU Fullerton and President of the Association of Chinese Philosophers in America (ACPA). Her research interests are Chinese Philosophy and Philosophy of Mind. She is the author of *An Introduction to Chinese Philosophy: From Ancient Philosophy to Chinese Buddhism* (Blackwell, 2006) and co-editor, with John Perry, of *Consciousness and the Self* (Cambridge University Press, December 2011). Currently, she is working on a monograph on Neo-Confucianism, tentatively entitled *Metaphysics, Morality, and Mind: An Analytic Reconstruction of Neo-Confucianism*. Recently, in July 2010, Professor Liu co-organized a conference in Beijing, China on Chinese metaphysics and epistemology with Renmin University (in China) in July 2010. She is also a member of the advisory board of the John Templeton Foundation.

Welcome aboard, Halla and JeeLoo!

ARTICLES

Teaching Chinese Philosophy: A Survey of the Field

A. Minh Nguyen

Eastern Kentucky University

Introduction

What are the challenges that instructors face in teaching Chinese philosophy to Western students? How are they to be overcome? How can we integrate Chinese thought into our philosophy curriculum to make it more inclusive? One potentially valuable source of insight into these matters is the opinions of those who have taught Chinese philosophy to Western students. From May 2009 to December 2010, I asked instructors of Chinese philosophy from all over the world to complete an anonymous questionnaire that contained ten open-ended questions. Eighty-three such instructors, mostly from North America, responded.

The aim of this paper is to share the data collected and highlight certain results. We shall discuss the lessons that can be drawn from them at another time.¹ The questionnaire attempts to elicit responses to the following questions:

- 1) What are the challenges that you have faced in teaching Chinese philosophy to Western students? Please be specific and detailed.
-

- 2) With respect to the challenges that you have succeeded in overcoming, how did you do it? Please specify any teaching techniques (active learning, group work, role playing, etc.) and/or classroom strategies (problem solving, case studies, background reports, etc.) that worked for you.
- 3) With respect to the challenges that you have yet to overcome, why do they seem so intractable?
- 4) In “How to Add Chinese Philosophy to Your Introductory Course,” Bryan W. Van Norden writes:

But instead of either Confucius or Laozi [or Zhuangzi (Chuang Tzu) or Han Feizi (Han Fei Tzu)], I recommend five philosophers for your introductory classes: Mozi (Mo Tzu), an agent-neutral consequentialist, Yang Zhu (Yang Chu), an egoist, Mengzi (Mencius), a Confucian virtue ethicist, Gongsun Longzi (Kung-sun Lung Tzu), the author of a sophistical dialogue, and Xunzi (Hsun Tzu), a Confucian virtue ethicist who was a critic of Mengzi.²

In the context of this essay, “introductory course” and “introductory class” refer to introductory course and introductory class in philosophy that do not focus on Chinese thought. Do you agree with Van Norden? Why or why not?

- 5) Assuming that Van Norden is right, what is it about the work of Confucius, Laozi, Zhuangzi (Chuang Tzu), or Han Feizi (Han Fei Tzu) that makes the task of teaching it to Western students so challenging?
- 6) If you are to teach an undergraduate course introducing Chinese philosophy to Western students, what will be the course objectives? What will be the student learning outcomes? (Course objectives correspond to what the instructor will do in the course. Student learning outcomes correspond to what successful students will learn in the course.)
- 7) Would you recommend any instructional materials (books, software, Web-based resources, etc.) for an undergraduate course introducing Chinese philosophy to Western students?
- 8) What are the rewards of teaching Chinese philosophy for you? And for your department?

- 9) What are the rewards of learning Chinese philosophy for you? And for your students?
- 10) Would you recommend any research (books, articles, reports, etc.) on any of the subjects that we have covered, especially research on the challenges of teaching Chinese philosophy to Western students?

Why the Survey?

The survey is administered to gauge how instructors are doing in teaching Chinese philosophy to Western students. From a sociological and pedagogical point of view, it is fruitful to explore the challenges, if any, that they face and how such challenges can be overcome. Potential survey participants are asked to describe any teaching techniques, classroom strategies, and/or instructional materials that work for them and their students. I also attempt to collect hard data about the benefits of teaching and learning Chinese philosophy. While this study is not intended as a contribution to first-order philosophy of any sort, the results it delivers may prove beneficial not only to those interested in assessing sweeping sociological claims about teaching Chinese thought, but also to all of its practitioners who wish to improve their instruction regardless of whether they are affiliated with a philosophy, religion, history, literature, or East Asian studies program.

Population and Sample

The target population consists of professional philosophers and other academics who teach Chinese philosophy to Western students. I won't attempt to break down results by different categories of survey respondents—for instance, those with a Ph.D. in philosophy (the predominant group); graduate students in philosophy; those with a Ph.D. in another field such as religion, history, literature, or East Asian studies; graduate students in such a field; etc.

From May 2009 to December 2010, I emailed invitations to 488 people from all over the world for whom I had evidence for thinking that they had taught Chinese philosophy to Western students (e.g., actual syllabi of courses in Chinese philosophy). Eighty-three people completed and returned their copies of the questionnaire. The response rate is thus 17.0%.

Below are statistics about the survey respondents' countries of current residence.

Country of Residence	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Australia	1	1.2
Belgium	2	2.4
Canada	5	6.0
China ³	7	8.4
Germany	1	1.2
Ireland	2	2.4
Israel	1	1.2
Italy	1	1.2
New Zealand	1	1.2
Taiwan	1	1.2
United States	61	73.5

Limitations of the Study

There are three limitations that need to be acknowledged and addressed regarding the present study. First, the total number of survey respondents is not especially large. Second, the sample is more like a convenience sample than a random sample. I did not use, nor could I find, any selection method that ensures that each member of the population has an equal chance of being chosen, and the response rate among those chosen is low. Third, since 73.5% of the survey respondents are currently living in the United States, 79.5% of them in North America (specifically, Canada and the United States), and 84.3% of them in the English-speaking world (specifically, Australia, Canada, Ireland, New Zealand, and the United States), the survey suffers from undercoverage and provides at best only a snapshot of the state of teaching Chinese philosophy in the United States, in North America, and in the English-speaking world, respectively.

Highlights

Below are highlights of the survey results, with participants' detailed answers to each survey question following.

- 68.7% of the survey respondents say they have faced challenges in teaching Chinese philosophy to Western students.
 - 24.1% of the survey respondents say they have faced no such challenges.
 - 7.2% of the survey respondents fail to answer Question #1.
 - 16.9% of the survey respondents agree with Bryan W. Van Norden's recommendation concerning how to add Chinese philosophy to one's introductory course.
 - 56.5% of the survey respondents disagree.
 - 13.3% of the survey respondents neither agree nor disagree.
 - 13.3% of the survey respondents fail to answer Question #4.
 - 22.9% of the survey respondents recommend Wing-Tsit Chan, trans., *A Source Book in Chinese Philosophy* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1969); and Philip J. Ivanhoe and Bryan W. Van Norden, eds., *Readings in Classical Chinese Philosophy*, 2nd ed. (Indianapolis, IN: Hackett, 2006).
 - 9.6% of the survey respondents recommend Angus C. Graham, *Disputers of the Tao: Philosophical Argument in Ancient China* (LaSalle, IL: Open Court, 1989).
 - 8.4% of the survey respondents recommend Roger T. Ames and Henry Rosemont, Jr., trans., *The Analects of Confucius: A Philosophical Translation* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1998); Yu-Lan Fung, *A Short History of Chinese Philosophy*, ed. Derk Bodde (New York: Free Press, 1997); and Burton Watson, trans., *Chuang Tzu: Basic Writings* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996).
 - The above are the top 6 most recommended books.
- Most students come in with virtually no background, which seems to work fine. They need some help figuring out how to make sense of Romanization systems, dealing with the sometimes bewildering number of names (often referring to the same person), and getting enough historical context so they can best understand what is really at stake in the writings of the Chinese masters. But in general, I would not say there are any huge barriers to entry. One issue that very occasionally comes up: a student who arrives convinced that Chinese philosophy is all "mystical" or "spiritual," that Chinese philosophers "are not bothered by contradictions," and so on. In most cases, an intensive encounter with the texts helps to broaden their understanding, but sometimes this can be a stumbling block. One other kind of challenge: when I don't want to start from the beginning, such as when I am teaching a comparative course, a more advanced course, or a course in Neo-Confucianism or in modern Chinese philosophy. If I simply require having taken (e.g.) classical Chinese philosophy, that may keep out excellent and interested students. What to do? My solution, "Chinese philosophy boot camp," is described below.
 - The primary sources (*The Analects*, *Zhuangzi*, *Tao Te Ching*, etc., in translation) are sometimes difficult for the students to read and get the philosophical meanings from them. I had to prepare many handouts, to make things clear.
 - The biggest challenge I have faced, since in my teaching of early Chinese philosophy I emphasize correlative cosmology and the co-constitution of personhood, is to get young Western students to appreciate these issues. Young Western students tend to be sold on the Western ideals of individualism and the value of individuated selfhood and often have very different feelings about family relationships and social norms than classical Chinese philosophers. They tend to like Daoism more because they feel somehow that, in its critique of Confucian norms, Daoism is more affirming of individualism. They often note in class discussions and essays that, even though they can see how ancient Chinese thought offers some fine ideals, Westerners just won't live by or realize these ideals, so it's not so important to know these Chinese materials in their lives. Students tend to confuse modern practices with normative ideals, and this poses real challenges to anyone trying to show what valuable resources the Chinese tradition has for seeing social and natural life differently.
 - My greatest challenge, beyond that of introducing most American students to an entirely new philosophical and cultural tradition, has been twofold. First, I have found that my classes are of such a mixed level of preparation that I sometimes despair of meeting the needs of the class. By this I mean that in very few cases I have students who have training in Chinese history or East Asian studies. I sometimes also have some philosophy students who, even though they are encountering Chinese philosophy for the first time, do have a level of familiarity with Western philosophy, i.e., they are capable of reading philosophical texts. But then I always have a wonderful mix of students of the School of Management to Fine Arts and Communications—and the College of Arts and Sciences. I always worry that I will bore some students by presenting material at too simple a level or, at the other end, completely confusing students who have never studied anything about either philosophy or East Asian studies. Second, I have found it very difficult to find a good introductory textbook for the undergraduates. Recently I have been using Karyn Lai's *An Introduction to*

Question #1: *What are the challenges that you have faced in teaching Chinese philosophy to Western students? Please be specific and detailed.*

The following are answers from survey respondents⁴:

- In my teaching I emphasize explaining and evaluating arguments. There are no obvious arguments in some of the major texts in Chinese philosophy.

Chinese Philosophy (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008) and have found it excellent along with various anthologies of primary sources in translation (Ivanhoe and Van Norden, and Wing-Tsit Chan, for example).

- I've noticed that the more students have been "indoctrinated" into the Western philosophical tradition, the less likely they are to easily immerse themselves in early Chinese texts. The obstacle seems to be that they are looking for familiar tropes but are unable to find them. It's as if philosophical training debilitates students from thinking any other way but through strict propositional logic and static reified concepts that promise to lead to absolute truth.
- I suppose a big challenge is that it is hard to teach students the Chinese philosophical terms in English. For example, 禮、理、利、李 can all be translated as *li*. Obviously, students without any Chinese language background will easily be confused about them. And I usually need to spend time to teach them Chinese history and culture, as they have no background on that.
- I am retired after 35 years of teaching including Chinese philosophy. I have enjoyed teaching Chinese philosophy very much and with little challenge.
- Many students have a one-dimensional view of Chinese philosophy and equate it with mysticism, so it takes some work to highlight the diversity and complexity of views found in Chinese philosophy.
- One, their expectations and our approach. Two, the mixed audience: philosophy students without knowledge of China and sinology students with little knowledge of philosophy.
- Students often don't have a background in Western philosophy so comparisons can be difficult for them. Coming from a monotheistic culture, they also have a difficult time understanding how East Asians can embrace several different belief systems.
- There's no "challenge." They love it, and so do I.
- First off, while I do teach Chinese philosophy, I do so in the context of my Chinese history class. Consequently, my approach is probably different from those who are in philosophy departments. That being said, I'm sure we encounter a similar problem: unfamiliarity with the basic concepts. However, this can also be liberating since many students don't have intellectual baggage attached to those concepts. My specific problem is teaching to students who are primarily conservative Christians. There is a great deal of skepticism, if not outright hostility, to other religions among some members of the student body.
- My only real challenge has been the lack of reliable translations. The solution has been to write my own and distribute them to students as course notes. I myself have never had much trouble getting students to engage with the material. I think one just needs to present it in philosophically stimulating ways, with links to concerns the students can understand.
- The main challenge has to do with a lack of awareness about the subject beyond the standard stereotypes. Students, and to some extent faculty, remain blissfully ignorant of the intellectual history of non-Western traditions. There is always a market for these courses among students, however. And I find no resistance among faculty. So, this hardly counts as a challenge.
- Sufficiently distancing my students from their preconceptions of Asian thought, thanks to American culture. "Defamiliarizing" them from what they think they know has helped.
- A major challenge is dealing with the lack of preparation of most students in basic ideas in Western civilization or in an introductory philosophy course. This makes it difficult to draw comparisons between Chinese and Western thought. Many students are also intimidated by names and terms, which is made doubly worse by the use of different systems of Romanization in books such as those by Wing-Tsit Chan and Fung Yu-Lan, as compared with articles in journals like *Philosophy East and West*.
- My major challenge has been wrestling with imprecise English translations and explaining to students with no Chinese what is at stake in the various decisions that translators make. Another challenge has been to remind students that they are dealing with texts from a vastly different time and place.
- To be honest, it's only philosophers who emphasize "the challenges" of teaching Chinese philosophy; everyone else thinks of it as a subject that's not more or less inherently difficult than any other. In my view, this is because professional philosophers have an involuted conception of their discipline, and have difficulty coming to terms with philosophical discourse that does not begin with the same assumptions as their own. In fact, the teachers may be dealing with more challenges than the students, to whom disciplinary shibboleths do not mean very much.
- Primarily to interest young American students in a culture with which they have no familiarity.
- It is not more challenging to teach Chinese philosophy than Western philosophy to Western students, as the courses are normally elective, and those students who choose to take the courses are normally better students, with interest in knowing about other cultures. Since the textbooks used are in English translation, and so some special efforts need to be made (for example, discuss the various meanings in general and particular meanings in the context of the original Chinese characters) so that students will not use Chinese philosophical terms in the way these terms are meant in Western philosophy.
- Initially I worried too much about arguing for the importance of the subject matter to the students. After the Olympics in China, I stopped worrying about this and realized it was not an issue to begin with.
- A large number of students at my institution come from a very strong Christian background, and they have a tendency to assimilate Chinese views (and especially those elements of them that are more religious in character) to Christian views while overlooking or downplaying the aspects of Chinese thought that are quite unlike Christianity. So, I frequently have to struggle against this tendency and try to get them to see that the Chinese views are *not* just the same as their own, while also avoiding going to the other extreme and having them think that the two are totally unlike.
- Mostly just the difficulty of explaining concepts to students that are different from those they have learned growing up.
- There are some rudimentary challenges, like pronunciation of terms, names, and texts that impede classroom discussion somewhat; students tend to be intimidated. Aside from that, the less-than-systematic nature of the texts provides a serious challenge, even with otherwise well-trained philosophy students.

- For the most part, the challenges are similar to teaching any tradition of philosophy: primarily, how does one motivate interest in the topics and generate an appreciation for philosophical method? In the case of China, there is often a bit more challenge in regard to finding reliable translations for some thinkers and providing the needed historical and cultural background.
- The real challenge is just teaching philosophy to undergraduates. Chinese philosophy poses no special problems in this regard.
- (1) There is a language barrier. It is difficult to convey nuances of meaning for important Chinese terms (e.g., “dao”). (2) There is a shared background barrier. Students tend to look for issues that they can relate to, and these tend not to coincide with issues that Chinese thinkers find interesting. The examples that Chinese thinkers give tend to fall on deaf ears or be misinterpreted. (3) There is prejudice. Students sometimes are too willing to settle on interpretations/understandings according to which Chinese philosophy is silly, stupid, confused, ridiculous, and so on. I suspect this is fueled by popular stereotypes.
- The main issue is convincing Western-trained professors of philosophy that thinkers in the school of Confucianism or Neo-Confucianism qualify as philosophers as defined in Europe. Without that position made clear, hiring a specialist in Chinese philosophy may well seem a risk to them.
- I am not sure that there are unique challenges in teaching Chinese philosophy to Western students that aren’t shared with teaching, for instance, ancient philosophy to modern students, or any philosophy to non- or not-yet-philosophical students. In each of these cases, the challenge is to get them to see the material as relevant to their lives.
- The major challenges include the fact that most students will be unfamiliar with the intellectual contexts of Asian philosophies, and will be looking for features familiar to them.
- (a) Teaching students how to work with translations of the texts. (b) Explaining to students the openness of the texts to interpretation. (c) Introducing a conceptual framework that is more empirical and pragmatic (many of my students have encountered Western philosophy and are familiar with the methods and styles of thinking therein).
- Not having a good textbook. Students do not have enough knowledge about China and need to spend a lot of time on preliminaries.
- Two challenges I have faced: (1) Students’ stereotypical understanding of what philosophy is—particularly what analytic philosophy is—and using it to judge Chinese philosophy, accusing Chinese philosophy as not argumentative (e.g., the *Analect*s and the *Daodejing*) and as mystical (e.g., the *Daodejing* and the *Zhuangzi*). Many Western philosophers’ (biased or wrong) opinions about Chinese philosophy have somewhat swayed students’ impression about Chinese philosophy. (2) Current books or textbooks on Chinese philosophy are either too specialized for beginners, or too superficial, so they are not very helpful to students in their struggle with the primary texts. (I am working on a guide to Asian philosophy text that is different from what is on the market, and I am close to the completion of it.)
- The challenges are several. (1) The supposition on the part of students that Chinese philosophers aren’t real philosophers; they do not do analytical philosophy, don’t make arguments and the like. (2) Lack of familiarity with Chinese philosophers’ names, concepts, historical settings. It is still the case that American college students have virtually no knowledge of China that stretches back beyond 10 years at most. (3) We typically have only one course devoted exclusively to Chinese philosophy, or in its most narrow form “Confucianism and Daoism.” Even so, this is too vast a terrain to cover in one course. Most philosophy programs have at least 3 history-of-philosophy surveys covering Western philosophy: Pre-Socratics to Aquinas, Aquinas to Hegel, Hegel to Present (or some such). This shows how woefully deficient the coverage of Chinese philosophy is.
- A major problem is that students usually can’t read Chinese, that many translations are not very reliable, and that the secondary literature is often too sinological and philosophically not very useful.
- Lack of any context in which to put the information. Buddhism, Taoism, and Confucianism are very different ways of looking at the world than the Christian approach. Not offending Christian students who want to impose their views on the class and yet getting them to consider the ideas I am presenting.
- It depends on the level of the class. For an introductory level course, I don’t find it more difficult than an introduction to Western philosophy, and most of the challenges are the same (how to balance breadth and depth, etc.). Students tend to be more interested than in Western philosophy, but also to have an uncritical enthusiasm, so the biggest challenge is getting them to be more critical in thinking about the texts. For upper level courses (for philosophy majors), the biggest challenges are connecting the course to problems the students are interested in from Western philosophy and drawing sophisticated philosophical positions from texts that are usually fragmentary and not very explicit in their arguments. For graduate level courses, the problems are the same, but it is perhaps more difficult to engage the philosophical issues they are interested in (their interests tend to be more determinate than those of the undergraduates) and it is difficult to teach a graduate level course to students with no background in Chinese culture. On all levels, one challenge is the inadequacy of even the best translations. For upper level and graduate level courses, the biggest challenge is to connect the texts to the interests of the students without just imposing Western philosophy onto the texts.
- The main challenges are challenges to teaching students how to think philosophically in general and how to understand and interpret texts in context. I see this as a general problem, not specific to Chinese philosophy. I don’t think students are less capable of this in Chinese philosophy than they are in Western philosophy.
- The language is an obvious challenge. Even the pronunciation of Chinese names and key words is problematic. A second obstacle is a severe lack of knowledge of Chinese history and culture. A third obstacle is the absence of theism in ancient Confucianism and other thinkers. Westerners—at least church-going Westerners—often think of morality as a function of religious faith. Since much Chinese philosophy—like Indian and other philosophy—is not theistic, students sometimes have difficulty understanding or caring.
- Before answering any of these queries, I should clarify that, while I teach Chinese philosophy, I do so in the interdisciplinary contexts of Religious Studies and Asian

Studies, rather than in a conventional philosophy classroom. Western students tend to impose or import categories and assumptions from their own philosophical culture, such as body/mind dualism, the law of the excluded middle, etc. This constitutes a challenge only insofar as it can fail to become a “teachable moment.”

- Students have no background on the history or languages of China or East Asia. Of course, these days, students have less and less background on any history or languages and sometimes don't even know what Latin is. With China and East Asia, however, providing some background is unavoidable, especially given the close connection between Confucianism and the history of China and its government. Also, students may have “New Age” misconceptions about China and Chinese thought, e.g., that Chinese religion and philosophy is identical to that of India, that it is all mystical, etc.
- Students are often unprepared to take the initiative to think for themselves and engage in the project of questioning and assume responsibility for their own education. This step is essential to teaching most Asian philosophy.
- Most especially the assumption that there is a distinctive, unified “Eastern” view, as opposed to a wide diversity of views. Other than that, I've found students to be very open and receptive. The one class I teach—on pre-unification Chinese philosophy—is fun to teach and well-received, *not* more challenging than my Western philosophy classes.
- There are two main problems: (1) translation problems and (2) students' lack of cultural and historical context needed for understanding Chinese philosophy.
- The challenge, in a word, is to make Chinese philosophy (or a part of it) known as it is to the Western students. The obstacles in the way include the following: (1) the traditional Chinese language, some parts of which can hardly be translated into Western languages; (2) the style of the Chinese philosophers to argue and to present ideas, which often go by way of analogy rather than official definition and inference and may therefore seem unclear or even naive to Western students; (3) simplified or biased expositions in popular textbooks; and (4) the tendency to label Chinese philosophers or philosophical ideas with Western “isms” (an example appears in the quote in Question 4 below, where Mozi is said to be “an agent-neutral consequentialist”), which is often misleading.
- Actually, I am well-experienced in teaching this class. Moreover, my students are staying in Taiwan for 6-12 months or longer and are learning Chinese language and Chinese/Taiwanese culture. Thus, they can observe manifestations of Chinese philosophy around them in daily life and language. Also, this allows me to write the Chinese characters for the key terms and talk about the concepts in light of the characters. They tend to be intrigued by all of the link-ups between the thought and life, as well as to art and poetry.
- I've been teaching Chinese thought to undergrads for 33 years. Most of those who come to the class are curious enough to explore the world of Chinese thinking, so I am able to use mostly traditional methods to present and discuss the materials. It's important to avoid the extremes of either a dismissive attitude (as some of my professional colleagues have toward some texts like the *Mencius*) or a pious devotion that neglects problems within the traditions. If one helps students read the texts with both an empathy to understand from within and a critical mind to reflect from

the outside, most students respond quite well. The major problem that my colleagues probably have is dealing with those texts in the tradition that they don't like. Fortunately, the traditions are complex enough that those colleagues can pick and choose texts they like.

- Students tend to look for (and believe themselves to have found) sweeping differences between Chinese philosophy as a whole and Western philosophy as a whole. At the same time they tend to idealize the Chinese thinkers, often painting them as superior alternatives to Western ones. In so doing they tend to miss the subtler views expressed in the Chinese philosophical canon and ride roughshod over the important differences between specific thinkers. I would say roughly 30% of the papers they write say something to the effect that Western philosophy is “logical” and Chinese philosophy “mystical” or “spiritual.” Students also struggle to find significant philosophical theses in some of the pithier texts, such as the *Analects* and the *Daodejing*.
- Do not see much difference. I teach both Ancient Greek Philosophy and Ancient Chinese Philosophy. Students do not usually feel they have special challenges in learning Chinese philosophy. Sometimes I feel we overemphasize the so-called “peculiarity” of Chinese philosophy.
- (1) How Chinese philosophy can be related, and contribute, to the issues, topics, and subjects in philosophy that are jointly/commonly concerned, through philosophical interpretation, by both Chinese and Western philosophy. (2) How the classical texts in ancient Chinese philosophy can be understood through philosophical interpretation to be philosophically interesting and significant. (3) How the study of Chinese philosophy can be approached through analytic methodology, understood in a broad way, that is to enhance accessibility, cross-context understanding, and being subject to criticism.
- Students lack background in Chinese history and understanding of modern China.
- Most of them like what they read but some would question the authoritarian aspects of Confucianism, especially the notions of loyalty and filial piety. For instance, when we read Confucius's *Analects* 4:18-21 (“The Virtuous Person and Filial Piety”), students feel uneasy to respond. They cannot understand the three years grieving for one's parents' death. Some of them challenge the paternalistic tendency in those readings.
- Removing the stereotypes about Chinese philosophy (it's all about Nature, it's all about Confucius, etc.) and introducing students to a way of thinking and doing philosophy that challenges Amero-Eurocentric patterns and prejudices.
- I think language and cultural difference are the major challenges.
- Finding English translations with Pinyin instead of the old Wade-Giles system. I began my Chinese studies using Wade-Giles, but this is not the case today. Trying to recognize Chinese names in both systems is futile. For my class on Classical Confucianism, I had to translate hundreds of names and terms to make them legible.
- On the outset, I would like to remark that, while Chinese philosophy strongly influences my research and my teaching, at [name of college deleted] I am scheduled to teach courses only in the Religion Department. I am not sure if it is possible to give a general answer to this question since today's students have varying backgrounds and varying levels of interest in Chinese history and philosophy. In addition, the level of education and the exposure to

Chinese culture in particular and East Asian culture in general vary by country, by region, and even by person. The biggest problem for teaching Chinese philosophy at a liberal arts college in the Midwest is that most students have little or no background in East Asian history, literature, religion, and philosophy. The little knowledge they do have is often colored by stereotypes provided by pop culture. This means that in the classroom, I have not only to teach Chinese or Eastern philosophy proper but also to combat cultural stereotypes to some degree.

- The challenges are manifold. The biggest ones include the following: the aphoristic style of expression in many early Chinese texts (e.g., the *Analects*, the *Mencius*, and the *Zhuangzi*); the inadequacy of English translations (especially considering the multilateral meanings of Chinese characters that can hardly find any simple English equivalents); and the cultural barrier caused by the gaps between the West and the East, modern and ancient times, as well as the mental resistance to ideas that seem to be conflicting with some students' embedded beliefs and opinions.
- The biggest challenge is getting students to understand the cultural and historical context that the particular philosophy grew out of and the cultural and historical forces that have altered that philosophy in any way. These ideas and philosophies don't exist in a vacuum and the societies are extremely complex and can't be judged by our values or standards. Ethnocentrism certainly plays into that as well. Suspension of judgment and belief is advised.
- Usually, all that Western students know about China is negative press in the popular media. If they know anything about Chinese philosophy, it has usually been filtered through a vocabulary that makes Chinese philosophy into an anemic, second-rate Christianity: Heaven, the Way, virtue, ritual, benevolence, principle, and so on. Teaching Chinese philosophy usually requires that one deconstruct existing prejudices before there is a space to take the Chinese tradition on its own terms. And then there is the self-understanding of professional philosophy that philosophy as a discipline is an Anglo-European narrative that does not include the "non-Western" traditions of China, India, Japan, Buddhism, Islam, and so on.
- The lack of historical background knowledge among the students is a big obstacle. Fear of studying something that is not connected to the Bible is another.
- Being able to shift perspective from a Judeo-Christian view, with stress on the search for Truth and the source of legitimation as God, to Dao, as dynamic, open, and non-commanding.
- I don't believe the two cultures have incompatible worldviews, or that students need to let go of one in order to understand the other. Consequently, the challenge for me is to get the students as comfortable as possible with the differences of style and language.
- I have taught Chinese philosophy in the context of Religious Studies. Confucianism is much more difficult to teach than Daoism in this context, because students often find the readings quite dry. However, because Religious Studies students are used to learning about notions of ethics which are not rule-based and have been exposed to ideas that good and evil are more fluid, the apparent "relativism" of Chinese thinking is not problematic for them. The problem I do have is that many students come from other disciplines (e.g., computer science and engineering) who assume that Religious Studies is easy and are not used to thinking about texts, but rather assume that Liberal Arts courses should involve only memorization. Getting these students to think is a challenge. In addition, there is in my view a lack of material that uses *pinyin* and the two systems of romanization are often confusing to students. My personal preference is for translation editions that include the Chinese texts, because it enables me to look up things in class when students ask questions that might relate to problems of translation rather than flipping between books. Lastly, one of the big problems in teaching Chinese philosophy is that much of the material is not readily available in English—for example, the *Huainanzi* in its entirety and many of the Neo-Confucian writings. This is not so much a problem for introductory courses, but it becomes more of a problem at higher levels.
- As a Chinese instructor, I was not familiar with Western students' response to Chinese philosophical wisdom at the beginning. It took me a while to find out and understand why Western students had a different response to certain Chinese ideas than Chinese students. How to handle the classroom atmosphere and make it easy and comfortable was another challenge. After one more year, I have gained abundant experience in teaching and leading the discussion. I have become much more relaxed in teaching, which turns each class into a great experience to share with my students.
- Students are accustomed to other different categories. Some of them, the most curious and diligent, try to go deeper and to understand different perspectives, but most of them consider such differences as just exotic or strange ideas, and do not face the questions which come from such differences.
- Lack of appropriate reading and DVD materials for lower-division courses such as 100- and 200-level courses. Oftentimes, Chinese philosophy is bundled together with other Asian philosophy. Hence, it is hard just to teach Chinese philosophy in the lower-division courses and have accessible reading materials and DVDs to introduce first- and second-year students to the subject.
- The students' lack of knowledge of the historical contexts in which philosophy was developed; their lack of knowledge of the Chinese language.
- Students tend to find difficult whatever originates from a different cultural and religious background. Encountering difference is always challenging. The main challenge is perhaps to counteract the mostly Christian assumptions about God and religion, as well as the modern Western assumptions about the nature of self and society. Another challenge is to help students realize that, unlike most Western philosophies, Chinese philosophies are alive and practically relevant outside academia.
- No special challenges that I've noticed other than the challenges of teaching any philosophy course. Most students are too timid to trust their own intuitions. Also, of course, there are plenty of preconceptions and misconceptions about Daoism and Confucianism, but those are easily dispensed with.
- My experience from having taught Chinese philosophy to North-American students for 15 years is that the most difficult and important part of teaching Chinese philosophy is to explain Chinese philosophical concepts with Chinese terms fitting Western philosophical understanding. To explain philosophical terms in Chinese philosophy in a way

that fits students' Western philosophical background, one needs a deep understanding of the systems and structures of Chinese philosophy and Western philosophy. Concepts and terms in both philosophies are very complicated. Simply telling students similarities and differences between the two is misleading students and creating confusion for their later studies.

- I am teaching Western philosophy in China now, but I can feel the same situation as teaching Chinese philosophy in the West, for they are facing different cultures. I think the key challenge in teaching Chinese philosophy in the West as teaching Western philosophy in China is to learn the cultural background to which the philosophy belongs. As Chinese students could not understand what Plato's concept of idea means without knowing ancient Greek language, Western students could not understand 理 or 气 without knowing ancient Chinese language. In this sense, for Western students who want to study Chinese philosophy, the first step is to study Chinese language, ancient and modern.
- The fact that Chinese language and philosophy is evocative and subtle compared to the more analytic and direct Western philosophy poses a bit of a problem at first, but pointing these features out with some good examples tends to make for smoother sailing afterwards. While teaching Chinese philosophy is different, I do not think it is overly problematic for introductory courses. Another matter would be for upper division courses, where one would need command of the language. But for me it is no different than teaching Japanese philosophy or Indian philosophy, or Greek philosophy for that matter.
- I am in a very conservative analytic philosophy department and was hired to teach logic and philosophy of science. In mid-career I "heard the mandate of *Tian*" and began to learn and eventually to teach Chinese philosophy. While my department was perfectly willing to "let" me teach Chinese philosophy and Chinese aesthetics (I am a tenured full professor—what could they do?), they always considered it "fluff." For this reason very few of my colleagues advised their students to take my courses in Chinese philosophy. I am not sure, but some of them may even have advised against it. My colleagues in the Asian Studies Program were delighted that I taught these courses, but that program is still relatively small with not enough students to "go around." Thus my enrollments were seldom as healthy as I would have liked. The courses I taught went very well, perhaps because of my experience with Zhuangzi. I teach Introduction to Philosophy every semester. For the last 10-15 years, after several (3-5) weeks on Plato, we spend a few weeks (it takes at least 2 weeks, 3 is better) reading Zhuangzi. In the beginning, my students were surprised and resistant because he is *so* different from Plato. But I learned how to anticipate their concerns and head them off. Take, for example, the following. *Student*: This ["Free and Easy Wandering"] is just a bunch of fantasy stories. *Me*: Not unlike the Myth of the Cave. *Student*: This ["Discussion on Making Things Equal"] is too hard! *Me*: Remember what you first said about Plato? Philosophy is hard. *Student*: The names are too strange! I cannot pronounce them. *Me*: And how did you do with Thrasymachus and Polemarchus? You got used to them. Aside from those reassuring similarities, however, I pointed out how different Zhuangzi was from Plato and worked very hard to be sure students did not conflate the two. That may have been the most difficult

thing, but I think I succeeded. My experience with Zhuangzi in Introduction to Philosophy carried over to the courses in Chinese philosophy where students were more open to the experience to begin with. When I announced my retirement, my department wanted to replace me with someone who specialized in logic and philosophy of science. The University, however, refused to let them, arguing (quite incorrectly, I am sure) that since there was at least one person who could teach logic, philosophy of science, and Chinese philosophy (i.e., me), they should replace me with someone else who had those three specialties. My department was afraid that this meant losing a specialist in logic and has refused to do so. Then came the economic downturn and the hiring freeze. The issue is unresolved with the University Administration and the Asian Studies Program facing off against the Philosophy Department. The resolution will probably come when the Philosophy Department hires a new logician and philosopher of science and the University has enough money to hire another person with a joint appointment in Philosophy and Asian Studies. The Philosophy Department, however, will not be open to that possibility until *after* they have hired a logician. In other words, my difficulties have been with my colleagues in Philosophy—the students and the rest of the University have been open-minded and enthusiastic.

- I did not face any challenges. Students were somewhat surprised to find out that Buddhism and Taoism are religions without belief in God or gods.
- Western students are usually baffled by the concept of negation as embodied in basic Buddhist and Taoist traditions. They may also be intrigued by it, but they may be appalled by the notion that ceasing to exist might be some sort of worthy achievement. Western students, like most modern Chinese people, are head over heels into the Cycle of Samsara, and that is where they want to be. The wisdom of the Four Noble Truths, the idea that the world might be better off without so many machines, or the thought that silence and immobility are good disciplines, seems absurd to them. There is no respect for venerable elders in the West (and according to Hu Shih, there has not been much in Asia either in recent centuries). Elders in the West are essentially moribund figures, either comical or pathetic remnants of past generations who would do better to die and get out of the way. This attitude is prevalent, yet glossed over by the sham Christianity that is characteristic of the modern West. It also glosses over the Christian injunction against excessive wealth and use of force ("Love your enemies, do good to them who revile and persecute you" is the word of Christ, but no one takes it seriously, no one).
- Students with a background in Western philosophy often express that they miss argumentative rigor when being introduced to Chinese philosophy. Students have difficulty relating Chinese philosophy to those topics covered in other philosophy courses. Students repeatedly express that they tend to be primarily confronted with texts from the classical Chinese tradition. Most of the undergraduate students at my university [name of university deleted] tend to be from [name of region deleted] and regard the promotion of Neo-Confucianism by the Chinese government as political propaganda.

Question #2: *With respect to the challenges that you have succeeded in overcoming, how did you do it? Please specify any teaching techniques (active learning, group work, role playing, etc.) and/or classroom strategies (problem solving, case studies, background reports, etc.) that worked for you.*

The following are answers from survey respondents:

- Rather than stressing arguments in texts, I concentrate on arguments between texts. I explore the Confucian position briefly in the *Analects*, show how it was attacked (or could be attacked) by the Mohists and Yangists, and examine Mengzi's response to those attacks. I then treat Zhuangzi and Laozi as responses to Confucianism. Otherwise, I teach Chinese philosophy in the same way as I teach Western philosophy. I do not use different strategies in the classroom.
- It's important to deal with language issues right from the get-go. The differences between the Chinese original text (in characters), different ways of Romanizing those characters so as to make them pronounceable by Western students, and then different ways of translating all need to be worked through, and probably returned to. In fact, I find that this is a "feature" rather than a "bug," in that many students are fascinated by the process of interpretation leading to different translations. Solving the need for historical background is not, in my experience, as simple as it sounds: I wish there were better materials available, especially for the early period. I'm continually experimenting with different approaches and materials. Finally, I have repeatedly required students who have not taken prior courses in Chinese philosophy, but who want to take a more advanced course (e.g., seminar on Confucianism and virtue ethics), to attend a half-day Chinese philosophy boot camp. There is no reading in advance: all the work is done over the course of the afternoon. We deal with language issues, talk a bit about history, read and discuss snippets of early texts, and in general plunge into the world of Chinese philosophy. Obviously not the same as a semester-long course, but enough (it seems) for them to feel like they can make sense of the work I then ask them to do in the course itself. I've had some fascinating correspondence lately with Barry Keenan (Keenan.15@osu.edu) about his methods of teaching Chinese philosophy, including the use of dialogues, students writing journal reactions to passages from the *Four Books*—and then discussing them with him in one-on-one tutorials, etc. If you haven't been in touch with him, you might do so.
- Summarizing the key concepts, preparing handouts, explaining the Chinese concepts (such as *jen*, *tao*, *li*, etc.) in the ways that are familiar. I did use some group work for Confucianism (students could relate many ideas to their families), but for Taoism it was more difficult.
- Overcoming these challenges tends to be far easier in covering the *Dao De Jing* and *Zhuangzi*. Part of this success lies in a confusion mentioned above regarding how students tend to think of the Daoist tradition as more affirming of the kind of individualism the students have already embraced. But when Laozi's warnings against pushing norms in society and trying to overwhelm others with power come across well, students do tend to get the point, as well as understand better how classical Chinese correlative cosmology helps illuminate some of the Chinese schools' social thought. It is always fun in these classes to let the students play with the classical Chinese language a little bit, and so I might also ask them to do some of their own amateur translation of Chinese texts using the *Shuhai Wenyuan* website done at the University of Hawai'i.
- With such a diverse student group, I have found that inviting the students to use different formats has worked well. For instance, I have even had some epic poems about Chinese philosophy from the creative writing students. One of my favorites was a very, very bright business student who devised a number of investment portfolios for thinkers such as Kongzi, Mengzi, Liezi (who spent his money on some great parties), Hanfeizi, Mozi, and even Zhu Xi and Wang Yangming. If the students can relate what they are learning in the class to the methods of their majors, it helps a lot. I often have a Teaching Assistant and they will run a series of discussion groups. This is very helpful for the students; if they are too shy to ask me a question, my TA will bring it back to me. I also have the TA take two or three pages of notes for each class and we send them along as a teaching aid. The TA will know what is important and what is not. The students really like this kind of assistance. I still am addicted to books and articles in print. What I often do is invite my students to share with me and other students what they can find online about Chinese philosophy. There is a world of information out there and the students know how to access it much better than I do; or at least they can find it on their computers with greater ease than I can. I can then talk to them about trying to develop the art of separating the good materials from so much of the bad that is out there online as well. Living in [name of city deleted], I also have the pleasure of taking them to the Museum of Fine Arts and wander through the Asian galleries—they love to do this and it gives some sense of how material culture and thought fuse.
- The best that I have been able to do is use complete texts and introduce the actual semantic fields of Classical Chinese. For students who are willing, this seems to work.
- Actually, teaching students Chinese history and culture is not a big problem. Although they have no background in Chinese history or language, it is not too hard to teach them the information. But I have less time to teach the philosophy materials. I suppose that's a necessary evil, though.
- Having students read texts from different schools of thought carefully, write reflection papers on focused questions on them, hear lectures on them, ask questions, and participate in small discussion groups during classroom time are the most important things I've done in addressing the challenges.
- Two case studies: one, philosophy of language (what do the Chinese masters say about language and what do they do with language?); two, relationship between Heaven and the human being.
- My technique was that I was very appreciative of the material, enjoyed talking about it, and wrote the key Chinese characters on the blackboard and explained them. I used my book, [title of book deleted], and the *Analects*, and the *Tao Te Ching*. A bit of Mencius and Chuang Tzu.
- Open discussion is the best format for me. We do close reading, primarily from Ivanhoe and Van Norden's reader. I may give four or five guiding questions, but let students come in and begin the discussion wherever they would like. Their curiosity usually leads to productive class time.
- This is a complicated question, which I've dealt with in some detail in my [reference deleted].

- I have members of the class explicate passages in the readings for the course, though this does not necessarily deal with the issues regarding challenges in the answer to Question 1.
- I have no new or innovative techniques to recommend. Close reading, guided classroom discussion, and so on have worked as well as can be expected. I would advise assigning translations of the original sources, with as few secondary readings as possible. In undergraduate classes, I generally use Burton Watson's translations, except for the *Daodejing* I use the translation by Robert Henricks (based on the Mawangdui manuscripts), and for the *Analects* and Mencius I use the bilingual editions by D. C. Lau (even though I have to say they're remarkably inaccurate). And for Sunzi I use Samuel Griffith. These translations vary in quality, but they convey a sense of how East Asian readers have understood these texts over the centuries. At the undergraduate level, that is the most important criterion for me, and leads me to eliminate other translations that might be preferable to philosophers today (such as A. C. Graham's translation of Zhuangzi).
- Two methods have helped: (1) using Chinese cooking and eating methods to demonstrate the importance of community and harmony; (2) reading the classics [*Kongzi*, *Laozi*] in precise detail so that a change of mind and a transformation of soul become available to groups of students who have been exposed to only individualism and force as the way of life.
- I have found it important to create names of classes that will get students in the door the first day. Once that has been accomplished, everything else is easy. This fall I am teaching Anarchism in China, but the class is really about Zhuangzi. We will read a translation by Victor Mair, and an edited volume by Roger Ames, as well as two other books. Occasionally I will show pictures such as a Confucian temple today before we read the *Analects*. This helps students understand that they are connecting with a living tradition relevant to the entire region of Asia from Vietnam to Korea.
- The problem discussed above usually stems from the students' lack of skill at careful reading. The way I usually deal with it is to spend class time making them look closely at particular passages to consider exactly what they do or do not imply. Once we have discussed a couple of passages in detail, they begin to have a better sense of how to read and analyze the texts, and their comparisons with Western views become more tempered.
- Mostly through concrete examples, small group work, applying Asian philosophies to contemporary issues, having students with backgrounds in Asian culture share their expertise. I have found using examples from Asian martial arts, especially Aikido and Kung Fu, has helped illustrate some difficult Asian concepts. I have used a clip from Akira Kurosawa's *Dreams*, a segment entitled "Village of the Watermills," as a concrete example of Lao Tzu's ideal society. I've also used a PBS video entitled "Affluenza" to illustrate some life style changes in our modern society that Lao Tzu might support.
- I have used my own pronunciation guide that I hand out and recite with them; that seems to help a bit. The challenge of the text can only be dealt with by going through particular passages and showing the students how the work of interpretation is carried out. Then, they work in groups to try to work through other passages that are difficult. It's slow and hard, but it does teach them a valuable skill, not only for Chinese texts but for literature in general.
- One thing that is important for just about any philosophy course is the ability to read texts carefully and critically. In order to foster this ability, I sometimes assign single passages and require students to discuss and write short response papers explicating the passage and analyzing the core problems they see.
- Teach intro as a historical/comparative course with Chinese philosophy representing the comparative element. A succession of loosely construed world views historically cast around the theme of the development of the self seems to orient students into some kind of story line and an appreciation of philosophy and provide an alternative worldview through the Chinese inclusion.
- Re (3): I use a suggestion that Thomas Kasulis makes in his book, *Intimacy or Integrity: Philosophy and Cultural Differences* (Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press, 2002), that studying a different culture's philosophy is like studying a different gestalt. I motivate this model for studying Chinese philosophy with examples of gestalts from psychology. I continually emphasize that students need to try to "take on a different gestalt" rather than incorporate Chinese philosophy into their Euro-American belief-systems. I avoid explaining anything by reference to what Western thinkers have said. I also make a point of commenting on how one could misunderstand what's going on in virtue of failing to abandon one's traditional Western gestalt. I think this makes the students feel like they are in on a secret, and it puts them in a position to understand why some popular conceptions of Chinese thought are misconceptions. This partly addresses challenge (2). Re (2): I also try to give a metanarrative, to show that there is a common set of problems all the different traditions are working on. I like the story Chad Hansen tells in his *A Daoist Theory of Chinese Thought: A Philosophical Interpretation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992). I think this helps students to get in the paradigm for traditional Chinese philosophy, at least to some extent.
- The pedagogy of Classical Confucian academies is perfectly fitted to the *Five Classics* and the *Four Books*. Zhu Xi (1130-1200) wrote extensively about just what 讀書法 喔人 (method of study) makes these texts come alive to readers. I use both academy pedagogy and Zhu's recommended methods and the results with liberal arts undergraduates are spectacular. I do not teach introductory world or Western philosophy. But when I teach Chinese thought in a "Chinese Civilization" survey course, I develop exercises such as using Mengzi selections in a simulation of the civil service examination system.
- I try to maximize student engagement in various ways. One is by minimizing lecture. Another is by using the Internet, for instance, to support group projects, such as collaborative commentaries. I would recommend Web-based resources such as Moodle to anyone as a means of making the course more accessible. In particular, it facilitates student interaction outside of class, which can be difficult otherwise given people's heavy work schedules.
- There is no substitute, in meeting the challenges, for patient explanation.
- The responses here "(a), (b), (c)" follow the points listed in the answer to Question 1. (a) In this regard, I take some care to explain to students how they can deal with differences in translations. This involves introducing the

background areas of a selection of translators and getting students to be sensitive to translation processes and the aims of particular translators. (b) Demonstrating to students that there are early texts in other philosophical traditions that are piecemeal and likewise open to interpretation. But there are texts that are *not* piecemeal and just as difficult to interpret. Here I have found giving students a sense of Chinese intellectual history remarkably helpful as they can place the texts and see at least some of them as responses. (c) Active learning: I get students in tutorial groups to discuss samples of texts, and get them to share their observations. I also use online technologies to extend discussions we've had in class. For instance, I use a software program called Web Vista (our university is soon changing over to Blackboard for online discussions and collaborative textual analysis, and to provide links to other Internet resources. These approaches help to open up students' thinking by encouraging them to explore, which is a critical part of learning to philosophize.

- (1) Explaining to students that philosophy even in the West is not monolithic whether with respect to content or style. (Kierkegaard, Nietzsche, Heidegger—Carnap thinks Heidegger is writing nonsense, but Heidegger is only doing philosophy in a different way.) The same is true with Chinese philosophy. (2) Ask your friends or classmates who have Chinese cultural background regarding a particular philosophical idea (filial piety or ancestor worship, for example), show a select Chinese movie (*Mulan*, for example), and refer to the practical application or implementation of philosophical thoughts such as *qigong* (a Chinese meditative practice which uses slow graceful movements and controlled breathing techniques), Taiji boxing, Chinese medicine, martial arts, etc.
- I've had debates between "Mengzi" and "Xunzi," role playing a set of philosophers at the Jixia academy or Huainan academy, role playing "life at Louguantai" which lets the students think about Daoists and Buddhists living near each other, and debates between them. I have had students write "findings papers" the purpose of which is to write an interpretive analysis, an analytical criticism, a comparison with a Western or other Chinese thinker, or a point for discussion appropriate for class.
- Usually my courses work well and most students find them okay. I just lecture and then have discussion—as in any other class I teach.
- I have tried to approach it through children's literature—namely, *Journey to the West*—so that we can discuss the ideas and see similarities as well as differences. I have had the students read the parts to one of the episodes from the animated program, but I am not so sure it was successful. I am open to suggestions. My goal is to get students to read beyond. I've met some of my students from my last class who have told me they are now reading more about Chinese philosophy so I guess I have succeeded somewhat. I have them do a book review which includes a personal response not just a summary of the ideas.
- For an introductory level course, I teach it pretty much like any historically oriented introduction to philosophy, although more time must be spent drawing out arguments and clear positions from the texts. For an upper level (or graduate level) course, I usually focus on one theme and spend most of the course in a close reading of one text (with a quick reading of several texts for contexts in the beginning), with a final paper of 10-15 pages. Some specific

things that have worked: (1) I give short papers through the quarter as specific exercises. The first is for students to do their own translation of one half of Chapter One of the *Dao De Jing*, using a website that lets you click on the characters to get the definitions such as Shuhai Wenyuan (<http://www.shuhai.hawaii.edu/>), or Association Française des Professeurs de Chinois (AFPC) (<http://www.afpc.asso.fr/wengu/wg/wengu.php?l=intro>). I then have them work in groups to compare their translations. This works very well in conveying a sense of the original language and the problems of translation, and students enjoy it. I encourage them to check the original text when they write their final papers, and usually about half of the students are able to do that. The second is a short paper analyzing one passage in the main text, comparing the differences in at least two translations. The third is a short paper drawing together evidence spread across the text. (2) I always set the class up telling the students that it is experimental, that Chinese texts are rarely taught in philosophy departments, that we will be inquiring together, and that there is a good chance that their final papers will be on topics no one has ever written about. The students are usually excited by the challenge. (3) I introduce the key terms in Chinese, give them my own translations of key passages, and sometimes talk through key sentences from the Chinese. (4) I always order two translations of the key text, usually using Philip J. Ivanhoe and Bryan W. Van Norden, eds., *Readings in Classical Chinese Philosophy* (Indianapolis, IN: Hackett, 2006) as one and then a full translation of the main text as another.

- I have a model which I give students to follow in learning how to make a case for their interpretations of the texts that we read and how to develop a thesis-defending essay. I try to have small group work in class as often as possible to help them clarify issues that may be important and play a role in their thesis-defending essays. They are also required to respond in writing to reading once a week. I also expect ongoing contribution to in-class discussion. Each student must develop an interpretation and an argument on the reading once a week. I often use these to structure my lecture-discussion. I have an ongoing research project on Confucius's *Analects* that has helped me understand early Chinese philosophy. That work has helped me to develop strategies for explaining these texts in context of recent research, both mine and others'.
- For the language issue, translations of numerous classic and modern texts make it possible to work around that obstacle. One just has to do the best one can with pronunciation. I fear I do very poorly here. It is generally possible to use a historically oriented anthology. Another possibility is to develop the course topically. Many Western students are not themselves practicing Jews, Christians, or Muslims, though they still think of morality as a religious issue. For more religiously oriented students, asking students to understand without accepting sometimes helps. It also helps to critique views as one takes them up, at the same time critiquing Western perspectives.
- I find it useful to frame comparative philosophy in terms of costs and benefits—that is, to ask students precisely what costs and benefits result from particular philosophical commitments, with an eye toward recognizing how different commitments may produce comparable combinations of costs and benefits, as well as how similar commitments may meet with divergent outcomes in contrasting cultural and historical contexts.

- My teaching technique is to tell them what they don't know, give them background information about the languages, and fill in the history where relevant, especially the role of Qin Shi Huangdi, First Emperor of China, in the history of Chinese philosophy.
- Clearly structured lecture presentations yielding focused, irresistible questions was the best solution.
- I think reading Mozi pretty effectively puts the problematic view to rest!
- (1) I use group work for an initial understanding of key concepts (however, this technique does not always work out well, some years work better than others do) and then I lecture on the concepts. Students may discover they are way off in their interpretation of those concepts. Generally this derives from reading the translations. (2) In teaching Taoism, I present a metaphysical foundation, from which everything else flows, and point out what problems (questions) those ancients try to solve (answer). Also, I lecture on cultural and historical contexts in which this or that theory arises. (3) Other Chinese philosophers tend to be less metaphysical. Students get the impression that they can understand them a bit easier, although once again, without knowledge of the context of the thinking, it's not always true that they are easier to understand. (4) Since I'm bilingual, I usually bring an original text with me to discuss certain puzzling passages with the class.
- Instead of trying to make a systematic exposition, I prefer starting with some selected original texts and emphasize in the class on problem solving and case studies, in which the students are encouraged to go as deep as they can into some specific ideas or arguments by questioning or criticizing them. This may provide the students with only some scattered ideas about a philosopher, but may help them gain a deeper understanding of the Chinese way of philosophizing. In doing this I try to hold a principle that the Chinese philosophers used the same logic as we have today (thus they are not hopelessly mysterious or obscure as some of them seem to be), although their methods of argumentation may seem peculiar (and what those peculiar methods really are, I think, remain one of the most important problems for us). I leave it to the students to decide, if they find it helpful, to what "isms" the philosopher in question should belong.
- Our classes tend to be three hours. In each class, I present a new philosopher. Before class, the students are expected to go over some readings, though I can't expect high comprehension. The last part of the class is set aside for discussion of the philosopher and his ideas, and for the students to discuss their thoughts and feelings. I try to keep attuned to where the students are in their own thinking, so I can adjust my teaching where necessary. This past autumn, the students had two opportunities to give presentations in class. Since I spent a little extra time on Zhuangzi (Chuang Tzu), I asked them to select and discuss the paragraphs from the text that most intrigued and/or puzzled them. That was an amazing class session. Toward the end of the semester, each student gave a presentation on his/her research project. There was a great variety of interests. Some students spoke purely on philosophic issues or topics, others related the philosophy to other cultural phenomena, such as art and religion. It was a great sharing of interests and ideas.
- Let me start with the first set of problems identified above—making sweeping generalizations about the differences between Chinese philosophy and Western philosophy as undifferentiated wholes. I find it helps to stress the many ways in which specific philosophers were in debate with one another. It is easy for the students to overlook the fact that the majority of the *Mengzi* is written as a response to competing views, such as those of the Mohists or Yangists. They need to be reminded that the *Daodejing*'s references to virtues such as humaneness (*rén*) are likely criticisms of Confucian (or at least Ruist) views. The remaining problem identified in Question 1 was the inability of students to find significant philosophical theses in pithy texts like the *Analects* and the *Daodejing*. I have combated this by requiring short-reading responses in which students work to interpret one passage by comparing it with other relevant passages.
- My answer will probably disappoint you, as I think we tend to overemphasize the "challenge" to teach Chinese philosophy. I do not feel much difference between teaching Chinese philosophy and teaching philosophy in general. Since I do not perceive any particular challenge, this question does not apply.
- (1) To explain in what sense and to what extent Chinese philosophy and Western philosophy are jointly characterized as philosophy. (2) To emphasize the important role played by philosophical interpretation in cross-tradition philosophical inquiries. (3) To explain philosophical methodology. (4) To explain and emphasize the important role played by analytic method and method of comparative philosophy, both of which are understood in a broad, philosophically interesting way. (5) To take the following general constructive-engagement methodological strategy in treating distinct approaches and setting a philosophical goal in teaching Chinese philosophy: Inquires into how, via reflective criticism and self-criticism, distinct modes of thinking, methodological approaches, visions, insights, substantial points of view, or conceptual/explanatory resources from different philosophical traditions, and/or from different styles/orientations of doing philosophy (within one tradition or out of different traditions) can learn from each other and jointly make constructive contribution to the common philosophical enterprise (i.e., to our understanding and treatment of a series of issues or topics of philosophical significance that are jointly concerned under philosophical interpretation and/or from a broader philosophical vantage point).
- I do not teach at a university but my general experience in teaching Chinese philosophy has been to follow the St. John's College method: Ask a simple-minded seminar question about the text which has both a general aspect and a particular aspect. For example, "What is *li* (ritual)?" Or, "What is *li* (principle)?" This requires students to read the text closely and to try to understand what the author meant, or had to have meant, in the context in which he (usually he, but not always) was writing. This is both easier (no lecture preparation) and much more difficult because, though the seminar leader may not know the answer to the question asked (actually, it's better if he/she does not know so that students feel they are equal partners in the search for meaning), he/she must thoroughly prepare page references for relevant quotations and, as the free-wheeling discussion proceeds, must prepare follow-up questions in case the discussion stalls. I have a detailed write-up of this type of seminar procedure somewhere. If anyone happens to be interested, I will be happy to dig up a copy.

- Devote a session to Chinese geography including geographic growth of early dynasties, show slides of (my visits to) sites related to Confucius, show the 70-minute documentary film *Made in China*, which is a commentary-less view of modern-day China.
- I favor interactive approach in my teaching. Let students talk freely and usually they can answer their questions through dialogue about their understanding of the assigned readings. I request them to read and write a reaction to what they read, so that they can prepare their opinions and insights beforehand.
- We spend the first three weeks of class examining cultural differences with a focus on logics (both/and vs. either/or), views of what constitutes knowledge and truth, goals, methodologies. I have also found it useful to link Chinese philosophical positions to current research, such as Daoism and ecology, Confucian views of human nature and psychology, Buddhism and cognitive science.
- I would invite students (in a group form) to present their understanding in front of the class.
- Using Wing-Tsit Chan's classic on Chinese philosophy [*A Source Book in Chinese Philosophy* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1969)], I assign students the various categories he has listed under the *Analects*, *Mencius*, etc., and have the students brief the class. I do the same thing for the disciples, for which I have prepared a special unit identifying the 27 mentioned in the *Analects*.
- In my courses, it seems that I have to simultaneously build a cultural and historical framework for the texts that I am teaching and teach the texts themselves. In the past, I have used two basic techniques. First, I have explicitly linked my courses in Asian religion and philosophy to the corresponding courses in the History Department. Second, I have discussed the texts in question as responses to philosophical questions and general human dilemmas and not as systems of thought unique and limited to the Chinese tradition. In addition, I attempt to introduce students to the cultures of East Asia by screening films from Vietnam, China, Korea, and Japan once a month. This is another way for students to learn about the life styles, narrative structures, and world views that can be found in East Asia.
- In-depth elaboration and discussion on groups of representative passages in a text (e.g., the *Analects*) surrounding some central ideas and concepts often help to transmit a more coherent system of Chinese thought that is easier for beginning students to understand. I often find the use of appropriate stories and legends especially helpful in illustrating some central ideas in the Chinese philosophical teachings and in overcoming the cultural barriers. I find the use of case studies and group work helpful only when they are organized on the basis of the right setting and proper understanding of Chinese thought.
- I have students begin by reading Clifford Geertz's piece "Religion as a Cultural System," which opens them up to looking at these traditions as a way of life and a worldview. I encourage and lead them, as much as possible, to look at the world through the eyes of someone who is Chinese, Japanese, Hindu, Buddhist, etc. To look at how these philosophies are applied to life so that they not only don't become totally foreign but also don't become strangers to life. It's not a matter of distorting them to make them seem familiar but seeing how they deal with some of the basic human questions that we are all wrestling with.
- I begin by trying to persuade the students that the current understanding of Chinese philosophy is problematic, and trying to develop an interpretive context in which to locate the Chinese philosophical narrative to allow it to speak for itself. I spend a lot of time with the *Analects* of Confucius for the same reason that someone wanting to introduce Western philosophy to an audience who had no background would spend a lot of time with Plato. I try to develop a nuanced and sophisticated understanding of the cluster of key concepts that allows the students to read Chinese philosophy on its own terms. I recommend that they spend time in China and experience living Chinese philosophy.
- I used a story-telling approach that put the students at ease. I draw connections to their traditions to show them links. The solution is not in the complaint; it is in the commitment to do it.
- Using examples from modern Western events to demonstrate Chinese ideas. Using Chinese ideas in Western conflict solving.
- I find it helpful to use examples, whether from the students' own experience, from literature (regardless of tradition), or even from Western philosophy. Equally helpful is putting the burden on the students to interpret what is meant. For example, I ask the students what Confucius means by saying that "only a person of humanity can endure adversity for long or enjoy prosperity for long" (*Analects* 25). This usually provokes a fruitful and extended class discussion, at the end of which the students have been able to enter directly into Confucius's ideas instead of simply writing down what I tell them.
- I usually try to relate issues of Chinese philosophy to the students' own lives in some way as well as show them how some Chinese presuppositions are very different from the Western ones. For example, the importance of ritual in Confucianism is often alien to them, so I try to get them to think about the unspoken rituals in their own lives, and show that this idea is not as alien to Western culture as they would suppose. I also try to present them with situations that they might read about in the news, or encounter in their lives, and get them to think about how different Chinese philosophers might respond. Lastly, I try to use Chinese films popular in the West to show how the philosophies of China are expressed. For example, Ang Lee's *Crouching Tiger, Hidden Dragon* has Confucian, Daoist, and Zen strands.
- At the beginning, I found students were not engaged with the required readings, and they did not follow my way of teaching either. I found out that students did not prepare well and it was hard for them to follow the content, which is pretty alien to them given their cultural background. So I changed the format of my teaching and asked students to do presentations and I stopped whenever needed to explain the material and facilitate discussions, and it turned out to be much better. Sometimes I found students would like to have a field trip. So I led them to Yonghe Buddhist Temple and Confucian Temple. This gave them concrete experience of Chinese Buddhism and Confucianism. Sometimes students had their own topic to address in the semester. I would change the course content a little bit so that they could share their interest with their fellow classmates. Sometimes students preferred video teaching, so I showed them movies and asked them to interview people and make movies themselves. All these helped

them really enjoy my class throughout the semester.

- I teach fundamentally East Asian history and culture, and thus references to philosophy and thought are in the frame of general notions about Chinese culture and civilization. I try to pose questions such as: Why is the final reality looked for in “change” instead of “immutable” entity? Why different religious attitudes and different religious characters? Why different descriptive-normative moral perceptions? Why different foundations of morality? Why no matter-and-spirit contrast? Another important point is that “every word can be translated, and dictionaries have equivalent for any word. But translation does not mean understanding the concepts and historical processes behind words.” From this statement I try to involve students in a textual analysis as far as their linguistic learning allows.
- I use a thematic approach to teaching Confucianism in order to give it a bit of structure. For instance, I break the course down into four themes: Background and Assumptions, Personhood, Governance, and Cosmology. Within these four themes, students are introduced to the primary texts such as the *Analects* and *Mencius* along with secondary literature. In addition, after the study of each theme, students would be assigned to do a presentation on an article from a list of contemporary journal articles. The topics include care ethics and *ren, ru* and Europe, human rights, democracy, political authority, and women’s education.
- Here are my 5 steps and a conclusion. (1) Chinese thinking is coherent, but has no logical system. Coherence makes sense, and we nod, such as at the ideal of government as family, government by music, government as enjoying a communal dinner. (2) “Nothing” is quite powerful in China. Empty room accommodates, no-use is useful, “no-do” does, as Mom trailing Tommy, telling stories to him who refuses to sleep, and Tommy hits his pillow. (3) Contradictions are meaningful. In life contradictions are all over to turn contraries, woe following weal, weal following woe, the same tactlessness could save life (useless tree) and cost life (goose butchered for being unable to cackle). Always be timely, etc. (4) Stories are told to discern levels of meaning in them, e.g., dreaming to be a butterfly, and then awakened to be uncertain if dreaming or awakened. Storytelling can explain what is logically inexplicable. Stories can “argue” for a point. Even Socrates did so in his *Apology*. (5) Show how literary the original Chinese sentences are, to savor Chinese subtlety of hidden meanings in “simple” unassuming historical fact. Poetic sensitivity is here. Conclusion: Not contrived techniques but discerning *showing* of the excitement of peculiar thinking *mode* of China should be pursued. For the fresh minds of the undergraduates, I would make a “cartoon” of Chinese *mode* of thinking (philosophy), somewhat as follows—it can/should vary each semester. I would contrast Bertrand Russell’s vivacious *The Problems of Philosophy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), point by point, with Arthur Waley’s surprising *Three Ways of Thought in Ancient China* (Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press, 1982). I would cut all my complaints on both. I would contrast Confucius’s zestful step-by-step seduction (*yu*) to good (*Analects* 9:11) with Socrates’s *denial* of youth-seduction or corrupting the youth (*diaphtheiron*) (*Apology* 15d). Have you ever expected Confucius despaired of no one “loving virtue as loving sex” (cited twice *Analects* 9:18 and 15:13)? He is never a tiresome mouther of platitudes! Have you ever noted *The Classic of Changes* as vibrant

mathematical poetry? Name-scholar Gongsun Long was a perceptive poet in logical garb for, after all, logic is a tool (*organon*) of perception of actuality! Thus Gongsun Long offers a paradigm to Western logicians! All this is exciting, vivid, concrete, and deep of China! In the end, we would ponder on “the history of Western Philosophy as a series of footnotes to Plato” (Alfred North Whitehead) in *contrast* to “Confucius single-handedly shaping China” (Wing-Tsit Chan). I have more, but this much is enough to show how I would offer the strangely exciting China to the wonderful fresh minds of the undergraduates.

- The challenges have not been overcome.
- In order to overcome a merely textual and theoretical approach to Chinese philosophy, I did two things. First, I supplemented my lectures with documentaries about living expressions of Confucianism, Daoism, and Buddhism. Second, I also require students to research and prepare a PowerPoint presentation about contemporary methods of self-cultivation and healing practices influenced by Chinese philosophical ideas.
- I use a very Socratic, maeutic system of drawing information out of students. I manage to be very successful at drawing students into the discussion by teasing the understanding out of them and getting them to realize that they can in fact trust their own understanding.
- Studying language is, of course, the first step in studying philosophy. In my class I ask Chinese students to read and write essays in English instead of Chinese. I ask my students to give their presentation one by one each time and to submit one 1500-word essay each week. I arrange discussion among students and direct them when they understand in a wrong way.
- It varies by philosopher. Some examples: For Confucius I make a sort of “Confucian Pictionary” for his basic notion and the attributes of the Superior Man. For Zhuangzi I use comics and have the students perform skits of some of the key and most representative “stories.” I show various translations of Wang Wei’s poem “Deer Park” so that they can see the possibilities of reading and how this makes for a more flexible way to interpret their texts. See Eliot Weinberger and Octavio Paz, *Nineteen Ways of Looking at Wang Wei: How a Chinese Poem Is Translated* (Kingston, RI: Moyer Bell, 1987); and C. John Holcombe, “Translating Wang Wei” (<http://www.textetc.com/workshop/wt-wang-wei-1.html>). I show slides with Chinese artworks, walk the students through them, and connect them to central themes. The students break into groups and work together in tasks that pit Mengzi and Xunzi against each other on human nature being good or evil. I use certain texts that are more approachable to supplement original readings such as *Journey to the West*, Benjamin Hoff’s *The Tao of Pooh* (New York: Penguin Books, 1982), and Chih Chung Tsai’s cartoon series (translated by Brian Bruya). I show certain films that help me illustrate basic concepts. These range all over. For instance, Ang Lee’s *Crouching Tiger, Hidden Dragon*, Jenniphir Goodman’s *The Tao of Steve*, Kim Ki Duk’s *Spring, Summer, Fall, Winter ... and Spring*, and the Wachowski brothers’ *The Matrix* (see Chapter 21, which includes the “There Is No Spoon” scene, for Ch’an Buddhism and the Sutra of Hui Neng). Such films bring up or illustrate philosophical aspects either verbally or by way of action. I rely heavily on elaborate PowerPoint presentations and web resources (such as <http://sacred-texts.com/> for additional free texts). I use some websites

that give an idea of what Chinese language is about besides some PowerPoint slides and a set of extensive notes I have written on either Chinese language and culture, or Chinese philosophy that incorporate key ideas, and which I explain in “plain language.” The goal is to show the students how different Chinese is, and what effect that has on how one conceptualizes issues. I rely on YouTube to find materials depending on how discussion is going and what would help the students connect with the material. I think there are many resources on the web that make the task of introducing Chinese philosophy to Western students a lot easier. I think today’s students need a variety of media and means.

- What I learned in teaching Zhuangzi in Introduction to Philosophy, which carried over to the courses in Chinese philosophy and Chinese aesthetics, was to spend enough time on the language—introducing some characters and working through the differences between Wade Giles and Pinyin. Since students who were going to learn more Chinese philosophy would have to deal with both systems of Romanization, I did not take the advice I was given to “stick with one system and don’t mention the other.” I could have spent a great deal more time on “background” than I did, but I answered background questions as they came up and we jumped right into the philosophy once the questions mentioned above were answered. So far the web has been a terrible resource for philosophy. Students use it to avoid thinking and writing for themselves. On the other hand, there are some wonderful web sites such as *Zhongwen.com: Chinese Characters and Culture* (<http://www.zhongwen.com/>), *China the Beautiful: Classical Chinese Art, Calligraphy, Poetry, History, Literature, Painting and Philosophy* (<http://www.chinapage.com/china.html>), and *A Visual Sourcebook of Chinese Civilization* (<http://depts.washington.edu/chinaciv/>). I use primary sources (hooray for Burton Watson, D. C. Lau, and Roger Ames and Henry Rosemont; Edward Slingerland is great, but probably not for students) avoiding secondary literature (except for the essays in the Ames and Rosemont translation of the *Analects*) until advanced courses. In teaching Chinese philosophy, it is very helpful to use more than one translation. Some people say this confuses students, but it is more honest to confuse them when things are confusing than to let them think that philosophy is *not* hard. It is a tradition at my university (class size in philosophy ranges from 10 to 25 students) to assign many short response papers and have a lot of class discussion. This is my teaching style and I didn’t change it. I also benefited greatly from conversations with like-minded colleagues—on campus in the Asian Studies Program, off campus at the Asian Studies Development Program and the Society for Asian and Comparative Philosophy. At the ASDP, scholar-teachers teach scholar-teachers how to teach—a hard thing for the usual research university faculty to take seriously. The American Academy of Religion (<http://www.aarweb.org/>) and AsiaNet (<http://www.asianetnews.net/>) are also excellent resources. I also read *Philosophy East and West: A Quarterly of Comparative Philosophy*, *Dao: A Journal of Comparative Philosophy*, and the *Journal of Chinese Philosophy* regularly (and the Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies every so often). In 40 years plus of teaching philosophy—including Intro, Logic, Philosophy of Science, Philosophy of Language, Philosophy of Mind, Chinese Philosophy, and Chinese Aesthetics—I think I have learned that being a successful teacher, well being a successful

philosophy teacher, is to trust yourself, trust your students, and *never* stop learning.

- Teaching ideas derived directly from original texts is the best way to convince students the differences between the Eastern and Western ways of thinking. I taught a course entitled “Chinese Ways of Thinking” and used Wing-Tsit Chan’s *A Source Book in Chinese Philosophy* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1969). Students would appreciate reading Taoist poems and Neo-Confucian ideas. Before getting into philosophical arguments among different philosophers, introduce the historical background of ancient China, including the Warring States Period that led to the rise of different philosophical ideas. This is very effective for students to understand all of those complex issues. Furthermore, instead of introducing all major ideas at one time, begin with two major strands of Confucianism and Taoism. The ramifications of those major ideas can be taught later.
- I like to ask my students to undertake a project of negation: clean up your room and get rid of three things you don’t really need every day for a week; the next week, get rid of one thing every day that you do think you “need”; finally, the third week, get rid of one absolutely essential thing every day. I have them bring the list of things they tossed out every Monday. They tend to discover that they could do without a lot of their stuff, even the things they considered essential.
- To respond to the criticism concerning the lack of argumentative rigor in Chinese philosophy, I introduce secondary sources that “fill in the blanks” and provide systematic arguments for positions originally developed in the Chinese canon. One way of countering the challenge is to teach Chinese philosophy from a comparative and problem-oriented perspective. Rather than simply focusing on similarities and differences between authors such as Socrates and Confucius, or Rorty and Zhuangzi, this perspective allows one to engage in a transcultural approach that draws on strengths and overcomes weaknesses with an intention to elaborate a new paradigm drawing from and superseding both traditions. I emphasize the contemporary relevance and need for rejuvenating classical Chinese philosophy, especially within current debates in environmental and political philosophy as well as in aesthetics. To counter the charge of using Chinese philosophy as a propaganda tool, I emphasize the difference between contemporary political reality and the moral philosophy developed in Confucianism, Daoism, and Buddhism. Students tend to appreciate learning about the critical but often underrepresented traditions, especially Daoism.

Question #3: *With respect to the challenges that you have yet to overcome, why do they seem so intractable?*

The following are answers from survey respondents:

- I am, of course, always working to improve my teaching, but there is really one large challenge in teaching Chinese philosophy that I am still facing. That challenge is to teach Daoism effectively. I think I do an adequate job with Laozi, but I’m still struggling with Zhuangzi. Like everyone else, I find him fascinating, but I have difficulty communicating this fascination except at a surface level.
- Well, I wish we all agreed on one Romanization system. Sadly for me, I really like to use the Brooks’s *The Original*

Analects—and some of their other works at times—and so need to deal with *three* different systems. But students seem to handle it OK. In general, I don't think there really are intractable problems.

- The inherent difficulty of the concepts (such as the notion of “nothingness” in Chan Buddhism) poses some problems—especially when there is no apparent equivalence in Western thought.
- Part of it has to do with the maturity levels of Intro-level students, and partly it has to do with how ingrained modern Western ideals have become. For all its overt lip service to social pluralism, American society still resists quite strongly the possibility that valuable things can be learned from other cultural traditions, and this resistance manifests in students' attitudes.
- I am supposed, and try, to teach the whole history of Chinese philosophy in one semester. The biggest problem is the two or three weeks I have to spend on the history of Buddhism. Buddhism deserves a year in itself and I always feel that no matter how I try to teach about it, I fail to give the students a good grasp of its historical and philosophical development in China. They do best with Chan and Pure Land and struggle with Tiantai and Huayan. I always try because you cannot really understand the Neo-Confucians unless you are aware of Buddhist thought in China. I also think that it is important to move into the modern period. I spend time on the modern Confucian revival because I know it best, but I could just as easily take the Kyoto School to talk about modern East Asian developments in Buddhist philosophy. But you really have to start with the beginning of Buddhism in South Asia in order to give them some background and this does not leave much time for the really important elements of the philosophical contributions of complex schools such as Tiantai, Huayan, and Chan.
- Because they have no background in Chinese language and culture.
- I haven't really found any challenges intractable with respect to teaching Chinese philosophy.
- I think the lack of a coherent general education program, although my university is better than many, keeps student contextual knowledge of the liberal arts at a less than desirable level.
- Why do you assume there are “intractable” problems? A terrible attitude.
- I think having an open discussion environment where *any* question or criticism can be raised allows everyone to participate and share views on the texts. Historicizing the texts also removes the “threat” some conservative students feel. I'll never forget one student who was very strongly attracted to Confucius, but had to preface his stating so by saying, “I have been bathed in the blood of Christ, but ...” Such strong convictions aren't the norm, but the challenge to get conservative Christian students to engage is consistent.
- As many colleges move toward “world” or “global” history, there is less emphasis on understanding important thinkers in the Western tradition through basic courses in Western civilization. This results in less than ideal approaches to passages from Chinese thinkers, where one is forced to oversimplify, or “dumb down,” the analysis, which can only be mitigated by “mini-crash courses” on Plato, Kant, or Hume.
- The only serious challenge that I have yet to overcome is to convince members of the Philosophy Department at my university that the material I work with does indeed qualify as “philosophy,” and that their favorite approaches to philosophical literature may not be the most fruitful. Early in my career, I had one philosophy graduate student in my seminars; lately, I have had not a single one. This can only mean that the Philosophy Department is discouraging their students from taking my classes. I know that they don't cross-list my classes, and they have never invited me to join their graduate groups (unlike the Department of History and the Department of Religious Studies). Why is this challenge so intractable? Because our Philosophy Department holds a narrow and backward-looking view of what constitutes “philosophy.”
- I use my book [reference deleted] to demonstrate the importance of comparative philosophy and the many ways in which Dewey and Confucius agree upon the absolute primacy of the social and human experience at a time of growing planetary tension.
- Part of it was encountering such a high percentage of students who are the first in their families to attend college. In the end, though, if the class is demanding and I push them hard, they are just as eager to learn as anyone else. I think it was a good challenge trying to figure out how to pitch a class on the *Analects*, or Zhuangzi, to a class with zero background.
- The problems I find more difficult are not specific to the case of Western students of Chinese philosophy, but are rather general problems that occur in many philosophy classes, such as students who are stubborn moral relativists, skeptics, and so forth, and who therefore do not feel much need to engage with or take the material seriously. To the extent that these problems are intractable, it is due to the difficult philosophical issues involved in providing the kinds of justifications needed to combat these positions.
- Mostly the challenges are those one faces in any philosophy course—difficult concepts, difficult readings, having students who are unwilling or unable to read assignments or write clear, well-reasoned papers.
- Chinese Romanization systems (both of them) are hard; and without formal training in Chinese, it's very hard for students to feel comfortable with them.
- I see no intractable problems. The classes I have taught are regularly very well subscribed and students demonstrate the ability to understand and appreciate the material.
- Just the institutional commitment to mediocrity and training students to “succeed” in the marketplace.
- Re (1): I suspect the difficulty here is my own, for my own lack of familiarity with Chinese language. Re (2): I have no idea how to address the fact that students just plain lack certain intuitions that Chinese thinkers tend to have.
- Categories in Chinese philosophy and in Confucianism in particular include the emotions. Neither moral philosophy nor most conceptions of Western religion allow for a practice to be considered ethics.
- That's a hard question. I suppose the reason may be that people come to education primarily to promote their status quo rather than to change it.
- I do not teach a course (survey or advanced) in Chinese philosophy specifically. But I do offer a freshman-sophomore level survey course on Asian and comparative philosophy (one third Chinese, one third Indian, and one

third Western). Let me mention some peculiarities of the survey course. Because of a declining faculty-student ratio, and also because our university is increasingly stingy in aid to graduate students unless it is keyed to their doing teaching-related work, we offer two or three large survey courses that qualify as introductions to philosophy, and in which graduate students handle discussion sections. Mine is one of these. In a large introductory course, which many students take simply to meet graduation requirements, it is inevitable that some of these students will be anti-intellectual and somewhat lacking in curiosity. One way to reach some of these will be described below, in the answer to Question 9. It does not work with everyone. On the other hand, a number of the brighter students become quite carried away by Chinese philosophy, especially (as my T.A.'s keep reporting) by the *Chuang-Tzu*, difficult though that is.

- All of the issues listed in Question 1 and Question 2 are ongoing and, while those are the methods I use to deal with them, I am constantly looking for better methods/approaches.
- (1) It may take a relatively long time to change the mind of analytically inclined philosophers. More graduate programs in Chinese philosophy and better job prospects will eventually make Chinese philosophy more attractive. (2) The Philosophy Department where Chinese philosophy courses are offered should try to cooperate with the Asian Studies Program so that more students can be drawn to Chinese philosophy. These students are more likely to understand and enjoy Chinese philosophy as they also learn from their program other cultural aspects of Asian (including Chinese) traditions.
- Well, perhaps not intractable, but formidable. One cannot simply pick up and teach a philosophical tradition (let's say of China) when one cannot presume their understanding of a worldview, vocabulary, history as one can with Western philosophical traditions.
- Because students usually can't read Chinese, because many translations are not very reliable, and because the secondary literature is often too sinological and philosophically not very useful.
- China and its civilization is not Western religion in kung fu outfits. It requires the students to think outside the box and not always make references to American life to understand it. It is a very difficult thing to ask.
- Honestly, my classes in Chinese philosophy have gone very well, at all levels slightly better than my courses in the history of Western philosophy. Getting philosophy students (particularly graduate students) to take Chinese philosophy can be a challenge, but student interest has grown steadily here. I wish I had more students who knew Chinese, and I've ended up doing independent studies to teach some classical Chinese.
- The intractable problems have to do with limitations of my own learning and the difficulties of getting American students to appreciate the importance of thinking critically about their own normative commitments. I work on these every year, but doubt that they allow of any final solution.
- The language is simply the language.
- To be frank, my greatest challenge in teaching Chinese philosophy lies with my philosophical colleagues' general refusal to recognize the legitimacy of my subject within their discipline.
- The intractable challenge is that the educational background of the modern student is increasingly deficient when it comes to history, world history, and foreign languages. American education is being dumbed down and politicized, and something like the truth about Zhou China doesn't fit such an agenda.
- There are many different types of student and a distinct ethos at almost each university. One class to reverse years of educational practices designed to privilege information is a difficult task.
- I don't see any intractable challenges. This isn't to claim my course is perfect, of course; but I do think it's actually the most successful of my various courses.
- I personally haven't found them to be intractable.
- First, the language problem cannot be readily solved, for apparent reasons. Sometimes I find a word-to-word correlation more helpful than a translation in understanding a certain sentence. An extreme example is, as some would hold, "white horse not horse" may be a better expression of Gongsun Longzi's "ba ma fei ma" than "a white horse is not a horse." Such problems relate to special behaviors of the languages, some of which still remain unknown to us. Second, the association of some Chinese philosophers with certain Western philosophical positions, although misleading as I said above, seems to be an easy way for the Western students to approach Chinese philosophy. Such a method is attractive and helpful for some students to obtain a general framework to begin with. Yet genuine understanding of Chinese philosophy requires one to do without this; at least the "isms" should come at the very end of the study, not at the beginning. This problem can be solved only in the process of gaining deeper and deeper familiarity with the Chinese texts.
- I didn't mention this above, but a key challenge is to get the students to read the texts as philosophic arguments and not just as cultural artifacts. If I can succeed in getting them to think through the ideas and proposals objectively, they will appreciate more deeply the cogency and suggestiveness of the ideas. They might even be persuaded by the Chinese philosophers to look at things in new ways. It is a great, great challenge to nudge American, including Chinese-American, students out of their cultural complacency and see and experience things anew.
- With regard to the first set of problems, my courses on Chinese philosophy are more or less electives. As such, they tend to attract students who take the course with strong preconceptions already in place, preconceptions of which it is hard to disabuse them. In some respects, though, the tendency for students to make sweeping generalizations about the Chinese thinkers is of a piece with their tendency to make sweeping generalizations about philosophers more generally. It takes time to appreciate the nuances of a particular thinker, whether that thinker is Mengzi or Plato.
- Even with non-specialists and lay people, I have not found the difficulties to be intractable. A short intro, however, is in order, but a commitment by the student to preparation and prior reading (perhaps several re-readings) of the text is essential. But that's no different from the problems with anything else you may be teaching.
- Our students arrive with little background or experience in, or curiosity about, foreign lands.
- Often the most difficult cases are philosophy majors who feel threatened by non-Western philosophies. Some of

my colleagues also have made disparaging remarks about the very inclusion of non-Western options in a philosophy department to students.

- Sometimes students are too passive in the class. Most of these students might take the course just to fulfill the General Education requirements.
- Again, English sources using Pinyin.
- The reason for this seems to be structural and threefold. 1) Chinese and East Asian history, literature, culture, and philosophy are rarely taught on the high school level in the USA. In addition, it is possible to earn an undergraduate education without any exposure to the academic study of the cultures of South and East Asia. 2) Cultural stereotypes about China and East Asia and, most of all, the “East versus West” rhetoric are perpetuated by teachers of American and European history, literature, religion, and philosophy. These stereotypes are also reinforced by a surprisingly high number of essays and volumes in the field of East Asian and comparative philosophy. 3) It also does not help that Chinese and East Asian philosophy is often relegated to area studies while all courses with area-neutral designations are presumed to fall in the field of Anglo-American and, sometimes, Continental European philosophy. For example, Mengzi and Xunzi are rarely included in courses on political philosophy and are mostly relegated to courses in Asian or Chinese philosophy.
- I believe the language barrier and ideological resistance can be overcome only through a long process of hard work and a gradual process of explication. There may not be sufficient resources (time, energy, devotion) for achieving such goals in introductory courses. Research on the attitudes toward and reception of Chinese thought before and after introductory courses may be a good help to start with.
- Once again, the difficulty of cultural context if you are not able to spend a semester with your students in China, Japan, etc. You’re asking them to suspend cultural assumptions and presenting something seemingly abstract and exotic. Very difficult to do this.
- I think we are making progress. We cannot overestimate the importance of wealth. As China rises in the contemporary world economically and politically, students are increasingly drawn to the task of understanding this culture better. And Chinese culture over the next few decades will help to reshape world culture. Perhaps the biggest obstacle is the recalcitrance of the professional discipline that remains persuaded that they do “real” philosophy while we do something else. But even this is shifting. Some key philosophers are showing some real professional interest these days in Chinese philosophy.
- The students are not motivated to learn about Asian or Chinese philosophy. It is difficult to instill motivation.
- Budget is needed to teach in smaller groups.
- I haven’t found the challenges in teaching Chinese philosophy any more intractable than those in teaching Western philosophy.
- I am not sure that they are intractable.
- I did not teach them enough comparative philosophy from the perspective of comparing Chinese and Western philosophies, because most of the Western students I taught were not philosophy majors.
- The main problem is the cultural background of students. Thus, those who have a good learning background can follow more easily. Another problem is that students of the first and second year have not enough Chinese linguistic footing.
- As mentioned earlier, adequate and accessible reading materials for lower-division courses are urgently needed. Students who have no background in Chinese language or culture are often at a loss as to how to approach the *Analects* or the *Daodejing*.
- Because too few students are willing to make the commitment of time and effort to gain historical knowledge and linguistic competence.
- (1) Language and interpretation: Since I do not know the original language, my interpretation of textual sources has to rely on translations. This is a real challenge because, for any canonical text, there are several English translations by competent scholars and diverse interpretations of key passages. This problem is especially visible when reading the *Dao De Jing*. Which one is the correct translation/interpretation? Who got it right? I have no way to answer these questions. (2) Relationship between classical texts and living communities: Confucianism, Daoism, and Buddhism are living traditions. The textbooks available tend to focus on “classical” texts and totally ignore the living communities where these texts are still authoritative. Thus, my course gave a somewhat distorted view of Chinese philosophy, a theoretical view isolated from what actual Confucians, Daoists, and Buddhists actually think. I cannot bridge the gap between Chinese religious studies and Chinese philosophy. I would appreciate textbooks that treat Chinese philosophy as a living tradition, not as something fossilized in texts. I noticed this while using *An Introduction to Chinese Philosophy: From Ancient Philosophy to Chinese Buddhism* by JeeLoo Liu. Her presentation of Buddhism is based exclusively on textual sources, totally ignoring the living schools of Chinese Buddhist thought and their interpretations of early sources.
- I don’t see any intractable challenges.
- Because there are students for different degrees, Ph.D. and M.A., in my class, the great difficulty for me is how to integrate them into the same understanding of the philosophers’ conceptions.
- The one philosopher that poses more challenges is Laozi, but I would not say he is intractable either. I only wish my Chinese were better so that I could give the students a better “taste” for the real thing.
- When students accept the differences between the Eastern and Western ways of thinking, there is no challenge.
- It is hard to imagine nothingness as an ideal.
- Some of the challenges are intractable because they are rooted in a lack of exposure to associative and correlative thinking in the curricula of most Western universities. With no background in the Chinese language, the hermeneutically sensitive students often feel they are doing injustice to the texts, because they are unable to read the primary sources in Chinese. Since the effort of engaging in years of language immersion seems too big a burden, they decide to continue focusing on texts that they are able to read in the original.

Question #4: In “How to Add Chinese Philosophy to Your Introductory Course,” Bryan W. Van Norden writes:

But instead of either Confucius or Laozi [or Zhuangzi (Chuang Tzu) or Han Feizi (Han Fei Tzu)], I recommend five philosophers for your introductory classes: Mozi (Mo Tzu), an agent-neutral consequentialist, Yang Zhu (Yang Chu), an egoist, Mengzi (Mencius), a Confucian virtue ethicist, Gongsun Longzi (Kung-sun Lung Tzu), the author of a sophistical dialogue, and Xunzi (Hsun Tzu), a Confucian virtue ethicist who was a critic of Mengzi.

In the context of this essay, “introductory course” and “introductory class” refer to introductory course and introductory class in philosophy that do not focus on Chinese thought. Do you agree with Van Norden? Why or why not?

The following are answers from survey respondents:

- I do not agree, although in fact I ask students to read selections by or relevant to the positions of those philosophers. The reason I don't agree is that treating them as Van Norden recommends assimilates them into debates in Western philosophy (as his descriptions of their positions indicate). Western philosophy is thus represented as defining the issues and the Chinese philosophers are represented as making or trying to make contributions to Western debates. If they are treated in this way, their work is apt to seem superficial (the arguments are often not well developed) and therefore not as important as that of Western philosophers. I think it is important for students to see that issues in Chinese philosophy arise out of confrontations between different Chinese philosophies.
- Hard for me to answer, because there are so many different ways of organizing a good introductory class. I take it that Bryan's goal is to help someone trained in Western philosophy to see roughly how to categorize, and thus fit into her or his course, some of the Chinese thinkers. There are benefits and costs to thinking about things in this way. Some good sides: it helps the instructor and students to see dialogue and debate in early China, and with that to see a diversity of views. Chinese philosophy is not all one thing. On the other hand, it surely risks making Chinese thought seem like a pale and idiosyncratic imitation of Western philosophy. I myself would prefer other ways of introducing Chinese thought than “Here's a Western egoist, and here's a Chinese one...”
- I agree that the contrast between Mencius and Xunzi is good to use for the intro course as they are quite accessible, but I think the concepts in the *Analects* (*jen, li, hsiao, tao*, etc.) are also very good as well as important, as they represent and describe the foundations of Chinese ethical thought. The *Tao Te Ching* is also wonderful to use and it is also quite accessible as well as known in the West.
- I agree that a greater variety of Chinese philosophers should be presented in order to present the full range of very viable philosophical options in classical Chinese thought. I also think Van Norden's choice of thinkers is generally good. The only thing I would leave out of an introductory class of the kind being described is the *Gongsun Lungzi*, because the “white horse” argumentation is going to seem quite mysterious without going very in-depth into Mohist and Daoist philosophy of language.
- I agree with Van Norden. If you had to pick only a few thinkers, this is a very good list, though I would take Zhuangzi rather than Yang Zhu. Zhuangzi is simply such a great thinker that I would never do without him. I also tell my classes if I had only one early classical thinker to introduce to my students or colleagues who know some philosophy, it would be Xunzi. First, Xunzi is brilliant. Second, he writes coherent philosophical essays that my students and friends would recognize as philosophical in the sense it is taught in most modern philosophy departments. If I had to choose just three or four for the whole history of Chinese philosophy, I would choose Zhuangzi, Xunzi, Zhu Xi, and Wang Yangming—if this were the Chinese part of an introduction to world philosophy. I believe that you cannot understand the sweep of Chinese thought (excluding Buddhism for another part of the course) without also including the Neo-Confucians.
- Van Norden probably recommends them because their exegetical style is more familiar to Western students. I agree with him that they might be profitably included in an introductory text as voices expressing positions that are compatible with certain already established Western positions. The problem, of course, is that they are not representative of the most important and uniquely valuable philosophical traditions in China, which deserve their own sections in an introductory text instead of being assimilated under established Western categories.
- I am not sure if there can be so much time to teach so many philosophers! Indeed, I am not sure if it is suitable to put a section “Chinese philosophy” in an introduction to philosophy course. Instead, it may be better to teach some thoughts from Chinese philosophy when the course is introducing, say, moral philosophy.
- No, I do not agree because I think it is best to include the schools of thought and texts that have been most influential in the Chinese tradition. In introductory courses, I have instead taught the *Analects* and the *Daodejing* for this reason. These texts also help students to appreciate the different ways/forms/styles in which philosophical and religious views can be presented.
- We try to avoid the jargon/cliché used in these statements (“egoist,” “consequentialist”). We discuss about 10 masters in our introductory class and also deal with neo-Confucianism and the more modern period.
- Van Norden has his tastes, and I have mine. One should use the works that one delights in discussing. Use the books that you find interesting, enjoyable, provocative, and that clash with Western ideas. In a regular course in philosophy, there isn't enough time to develop a sense of the Chinese material. You can teach them the words, but they won't make much of it. I'd say, “Forget it.” Give a course in Chinese philosophy. Don't induce the false impression that a week or so on several Chinese philosophers equates to a genuine understanding of the material. I have said, and I continue to believe, that in a regular introductory course in philosophy, there is not enough time to give students a genuine sense of the meaning of the Chinese texts. Of course, one can “teach” them, i.e., spend a week or so for the students to read the material and the instructor to talk about them. Given the cultural and intellectual divide, I think this must inevitably be superficial. As such, it is misleading because the students feel they've “done” the Chinese philosophy. You can teach the words, but not the meaning.
- I really cannot answer for the context of an intro philosophy class not focused on China. I regularly teach Confucius,

Mencius, Laozi, and Han Feizi from Ivanhoe and Van Norden because of their impact on future Chinese thought. Given that Confucius is foundational for East Asian culture, skipping right to Mencius doesn't lay the foundation I want the students to have.

- Actually, it's still a conceptual leap to assume that these classes will include Chinese figures. That said, I don't see what is wrong with Confucius, Laozi, or Han Feizi. Of course, the others mentioned are also quite interesting. Why must this be an either/or thing?
- Well, the problem is whether or not introductory comparisons work. I've not found them to. Students are confused and intimidated enough by Western philosophy; adding the extra onus of comparing/contrasting that tradition with Chinese thinkers does not help either task. I'd be more comfortable with using these thinkers in an advanced course. I haven't figured out how to do that yet because I'm not interested in "add Confucius and stir." I think it doesn't do much good to expose students to Ancient Chinese Thought with one text because it can so easily get amalgamated into the flow of Western thought.
- The key words in the paragraph cited seem to be "instead of." I consider *all* of these thinkers essential, including the ones suggested for extinction. I really don't see how you can understand Zhuangzi without a knowledge of Laozi, or, even more so, Mencius and Mozi without a knowledge of Confucius. I don't like Hobson's choices when it comes to pedagogy.
- I do not agree. There is little hard evidence that Yang Zhu was a real figure; at any rate, nothing of his work survives, and we are forced to read only the brief characterization of his position by Mencius, who was a fierce detractor. This does not strike me as suitable material for an introductory course. The only attraction would be that Yang Zhu's supposed "egoism" seems commensurate with a familiar Western model. In Gongsun Longzi, Van Norden has selected another philosopher with virtually no influence in the Chinese world; again the reason seems to be that his supposed "nominalism" is something that Western philosophers can readily appreciate.
- I do not agree because using tags and labels like those mentioned above puts students off immediately and prevents them from taking up in their own lives the actual experience of ancient Chinese culture. This type of teaching, however important to specialists, is guaranteed to send students fleeing from the classroom. It was in protest to such labeling that Hegel argued so persuasively in the Preface to his *Phenomenology of Spirit*. Philosophy must be lived through by struggle and easy tag lines give us a dead corpse.
- As different professors teach the introductory course differently, they should also be the final judge about which Chinese philosophers should be included, partially depending upon how the course itself is structured and partially depending upon the interest and expertise of the instructor. In any case, I will not include Yang Chu, as there is really no writing of his left; on the other hand, it is really strange not to teach Confucius, Laozi, or Zhuangzi.
- I disagree. In my World Civilizations course, I have them read excerpts from Confucius and Laozi over the course of two classes. The purpose is to see how the two philosophers are similar. These Western labels do not really do much to illuminate the source itself, so I avoid them.
- I have not taught an "introductory course" in the sense referred to here. I agree with Van Norden that Confucius, Laozi, and Zhuangzi are probably less desirable for such a course than the other five he mentions. I would probably not use Yang Zhu for an introductory class, but would consider using Han Feizi. I would probably not use Yang Zhu because of questions about the authenticity of the source materials. I would consider using Han Feizi as a useful contrast on matters of political philosophy, in particular as an example of someone who argues for an amoral approach to politics.
- If you are talking about an Introduction to Philosophy course, I could see adding all these except Kung-sun Lung Tzu. But perhaps that is because of my limited background in his thought.
- I disagree. On the one hand, Confucius and Laozi are "touchstone" figures—the students tend to have some passing knowledge of them, if not much about them or their associated texts. It would be misleading to present an introduction to Chinese thought without studying them. Also, Yang Zhu has no representative writings; the only thing we know about him comes from Mencius, and only very cursorily. Finally, the Gongsun Longzi texts are extremely difficult to understand, even with knowledge of Classical Chinese, much less for the intro student.
- The people he suggests are fine but I do not see any reason not to teach the other philosophers mentioned. It is all a matter of *how* they are taught. Students can learn from any of them, especially if the right secondary literature is used in class.
- Can't say I agree really since many of these thinkers are far less interesting and students really are hankering to understand Confucius and love the Daoists. Perhaps Vassar students are different—and I sure hope so for Bryan!
- I disagree. Confucius is central to the entire philosophical problematic, and he is what students are expecting to learn about. If one were to follow Van Norden's suggestion, I don't see how one would be able to motivate the issues in a way that doesn't seem silly and that doesn't distort the discussion to fit into the Western philosophical tradition.
- Well, I am skeptical of any such blanket claim. There are many things one might be trying to do in an introductory course, and hence many approaches. If one of the goals is to introduce students to the major figures in Chinese thought, it may make sense to focus on the major figures in Chinese thought, even if some of them are less immediately tractable to students.
- Van Norden is right about the difficulties of Confucius. But many of these are mainly the result of the fact that, in the *Analects*, passages on any given topic can be scattered. It has seemed to me that the difficulties dwindle considerably if one presents a group of scattered passages as interrelated, so the students get a clear view of a number of related points at once.
- I disagree. (a) Not sufficiently representative of the pre-Qin period: The debates of these five thinkers, while immensely important, are overwhelmingly in the area of ethics. Gongsun Longzi is about the only thinker in the list who offers an introduction to areas other than ethics in Chinese philosophy. Legalist philosophy is an integral part of Chinese philosophy (think about the debates on government in the Han dynasty and after); Daoist philosophy offers opportunities to reflect on metaphysics as well as philosophy of language. (b) Not sufficiently representative of Chinese philosophy as a whole: What

about discussions in the Han and after? Daoist-Legalist notions of government? Neo-Confucianism? And some would say, Chinese Buddhism? (c) The classification of the five thinkers is based very much on Western philosophical terms: “consequentialist,” “egoist,” “virtue ethicist,” “sophistical dialogue.” Sure, one could begin with these categories that students are more familiar with and work through them to show how subtly different Chinese philosophical thinking is. But isn’t that double the work, and could be misleading if one is not careful?

- Totally disagree. Are we teaching Chinese philosophy without Confucius or Laozi? Can one teach Greek philosophy without Plato or Aristotle? Any Chinese philosopher is helpful in an intro course. But I believe Confucius and Laozi should be among the first ones.
- I basically agree with Van Norden. In terms of feasibility and practicality, Van Norden’s suggestion makes sense, for Confucius, Laozi, and Zhuangzi are indeed less easy to understand, and there is a danger that beginners may end up empty-minded after struggling with the *Analects*, the *Daodejing*, and the *Zhuangzi*. However, one may wonder if this suggestion waters down Chinese philosophy. It may also give students a misleading impression that Chinese philosophy is *no* different from Western philosophy at all, either in content or in style. At least Van Norden’s suggestion could be balanced by introducing some comparatively accessible concepts or ideas from Confucius, Laozi, or Zhuangzi.
- No. I don’t agree with Van Norden (although I’m not suggesting that his approach might not work for him). Confucius has influenced more human beings than any other person who has ever lived. You cannot understand the cultural and social moorings of East Asia (China, Korea, Japan) unless you understand Confucianism. That means beginning with some of the *Analects*, some of the *24 Filial Exemplars*, and maybe showing how something contemporary (Japanese business, for example) was much indebted to Confucianism. Also, I think that well selected passages from the *Zhuangzi* work extremely well to show many of the central notions of Daoism and serve as important critiques of some Western philosophical ideas.
- I totally disagree. Van Norden’s classifications are, well, quite idiosyncratic and the statement is, well, quite daring. To recommend excluding Kongzi and Laozi is like recommending to exclude Plato and Aristotle from a curriculum on Greek philosophy.
- Partly disagree as these names are even less familiar to our students. They don’t create any bridge to bring them into the field.
- Good project! I’m sorry, this request finds me at an impossibly busy time, but I must respond at least to the question concerning Van Norden’s ideas, which I find represent the very worst way to go about teaching Chinese philosophy: namely, to approach it with one’s mind full of inappropriate Western (analytic!) categories—consequentialism, egoism, virtue ethics, etc. His work is an egregious example of bad hermeneutic practice: keep a firm hold on one’s own Western concepts and categories (which are obviously perfect and true) and then see what from these muddled thinkers from the mystic East manages to survive being passed through those filters (which is usually very little that’s undistorted). I have been teaching the *Analects*, the *Laozi*, and the *Zhuangzi* to undergraduates for over thirty years, with success—or

else I would have stopped trying using those texts long ago. The course in which I have been teaching the *Analects*, the *Laozi*, and the *Zhuangzi* for over thirty years is a first-year introduction to philosophy in general.

- I partly agree, but if you are going to do more than one Chinese text, it seems like you need to cover Daoism, not only for its importance but also because that is what students are most interested in. I have taught Zhuangzi many times in all levels of courses and I think it works well, so I would recommend it as a first or second choice. You need to set out one interpretation (at least for an introductory level course; for a higher level class, you might propose two and then debate them), even though many are possible. I often divide students into groups to discuss key stories (like the butterfly dream, or the death of Zhuangzi’s wife) and students like that and come up with interesting things. Also, Buddhism should not be forgotten. I would not include Yang Zhu, unless one was doing readings from the *Zhuangzi* and the *Lüshi Chunqiu*. My own approach would not be to present the texts as they fall into Western categories.
- I don’t think that there is a general best way to introduce Chinese philosophy in introductions to philosophy since those sorts of courses are various. And I don’t think any view of philosophy that supports such a decision is neutral. I teach an intro course on the ideal of honor. I use the *Analects* in my intro to philosophy because I can use it to address some questions that arise about what it means to be an honorable person. I contrast Confucius’s views with Aristotle’s. In my intro to Chinese philosophy courses, I offer abbreviated histories of early Chinese philosophy. I think it is important in these courses to read texts that establish the ways in which early Chinese philosophy differs from its Western counterparts.
- I usually use Mo Tzu, Mencius, and Hsun Tzu. One can compare and contrast them in interesting and relevant ways.
- Van Norden’s suggestion makes sense to me, insofar as it prescribes Chinese thinkers whose projects are more amenable to Western philosophical analysis than those expressed in the *Lunyu*, *Zhuangzi*, *Laozi*, etc.
- Wow. I really disagree. An introductory course with Chinese philosophy that *doesn’t* begin with Confucius and/or Laozi is misrepresenting the tradition and cheating the students. It would be like teaching Anaxagoras but not Socrates, Zeno of Elea but not Plato. It would give students the wrong idea about what was important and influential to the Chinese, and other East Asian countries, themselves.
- I have no opinion on Han Feizi, but in the other cases it seems clear that Van Norden is right to avoid the extremely complex, the extremely poetic/oracular, and the extremely ironic texts in favor of the more clear contrasts.
- Yes, I use Mencius and Xunzi effectively in an intro class on moral psychology. Laozi and Confucius are much harder for non-specialists to sink their teeth into, analytically, without substantial outside help.
- This advice is impractical. It’s difficult to add more Chinese philosophers in an introductory course. Is the course just on Chinese philosophy? I teach a Western philosophy oriented introductory course and include a significant Chinese philosophy component in it. I simply don’t have enough time for more Chinese philosophers. In a course like this, students should be introduced to only the most important Chinese philosophers. However, in an upper-

division course on Chinese philosophy, I have time to cover more than just 2 traditions and 2 philosophers.

- I do not fully agree. Although Han Feizi can be deleted from an introductory course, Confucius and Laozi certainly cannot be ignored. The reason is that Confucius and Laozi, as it is generally held, represent two pillars (out of three) that sustain the whole Chinese culture and therefore are key to understanding why the Chinese thought and society are formed and evolved as they are. I agree to add Mozi, not only because he was the strongest critic of Confucianism at his time, but also because the Mohist theory, especially the theory of logic, is both one of the greatest aspects of the Chinese thought and one of the most important clues to understanding the Chinese way of thinking, and yet much work remains to be done in clearing up the theory. I also agree to add Mengzi, because he is a necessary component of Confucianism, independent of and complementary to Confucius. The relation of Zhuangzi to Laozi may be regarded as similar to that of Mengzi to Confucius, and Zhuangzi is thus also a good choice. On the other hand, neither Xunzi nor Gongsun Longzi is in the same sense a must read, but I do not object to adding them if the instructor is interested in doing so. Yang Zhu is rather marginal and can be neglected. My suggestion, therefore, is the following list: Confucius and Mengzi (Confucianism), Laozi and Zhuangzi (Daoism), and Mozi (Mohism), leaving Xunzi and Gongsun Longzi as optional with the instructor.
- Van Norden seems to be quite a reductionist and a pigeonholer. I guess that reflects his approach to the introduction to philosophy. He seems to like to outline and juxtapose various ethical theories, I suppose, for the students to contemplate and to imagine where various Chinese philosophers fall in their intuitive views. I don't like his approach because he turns these life thinkers into textbook strawmen.
- I strongly agree, and for three reasons. First, the works of Confucius and Laozi tend to be too pithy and disjointed for students to grasp in a short period of time (as an introductory class generally requires). Second, the latter set of philosophers identified by Van Norden makes for better comparative material, as their views are indeed in the neighborhood of the views that Western philosophers identify as agent-neutral consequentialism, virtue ethics, and so on. Finally, far too many people doubt that Chinese thought is properly philosophical, precisely because they are familiar with only Confucius and Laozi and unfamiliar with Mozi, Gongsun Longzi, Xunzi, etc. My only reservation is that I think Han Feizi also belongs on the list of philosophers worth including in an introductory course, at least in one that addresses at some length issues in political philosophy.
- This depends on how much time you have for your class. If you have time, why not? Personally, I like to focus on a few more important classics in teaching Chinese philosophy.
- I am not sure if I understand Van Norden's citation as given here without the context. If that citation means indiscriminately using the listed five to replace Confucius and Lao Zi/Zhuang Zi, I'm afraid I largely disagree. (Yes, Han Feizi can be excluded, but neither Confucius nor Lao Zi/Zhuang Zi can in most cases). Confucius and Lao Zi/Zhuang Zi are the founding figures of the two major movements of thought throughout the Chinese philosophical traditions who are so important that any intro texts cannot afford to ignore them. And Lao Zi's/Zhuang Zi's thoughts include rich visions and resources for metaphysics, epistemology, philosophy of language and mind, etc. The addition of these five together with four moral-approach labels shows that this addition is basically ethics (moral/social/political philosophy) oriented. However, what are most philosophically interesting and significant in the classical Chinese philosophy are not limited to moral/social/political philosophy, but include those ideas concerning metaphysics, epistemology, philosophy of language and mind, etc. In this way, unless an intro class is pre-set to be ethics oriented (even in this case, Confucius's thoughts in the *Analects* arguably need to be included, surely, in a philosophically interesting way), there needs to cover at least Lao Zi's/Zhuang Zi's thoughts with regard to metaphysics, epistemology, etc., if this intro class is set to cover the issues of these areas. Two more notes. First, the *yin-yang* metaphysical/methodological vision in the *Yi-Jing* philosophy need to be more or less included as it is so important for understanding Chinese philosophy, especially with regard to some of its fundamental ways of thinking. Second, indeed, an old stereotypical understanding of the value of Chinese philosophy is that the classical Chinese philosophy is valuable only or basically with regard to its moral/social/political philosophy; the rich and solid scholarship especially in the last two decades has already sufficiently shown that this stereotypical understanding is incorrect.
- The supposed "difficulty" in teaching Confucius, I suggest, is that Westerners are generally provided with almost no access to the Chinese commentarial tradition—except a bit in Edward G. Slingerland's *Analects*—and are aware of very little historical context. To resolve these problems, I have produced a new translation of the *Analects*, which includes a short bio of Confucius, a discussion of Chinese history prior to Confucius, extensive discussion of the various major commentaries relating to the problems referenced within each analect, a concordance (usage of key Chinese characters and their locations within each analect), a chronology of dynasties from Yao to the present, a chronology of the Zhou dynasty including a more or less year-by-year chronology of Confucius's own activities during his lifetime, and an extensive bibliography of alternative translations and suggested reference texts.
- Both the fame of Confucius and the presumption of familiarity with the *Analects* by later Confucian and non-Confucian writers make Van Norden's proposal of *not* starting with the *Analects* problematic. My teaching of Chinese thought is now limited to a core (i.e., non-major) senior seminar that compares foundational philosophical thinkers in China with foundational philosophical thinkers in the U.S. (Emerson, Thoreau) and compares each to their inheritance by and for contemporary political forces in their home countries. Since, then, the interest of the course is in how philosophical teaching (d)evolves when it is appropriated by the political, we have good reason to start with the *Analects*. Despite the aforementioned disagreement with Van Norden on what texts to start with, his articles for this APA committee and at his website have been useful to me.
- I think we should read Confucius first. The *Analects* is the first of all Chinese classics. It presents the family-oriented ethics, the seed of morality.
- I have used some of the unrecommended philosophers

in intro classes as well as some of those recommended. As a suggestion I would agree that one should look at less discussed choices, but it depends on the background and interests of the instructor ultimately. What I find conspicuously missing is mention of any Chinese Buddhist philosophers or contemporary Chinese philosophers.

- I agree with Bryan. Actually, all of these authors are included in my course, though with different proportionality. It is mainly because I start with a discussion of the Chinese way of thinking and my approach is basically problem-oriented.
- I teach a class on Classical Confucianism only, thus the Daoists and other interesting philosophers are not covered. However, in the past, I used to teach a two-semester course on Asian philosophies, in which I did cover Van Norden's list. The problem then and now is English source material on such relatively minor philosophers as Mozi, Yang Zhu, and Gongsun Longzi. I could not offer a semester's course on any one of these three. But I did include them briefly to show the many philosophies that flourished during the Golden Age.
- I agree for two reasons. 1) The inclusion of a multiplicity of thinkers and texts in the classroom demonstrates to American students the diversity of Chinese philosophy. 2) It is a lot easier to apply Mozi, Xunzi, and Gongsun Longzi to the discourses prevalent in the philosophical traditions of Europe and America than the texts of the Big Three (Confucius, Laozi, and Zhuangzi), excluding the second chapter of the *Zhuangzi*. It also makes it harder to disqualify them as "texts of sages" and "less philosophical" than the traditional canon of philosophical texts from the traditions of Europe and America as it is frequently done in the case of Confucius's *Lunyu* and Laozi's *Daodejing*.
- I think an instructor should be free to choose a Chinese philosopher in relation to whom he or she is most familiar and resourceful for teaching. Considering Van Norden's list, I agree that Mencius, Xunzi, and Mo Zi can prove to be more accessible to beginners (though we should be cautious in defining them with such loaded Western terms as "virtue ethicist" or "agent-neutral consequentialist"). I don't know about Yang Zhu or Gongsun Longzi; they may be good depending on the instructor's philosophical background.
- No. While I greatly appreciate these philosophers, they in many ways are a response to what has come before. So you need to know the basic message first to understand the latter.
- Van Norden is shoehorning Chinese philosophy into Western categories, making its encounter with Western philosophy its defining moment. Western missionaries were able to find Christianity in China by interpreting Chinese philosophy through that lens; Van Norden is doing the same thing philosophically. He is generously allowing the Chinese tradition to be an alternative version of what we do. I teach an intro to philosophy course that uses Plato, Confucius, and Dewey, using Plato to bring familiar assumptions up on the screen. I then use Confucius to persuade the students that there is more than one way to organize the human experience and that, in many respects, the Chinese emphasis on personal cultivation within family and community complements Plato's search for regulative ideals. We need both partiality and objectivity, both imagination and reason, to become morally competent. I then use Dewey as a representative of the 20th-century internal critique being waged within the Western narrative

against substance ontology and all of the dualisms that arise out of Plato's metaphysical realism. This opens a door for Western and Chinese philosophy to embark on an inclusive conversation.

- This is not clear. I do not understand the question. Are the 5 books good books to use? Is that the question? Yes, they are good books. I always use the *Analecets* and the Lao-Zhuang texts.
- Disagree. Confucius's "Human beings can broaden the Way—it is not the Way that broadens human beings" is essential in the comparative context, as the diametrical opposite of "God created heaven and earth." Laozi can't be compromised for the ideas of mystery and ineffability. Zhuangzi is the example *par excellence* for skepticism, which allows existence as is. (Han Feizi—I agree.)
- In my introductory courses not devoted to Chinese philosophy, I use only Western texts.
- All these Chinese philosophers are covered in my class, and they all should be introduced to Western students.
- Various are starting methods, and each can be valuable, according to the ability to present them. I would start with thinkers who can attract the interest of students and are easy to understand. I would start with Mencius, Xunzi, Zhuangzi, and Liezi.
- I disagree. Most students who take an introductory course in Chinese philosophy will probably never take another course in Chinese philosophy. So it is essential that they are introduced to the primary text of the *Analecets*. If not, they can hardly be seen as cultured.
- It is not so much a question of whether one agrees—most pre-Qin philosophers have aspects which students can relate to. It does seem strange that the list includes only pre-Qin thinkers.
- I find the suggestion problematic. It is too idealistic and out of touch with the nature of introductory courses to philosophy. You can teach introduction to philosophy either by focusing on basic concepts and philosophical issues, or by providing a survey of world philosophies or worldviews, a survey that hopefully one day will replace the still prevalent introduction to the history of Western philosophy. If you adopt the former approach, that is, introducing fundamental philosophical concepts and issues, there is no way you can incorporate the thought of so many Chinese thinkers. If you adopt the latter approach, that is, providing a survey of world philosophies or worldviews, you are supposed to discuss the most influential thinkers. I fail to see how someone can introduce the Confucian worldview without Confucius or the Daoist worldview without Laozi.
- Well, to a certain extent, I agree, since the materials Van Norden suggests are philosophically provocative and match up well to materials in the classical Western canon. But I am concerned about contextualization and don't want to teach obscure materials at the expense of other, more well-known authors.
- Van Norden's suggestion is reasonable and important, but not suitable for an introductory course or an introductory class in philosophy that does not focus on Chinese thought. Even for an introductory course or an introductory class in philosophy that focuses on Chinese thought, we need more background of pre-Qin Chinese philosophical schools and an outline of what the members of these schools argue for, if we hope our students really understand what they learn.

Some Western philosophical concepts cannot exactly cover what those philosophers want to say.

- No, I don't agree with Van Norden, because Confucius, Laozi, and Zhuangzi are the representatives of Chinese philosophy both in China and in the West. If you want to introduce Chinese philosophy to the Western students who don't want to learn Chinese philosophy as their major or second degree, please tell them who the most outstanding philosophers representing Chinese culture are.
- I have not had any major issues with the philosophers mentioned. Of the five others Van Norden recommends, I actually use only Mozi, Mengzi, and Xunzi. They all seem to work fine for me.
- I do *not* agree. Much as I admire Van Norden in other respects, he seems to put Chinese philosophy into a set of Western categories. Feng Youlan did this too, but that was several generations ago. This may be okay, but only *after* students have had enough Confucius and Zhuangzi (no Laozi—I am an analytic philosopher by training and have a difficult time dealing with philosophy as poetry, whether in Heidegger or Laozi—probably a personal limitation). The most important thing—well, one of the most important things—Western philosophy can learn from Chinese philosophy is that our categories (agent-neutral consequentialist, egoist, virtue ethicist—not to mention, sophist, relativist, realist, the appearance/reality distinction, the transcendent realm of God and mathematics as radically different from the world of experience in which we live, etc.) are not the only possible ones. If you begin with a different set of assumptions or categories, you get a different kind of philosophy.
- I do not agree with Van Norden. In terms of their influences on the later periods in Chinese history, those five philosophers are minor philosophers. Especially in the introductory course, emphasis should be on the major philosophers. It is always nice for students to know more than less. But I don't think one can say that “instead of” the major ones, one prefers to teach the minor ones. One more thing I want to say is that Han Fei Tzu cannot be treated on the same level as Confucius, Lao Tzu, or Chuang Tzu, and that the last two cannot be replaced by anyone.
- I think Van Norden is far too committed to Confucius and Confucian thought. Americans love Confucius because he is such a positivist and a respecter of persons, especially family. They do not, in general, know just how perverted classical Confucianism became as the centuries passed, a great deal like institutional Christianity. By “positivist” I mean that Confucius avoids speculation in the realm of metaphysics, faith, cosmology, etc. He confines his doctrine to the ethics, rituals (essential practices), and practical conduct of human affairs. This allows modern students to read him pretty much as a social theorist, without the difficulties of spiritual or even natural philosophy. Taoists, in contrast, insist on metaphysical premises that underlie all their assertions about human conduct and reduce the Confucian agenda to a minimalist dimension. It really is minimalist, though not as pedantic as it becomes under the later Neo-Confucian traditionalists.
- Given that the above-recommended philosophers respond to Confucius and/or Laozi, I would be hesitant to focus on these later classics without having first introduced the students to the primary classics.

Question #5: Assuming that Van Norden is right, what is it about the work of Confucius, Laozi, Zhuangzi (Chuang Tzu), or Han Feizi (Han Fei Tzu) that makes the task of teaching it to Western students so challenging?

The following are answers from survey respondents:

- As indicated, I do not think that Van Norden is correct. I do, however, think that Confucius and Laozi are difficult to teach and I think this is primarily because their work lacks arguments. I have not tried to teach Han Feizi, so I'm not sure what to say about him.
- The challenges are different about each of them. Certainly with the first three, it takes a lot of work—if it is possible at all—to find a “system” in their writings. But each of them (again, especially the first three) is wonderfully rich and challenging. In my experience, Western students *like* the challenge of grappling with such texts. Seeing how one can begin to make sense of—and indeed, find insight in—these materials can be very satisfying.
- I guess the primary sources are at times obscure, and the instructor has to have a personal way of explaining them that would make sense to the students. It would be difficult for those who are not at all familiar with Chinese thought to teach the material.
- Part of the difficulty lies in the genre of the works: Confucius and the *Dao De Jing* are very aphoristic, the *Zhuangzi* is a collection of narratives, and the *Han Feizi* advocates a political order that the students are not sympathetic with. Part of the challenge also lies in explaining how important the Warring States Period is as a contextual background to the debates between the schools of the period. If the students don't understand how each school is an attempt to respond to the social chaos brought about by Zhuan Guo, then much of what these texts have to say to one another and to us will be lost.
- Let's take Kongzi. It is like teaching the pre-Socratics. The *Analects* introduces the themes that become important but it is not a very philosophically coherent text. You really have to move to Mengzi, or even better Xunzi, if you want to present something they can deal with in the classical period. But teaching the other thinkers does let you grapple with trying to explain that one of the benefits of studying Chinese philosophy is learning to deal with a really different philosophical world. Actually, Hanfeizi makes sense to my students even if they don't like the social consequences of his thought.
- They fall under different and unfamiliar cognitive paradigms.
- I suppose that can be a good example of different moral theories in different cultures, and so it is a benefit to the discussion of cultural relativism.
- The format of the *Analects* and the *Daodejing* certainly distinguishes them from traditional ways of presenting philosophical views in the Western tradition.
- I haven't had more difficulty with them than with Mozi, Yang Zhu, and Gongsun Longzi. In fact, it's sometimes scary how sympathetic the students are to Han Feizi after reading Confucius, Mencius, and Laozi. His doctrines are pragmatic. Different philosophers appeal to different students.
- I don't find it all that challenging. In fact, other than the strangeness factor, I find that many of the Confucian intellectual moves are more easily assimilated than strange notions like “eternal forms.”

- I take Confucius to be a different kind of thinker than the other two because Zhuangzi and Han Feizi can pretty easily be “translated” into Western argot. Zhuangzi is often made a typical Western skeptic or relativist; Han Feizi is so delightfully cynical that students love him.
- First of all, for the reasons stated in the answer to Question 4, I’m not prepared to make such an assumption. I fail to understand why the author of the passage is intent on replacing Confucius, Laozi, and Han Feizi. Is it that they are too challenging for contemporary college students? Are Mencius, Xunzi, and Gongsun Lunzi any less challenging? In other words, I don’t see the connection between the passage in Question 4 and Question 5.
- I disagree that the work of Confucius, Laozi, Zhuangzi, or Han Feizi are inordinately challenging to teach.
- I do not think he is right and I have never found American students resistant to ancient Chinese philosophy once they are introduced to it in a living way.
- I cannot imagine an idea of Chinese philosophy without Confucius, Laozi, or Zhuangzi. If asked to make a survey about three most important Chinese philosophers, these three would be my answer. Perhaps it is easy to teach Van Norden’s five philosophers to Western students, as they are closer to Western philosophy, but if so they should not study Chinese philosophy in the first place, as Western philosophers are better according to the underlying criterion of the choice of the five. Han Feizi is interesting, but for an introductory course, it should be up to the instructors.
- I don’t think they are any more challenging than teaching Plato.
- As I read Van Norden, his point is not that these texts are somehow more difficult specifically for Western students. Rather, I take it that his point is that these texts (or at least the first three) are more difficult for students and teachers *in general*, and I agree with him. As he notes in the article in question, the *Analects* consists mostly of very short passages. To get a sense of what Confucius thinks requires jumping from one passage to another and piecing together a more organized picture from the text, a skill that most beginning philosophy students do not possess or exercise well. Working on the *Daodejing* likewise requires such skills, so it, too, can be difficult for beginners. Furthermore, both the *Daodejing* and the *Zhuangzi* deliberately use quite vague and metaphorical language, and so they are much less straightforward to interpret, which makes them difficult to teach, especially if, as is normal for an introductory course, one is stressing to the students skills of analysis and clear thinking.
- I don’t know why he singles these out; Van Norden always has his own agendas that he thinks should be expressed as canonical in the field.
- In the case of Confucius and Laozi, I would guess that Van Norden is concerned that the unsystematic nature of these texts makes it more challenging for students to see the arguments. To some extent this is true of Zhuangzi (but it is pretty easy to tease out his views). Han Feizi is quite accessible, clear, and employs a systematic essay style. He is a profound and powerful political thinker. I can’t imagine why one would not teach him, unless one is not interested in covering political philosophy.
- I just don’t think it’s any more challenging than teaching Plato, Nietzsche, Heidegger, or most other Western thinkers.
- They are not written in a traditional Western style. (Same problem comes up with Descartes’s *Meditations* and Berkeley’s *Dialogues*). The students lack a shared background and set of concerns. (They have a different cultural gestalt).
- The categories of metaphysics and epistemology seldom work. In *What Is Ancient Philosophy?* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002), Pierre Hadot argued that early Greek philosophy was a spiritual exercise, and that viewpoint is quite similar to the classical Confucian texts.
- I do not agree that teaching any of these thinkers is any more difficult than teaching the works of any other Chinese thinker of the same period.
- Their philosophies are not argumentative. But this can be remedied by reconstructing arguments for their positions.
- (1) Their writing style is generally not argumentative. (2) Their content is diverse. (3) For many ideas of these philosophers, it is not easy to find functional equivalents in Western philosophy.
- This question is a little unclear to me, but I certainly think that the new work on teaching Confucianism done by the American Academy of Religion—Jeffrey L. Richey, ed., *Teaching Confucianism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008)—has fine suggestions for teaching Western students.
- Because students usually can’t read Chinese, because many translations are not very reliable, and because the secondary literature is often too sinological and philosophically not very useful. And comments like those by Van Norden.
- We have to overcome Genesis. No Garden of Eden, apple, tree of wisdom, serpent, or Adam and Eve. So where do we begin? Monkey offers a way of beginning as students can identify with his desire to be human, to be powerful, to be respected, and to control anger, greed, and pride.
- I find the *Analects* to be too fragmentary and to lack arguments, and I don’t even think it is coherent as a text, being written by many people over time. The *Dao De Jing* is just too ambiguous for an introductory level course, and it is too difficult to keep students from reading their own views into it. I have taught it several times in advanced level courses, and it works fine but is still difficult to deal with philosophically. As said in my answer to Question 4, I think Zhuangzi works quite well at all levels. Han Feizi doesn’t seem so difficult to teach, but would only make sense after reading some Confucian texts, particularly Xunzi.
- I just think he is wrong. I have not read his essay, but I tend to think how one picks texts for such a course in part reflects one’s view of philosophy. If you think that it consists in developing different types of theories, with their distinctive forms of arguments, then you might go with Van Norden’s list. My students find the texts Van Norden rules out engaging even if challenging. In my Chinese philosophy course, which serves as an intro course, I teach the course historically, not just in terms of set problems. I think the historical narrative is key to helping students make sense of these texts. So my focus is on Confucius’s view of moral inquiry and moral cultivation, Mozi’s reply, subsequent debates about human nature, and Zhuangzi’s critique of post-*Analects* debates. I fear that Van Norden’s approach makes the early Chinese tradition look more like Western philosophy than it really is.

- Actually, I am not sure Confucius is more challenging. For one thing, students have heard of Confucius and are curious.
- Actually, I find the *Zhuangzi* fairly easy to teach, if only because I tend to focus on the so-called “inner chapters,” which are more coherent than other portions of the text. I once taught an entire upper-level seminar on the *Laozi*, and someday hope to offer a similar course on the *Lunyu*. In this case, I found it useful to engage students in the very work that Chinese philosophical traditions have performed with regard to the text—that is, reasoning through the disparate layers of a heterogeneous anthology to identify what, if anything, constitutes the basis for their combination in this form, much less the identification of “Laozi” as a coherent thinker. I rarely teach the *Hanfeizi*, so I have no comment on that subject.
- Well, Van Norden is wrong. What is challenging for Western students about Confucius, however, is a concern with personal morality that is no longer fashionable. Also, Confucius describes a hierarchical society, where everyone has duties involving the “Sex Relations,” and this has become very foreign. ‘Hierarchy’ has become a bad word. Perhaps Van Norden wants to avoid it. The paradoxes of Daoism, however, are challenging just for their paradoxical nature. Not all philosophical treatments get it right.
- These texts are most of all nuanced, balanced, and demanding of independent student initiative, which is a goal at this level, not a starting point.
- Confucius and Laozi don’t present structured arguments of the sort that readers of philosophy expect in the contemporary Western academy. I wouldn’t say that Zhuangzi or Han Feizi is any less accessible than Gongsun Longzi or Yang Zhu. The most accessible, due to their essay-like argumentative style, are Xunzi and Mozi.
- (1) What I said in answer to Question 1 applies here as well: translation problems and lack of cultural and historical background. Students tend to be able to relate to only their own temporal and spatial experience. (2) Philosophical presuppositions vary between China and the West. Just to give you a simple illustration, Confucianism emphasizes order and society while the West emphasizes individuality and individual rights. The presuppositions clash. Few situations are more challenging.
- The works of Laozi and Zhuangzi are notoriously obscure, due to the poetic and allegoric style of the writings. Some say that it is almost hopeless to understand the ideas and arguments involved if the “understanding” is to be construed in the Western philosophical context. Neither can Confucius’s *Analects*, though less obscure, be seen as providing a theory consisting of definitions and arguments. All of this may give Western students the impression that these works contain only aphorisms and stories and can hardly be taken seriously as works of philosophy.
- It is not so difficult to introduce Confucius if the teacher presents him in light of the group of ethical-social-political problems he was addressing. He formulated his ideas in response to the problems of his age and in light of the ideals presented by the earlier sage kings. When the teacher sketches this background, Confucius’s ideas make eminently good sense. I was cued to this approach when a German scholar at a conference on translation said that when one encounters Confucius’s term ‘ren,’ one has to ask oneself what problems Confucius was addressing, what gaps in the people’s ethical life he was attempting to fill in, etc. Laozi was facing many of the same problems and issues, though his strategies were different and more sophisticated. It is effective to present Laozi in response to his age, including budding Confucianism. The teacher of Zhuangzi must be creative and intelligent to meet the challenge. It helps to use the abridged Burton Watson edition. Chapter I sets the themes and issues. Chapter II is a goldmine of philosophic thinking. Chapter VI gives Zhuangzi’s mature views. Zhuangzi has been the overwhelming favorite of most of my students. Again, it helps to present Han Feizi in the anarchic context of his time, in light of his belief that the world would be saved only by a strong, authoritative ruler controlling an effective governmental and military authority. The fruits of his thought can be contemplated in light of the Qin dynasty which had its moment of glory and downfall. Many lessons, positive and negative, can be drawn from all of this.
- The works of Confucius and Laozi tend to be too pithy and disjointed for students to grasp in a short period of time (as an introductory class generally requires).
- Why do you assume that the task is “challenging”?
- The difficulty is primarily a serious lack of access to the commentarial tradition and the historical context. On the other hand, try teaching Aristotle or Kant, etc.: same sort of problem. The joke used to be that German students would come to the U.S. so that they could study *The Critique of Pure Reason* in English rather than in the original German. Have students compare the texts of several translations, including those made by the instructor, if possible. This comparison is especially fruitful with the *Dao-de-jing*.
- I don’t think teaching Chinese philosophy is challenging. Some students do but they’re not the majority. All these names and readings seem very interesting to most students and they usually like Zhuangzi more than others.
- The challenge comes in part from the styles of philosophizing. The *Analects* is a very difficult read. The Daoists are entertaining but require a firm cultural background to be properly comprehended.
- I should mention that the concept of *Dao* is not so easily accessible to Western students.
- At the risk of sounding like a recording machine, English sources in Pinyin. I converted all of the key documents for the ones listed here personally, spending hundreds of hours on each. I then put them into a reader for my students.
- I do not think it is necessarily a matter of “easier” or “more difficult” but rather of the reinforcement of cultural stereotypes. Actually, I do get the impression that my students do not find the *Daodejing* too challenging. However, it is easier to identify the *Daodejing* and the first chapter of the *Zhuangzi* as “texts of sages” and thus to eliminate them from the philosophical discourse and to relegate them to “Chinese thought” without relevance for philosophy. This is more difficult to do with the *Hanfeizi* and the second chapter of the *Zhuangzi* and even more so with the texts of Mozi, Xunzi, and Gongsun Longzi. Therefore, I tend to agree with Van Norden’s position as quoted above.
- The complexity of their teachings is such that a young student may need long years of hard work in order to truly understand and master even in the context of Chinese culture and literature. For American students, one more challenge is posed by the lack of a chance to “experience” the kind of life that emphasizes the importance of family and sociality.

- It is an understanding of the original message, as opposed to an interpretation of it, which is not always easy.
- Van Norden is right that this list of philosophers does not fit as comfortably into our own established categories. But the challenge is to use this list of philosophers to develop a different strategy for dealing effectively with the human experience. The virtue of this list of thinkers is that rather than being technical, speculative, or abstract, they consistently bring the discussion back to our everyday experience. How do you take what we have and make the most of it? How do you enchant the ordinary and inspire the everyday? Perhaps ethics should begin from a grandmother's love for her grandson—the most ordinary and yet the most extraordinary thing that we experience—rather than from some claim about the principle of justice.
- There is little sustained prose. There are few developed arguments. On the other hand the students don't read prose or otherwise, and they don't understand arguments either.
- I don't agree with Van Norden with respect to courses on Chinese philosophy. Everyone needs to find out what works best for them. In my course, I teach Confucius (*Analects*, *Great Learning*, and *Doctrine of the Mean*), Lao Tzu (I'll keep the Wade-Giles spellings because I use the Wing-Tsit Chan anthology), Buddhism (Seng-Chao, Chi-Tsang, Hsüan-Tsang, and Ch'an Buddhism), Chu Hsi, and (on the rare occasions that there's enough time) Wang Yang-Ming. In the case of the *Analects*, the difficulty is not in the ideas but in finding an organizing principle for the scattered statements. I found that concentrating on his conception of virtue, particularly the relation between humanity and propriety, was a good way of focusing his ideas. With Lao Tzu (and Chuang Tzu), it's the paradoxical and elusive nature of his expression, but that can be clarified to the students once instructors achieve clarity in their own minds. I haven't taught Han Fei Tzu.
- I do not agree that one should teach those philosophers who appear to be more compatible with the main currents of Western philosophy. Because I have taught Chinese philosophy in the context of Religious Studies, the students would not be familiar with sophism, consequentialist ethics, etc. If anything, Zhuangzi and Laozi would be easier to teach because they could be related to Buddhism, which is very popular amongst Religious Studies students.
- As a Chinese professor specializing in philosophy, I found it easy for me to teach students all these philosophers and their thoughts. For a Western professor with strong analytical background like Dr. Van Norden, he or she may find it not easy to understand and teach these typical Chinese philosophies.
- I would avoid Laozi for students. On the contrary, Zhuangzi and Liezi are rather easy for reading and attracting interest, and offer examples of counter-logic.
- I would say a lack of appropriate introductory materials. Most of the texts in the comparative philosophy were written for graduate students or for specialists. Students in the introductory level are often left out in the cold. They must be very motivated to get interested in Chinese philosophy in spite of the lack of any accessible materials to get them interested in the first place. I recommend Karyn Lai, *An Introduction to Chinese Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008). We need more of this kind of introductory materials along with DVDs digesting major philosophical schools of thought for undergraduate students.
- I don't think it is that challenging.
- I disagree with Van Norden. I do not find the thought of Confucius, Laozi, Zhuangzi, or Han Feizi specially challenging. Assuming that he is right, however, I believe that what would make these thinkers more difficult than others is that their thoughts are not as systematic or argumentative as those of other later thinkers.
- Well, I don't find it any more challenging than teaching Plato or Aristotle. I think the biggest problem we face is bad translations.
- Again, some Western philosophical concepts cannot exactly cover what those philosophers want to say, or the way of Chinese thinking. We must spend more time defining the meanings of key Chinese philosophical terms such as *Yi* and *Ren*.
- If and only if Van Norden is right, you should let students know that Confucianism is the main trend in ancient Chinese philosophy and that the convergence of Confucianism, Daoism, and Buddhism is the distinct feature of Chinese philosophy.
- Regarding Confucius, Laozi, Zhuangzi, and Han Feizi, their thinking is subtler, surely, and there is much more to cover, whereas the others simply refine some ideas in these four. But I think one way to deal with this is not to be too ambitious and try to cover everything, but rather pick some key ideas and stick to those. So far my strategies work for me fine.
- The problem may be with the way Western philosophers have been trained. We have learned so much from our own very rich tradition that it is almost impossible for us to think in different ways. We are also so used to "correcting" students who don't understand, or misunderstand, Plato *et al* that we (at least many of us) find it hard not to do the same thing with Confucius, Mencius, Zhuangzi, etc., and hence to fit them into Western categories. Students, in my experience, find it easier to overcome many of the dualisms of the Western philosophical tradition, and to use other categories and approaches (Is human nature good, evil, or neutral? Which is more important: duty or spontaneity?) than most of us do. Members of my department want to "get it right" and "look for the truth" and still think that if you are no longer interested in *that*, you have given up on "standards" and "rigor." But once you agree that while Alfred North Whitehead might have been right about Western philosophy (it is essentially a set of footnotes to Plato), he is wrong about philosophy itself, then William James recommends himself, namely, that philosophy (including metaphysics) "means nothing but an unusually obstinate effort to think clearly." Or, as I put it, philosophy is hard. Hard even for people with Ph.D.'s in it—perhaps especially for people with Ph.D.'s in it.
- It is not challenging to teach Confucius; by the way, the *Book of Songs* is very useful in humanizing him. Chuang Tzu is clever and the journal very entertaining. Lao Tzu is cryptic and often, I think, misunderstood, even by "We Scholars" (Nietzsche's phrase).
- Primarily the style of writing and thinking. However, the difficulties are different with regard to each one. With Confucius, it is largely the predominant presence of an authoritative or submissive voice as well as the presupposition that harmonious relationships are intrinsically superior to the normative force of individual

choice. With Laozi, the difficulty consists in the use of parables as well as the overlap of cosmological and ethical thoughts. Students who grow up in a liberal-democratic framework with the assumption that the nature of human beings is neither good nor bad tend to find the discourse of instructing rulers that we find in Han Feizi difficult to understand. In the case of Zhuangzi, I see the least difficulties.

Question #6: *If you are to teach an undergraduate course introducing Chinese philosophy to Western students, what will be the course objectives? What will be the student learning outcomes? (Course objectives correspond to what the instructor will do in the course. Student learning outcomes correspond to what successful students will learn in the course.)*

The following are answers from survey respondents:

- I'm not exactly sure how course objectives and student learning outcomes differ. The only course in which I assign readings in Chinese philosophy is Philosophy 105: Problems of Good and Evil. In it I ask students to read selections from the work of Chinese philosophers, write one or two essays about specific questions about Chinese philosophy, and take two open-book, open-notebook, multiple-choice quizzes on Chinese philosophy. The course is a Humanities Inquiry course in the core curriculum and the language I use to state the learning objectives is taken from that used in describing the [name of university deleted] core curriculum: "Humanities Inquiry courses provide students with an understanding of the questions asked in different disciplines in the Humanities and with the methods used in those disciplines to answer them. It is the methods used by philosophers that I will ask you to employ in writing your essays. This will encourage you to understand philosophical methods, to improve your critical reasoning and writing, to take account of the ways in which ideas about good and evil have developed, and to analyze information both from your own viewpoint and from that of philosophers with whom you will almost certainly at some time disagree."
- Here's what I write on my syllabus: "The goals of the course are twofold: to introduce you to the central texts and themes of early Chinese philosophy, and to help you to develop your ability to read, discuss, and write philosophy. Each of these goals, in turn, is related to larger and longer-term objectives. The philosophical traditions that we will explore in this course have provided much of the intellectual context for the last two thousand years of Chinese—and in many cases, East Asian—culture. The course can thus serve as a foundation for further study of East Asia. At the same time, improved philosophical skills will assist you not only if you continue to study the world's philosophical traditions, but also in any area outside philosophy in which clear analysis and careful argument play a role. Two skills that will receive special emphasis are the *interpreting* complex or obscure texts, and identifying, assessing, and engaging in *reasoning*. Since we will at least tentatively presume that there is reasoning going on in the texts we are interpreting, the two skills are closely related. Some of the course's assignments will focus quite specifically on understanding philosophical reasoning, both in general and as seen in particular in our Chinese materials."
- I would say that as the course objective, understanding the key concepts (*jen, li, tao*, etc.) is essential, not only philosophically but also so that the students would understand something important about Chinese thought as well as Asian cultures. For this objective, the students should be able to explain in their own words the meanings of the selected key concepts.
- The course objectives and learning outcomes will involve making the students familiar with the context of the debates among ancient Chinese schools, the contents of the schools' disagreements with one another, and some ability to apply various Chinese philosophical insights to social and existential problems that the students in their own context find themselves facing. Students will do well if they can meet these requirements.
- First, I like to think that they will have a broad understanding of the general development of Chinese philosophy. Second, they will have enough of a grasp of the basic vocabulary of Chinese philosophy so that they can continue to read about it in the future with some hope of success. I also hope they can see how different it is and how important it is going to be in the modern world for Western philosophy to open out to other parts of global philosophy.
- I teach a Philosophies of Life course in which two of the four units are on the *Analects* of Confucius and early Buddhist sutras, respectively. Because I have the luxury of teaching entire texts from foreign traditions, I immerse the students in each tradition via key terminology. Students are expected to master these terms and thereby begin to understand the semantic web of the different worldviews.
- Course objectives: Let them have an initial idea of Chinese philosophy and compare that with other Western philosophies they have learnt. I personally like to compare the social and political philosophy. I know some others who like to compare the philosophy of language. Learning outcomes: Hopefully students can learn how to compare different philosophies. For example, they can use both Chinese and Western social theories to think about global democracy or human rights.
- Objectives are to give students an appreciation for the diversity and complexity of Chinese philosophical thought, which is why I include texts from early Confucianism, Mohism, Daoism, and Legalism and spend considerable time on each, including primary and secondary texts. Learning outcomes are that students come away from the course impressed with the fact that Chinese philosophers had developed views on many of the same issues of concern in Western philosophy, including human nature, ethics, etc.
- To introduce and reflect on Chinese philosophical texts through quotes from primary sources in various translations. The focus lies on the interaction between the text, its translation and interpretations.
- Again, I don't teach in a philosophy department. My goal is to provide the students with foundational texts that influence the course of Chinese history. I draw on those ideas until the end of the course. Students need to grasp that there is a different discourse in China; that the concepts that shaped Chinese responses to their world are radically different from Western ones.
- Objectives: I read closely primary texts. Learning outcomes: Students learn to read closely primary texts. This, by the way, is no different than my objectives and goals in courses on Western philosophy.

- Here are mine from my “Ancient Chinese Thought” course: (1) Describe the historical and cultural environment of the Warring States Period. (2) Explain religiophilosophically important theoretical terms of the “Hundred Schools” and how they relate to each other to form a complementary system. (3) Compare and contrast the ancient Chinese religiophilosophical tradition with the Western traditions, especially with respect to how each motivates its ethical principles. (4) Appreciate the beauty and complexity of a style of thinking that, so different from the Western, nonetheless can be comprehended and satisfyingly contemplated. Here’s the course description: Between the 6th and the 2nd centuries, BCE, China burgeoned with philosophical schools. Students will read texts from the most prominent schools and critique them, concentrating especially on the *Analects (Lun Yu)*, the *Mozi*, the *Zhuangzi*, the *Mencius*, the *Han Feizi* and the *Xunzi*. Special emphasis will be placed on how the traditions react to each other as they develop increasingly sophisticated defenses of their positions. The course will also attempt to identify, assess, and avoid popular Western readings of the Chinese philosophical tradition by—in part—incorporating recent historical findings and textual apparatus.
- Since I have taught a course in Chinese philosophy for thirty-five years, it’s not a question of “if.” I want students to have an appreciation of the variety and depth in the Chinese philosophical tradition, through familiarity with the ideas of important thinkers, and to be able to see how Chinese thought systems evolved, e.g., from Confucius to Mencius and Xunzi, to Dong Zhongshu, to Li Ao and Han Yu, to Zhou Dunyi, Zhu Xi and Lu Jiuyuan, to Xu Heng and Wu Cheng, to Wu Yupi, Chen Xianzhang, Lo Qinshun and Wang Yangming, and to Dai Zhen, Wang Fuzhi, Gu Yanwu and Kang Yuwei (to sketch only a few of the possibilities) I also want students to be conversant with basic Chinese philosophical ideas, such as *ren*, *dao*, *li* (ritual), *li* (principle), *taiji*, etc. Another aim, which, as mentioned above, is difficult to achieve these days, is for students to be able to compare Chinese and Western ideas.
- To familiarize students with the most important classical Chinese philosophers and the issues that they deemed worthy of debate. No more and no less.
- Course objectives: to show the great experiential transformations in ethical perspectives that are to be had by seriously taking up the challenges of the great ancient Chinese philosophers. Both ‘course objectives’ and ‘learning outcomes’—barbaric terms!—are entwined in this way of teaching. As Zhuangzi said, “To analyze is to kill.”
- Not merely to introduce some strange if not weird ideas to students but try to show what we can learn from Chinese philosophers on various (many, I believe) important philosophical subjects.
- What I tell them is that I understand that this may be their only class on Chinese philosophy, but the critical thinking skills and writing skills they will develop in my class will help them even if they end up with an office job after college. When that is over, we get down to reading Wing-Tsit Chan’s book.
- Course objectives: The course introduces students to the views of seven Chinese thinkers: Confucius, Mozi, Mengzi, Laozi, Zhuangzi, Xunzi, and Han Feizi. It also teaches skills of analysis and constructing arguments. Learning outcomes: Students will be able to name and summarize the views of the aforementioned seven thinkers. They will also be able to identify agreements and disagreements among these thinkers and explain how Chinese views developed over time in response to various social and intellectual challenges. They will also be able to critically evaluate the reasons offered by the Chinese thinkers for their views.
- I want to provide Western students with different perspectives on family, morality, personhood, etc. from those they have probably been taught in church or by living in a modern, free-market democracy.
- Here is what I have in my usual syllabus: “This course provides overview of the major philosophical traditions that originate in China, including significant philosophical responses and contributions to them from throughout greater Asia. These traditions include Buddhism, Confucianism, and Daoism. Emphasis is given to *philosophical* exegesis of texts and practices; some comparison and contrast with Western traditions may also be included for the sake of expanded understanding. Some religious aspects of these traditions will be discussed in passing, but primary investigation will be into their philosophical aspects. Following overviews of early Chinese philosophy, we will focus on aspects of its ethical and existential worldview that differentiate it from Western traditions. Hence, some closer focus will be given to ethical and political theories, rather than metaphysical and/or epistemological ones. Students will learn to appreciate the task of philosophical interpretation in attempting to understand the issues that are at stake within each text or tradition.”
- The objectives and outcomes would be the same for any philosophy course: to understand and appreciate the arguments of these thinkers and to be able to analyze and evaluate their views in clear and revealing ways.
- To get them to understand a more immanent and emergent approach to living.
- Here is an excerpt from the description of my undergraduate intro course on Asian philosophy: “The focus throughout is examining each philosophy on its own terms, as a whole, while avoiding simplistic explanations or translations into more familiar (European) ways of understanding. The guiding theme of the course is that differences between European and Asian philosophies, as well as differences among Asian philosophies, result from treating certain experiences and concerns as more or less salient, and that small-scale difference in emphasis produces large-scale difference in results.”
- Step one is to define a moral and spiritual practice that has no metaphysical aims. Roger T. Ames is quite persuasive in arguing that classical Confucian thought relies upon appropriate behavior, and the specific moral conditions of a decision that determine humane action.
- To develop a familiarity with major figures in Chinese thought. To see Chinese philosophy as relevant to their lives. To feel as though they could continue to study this material productively on their own after the course is over.
- These are my current course objectives. (1) To introduce students to issues raised by early Chinese thinkers, with emphasis on the two major schools (Confucianism and Daoism) while also attending to the variety of philosophical positions arising during the period of the hundred schools of thought in ancient China (approx. 600-200 BCE) and later. Topics covered include the nature of the world, ethical standards and convention, the place of relationships in

human life, the aims of government and language and its use in the world. (2) To familiarize students with intellectual history in ancient China, beginning with the Confucian thesis, its continuing defense by Mengzi and Xunzi in the face of challenges posed by Mohist, Legalist and Daoist philosophers. Students will be introduced to socio-historical aspects of society that spawned or influenced some of these philosophies. (3) To familiarize students with the methodologies and philosophical argumentation in early Chinese philosophy. (4) To develop students' critical and analytical skills in assessing and responding to ideas. To foster a good eye for clarity, coherence and good argumentation. These are the student learning outcomes I have for my course. Upon successful completion of the course students can expect to have developed, or further developed, the following competencies: (1) Understanding of the philosophies of the major schools of thought and their important interactions in the early Chinese context. (2) Understanding of the themes and issues raised in Chinese philosophy including in the areas of ethics, social and political philosophy, metaphysics and epistemology. (3) Familiarity with the methodologies and philosophical argumentation in early Chinese philosophy. This should enhance students' capacity for analytical and critical thinking as well as their appreciation of, and respect for, diversity. (4) Ability to engage in independent and reflective learning through assessing and responding to ideas. (5) Understanding of the contemporary significance of aspects of Chinese philosophy. (6) Developed written and oral communication skills through participation in class discussions and working at assignments.

- Introducing basic figures, theories, and concepts. Students will learn these things.
- (1) Students should understand that peoples (Western or Chinese) all care about good government, good life, and we all are worried about death, but from that basic fact different theories can be developed. It should be stressed that it is possible to have a non-theistic ethics and that it is possible for one to believe in Confucianism, Daoism, and Buddhism. (2) I will use selected representative excerpts from the *Analects*, the *Daodejing*, and the *Zhuangzi*. The rest will follow Van Norden's suggestion. (3) What relevancy does Chinese philosophy have to contemporary philosophical scholarship? Confucianism and virtue ethics, Daoism and environmental philosophy, Chinese philosophy and moral psychology, etc.
- Actually, it depends on whether I am taking a historical approach, a topical (problem-based) approach, or selecting particular thinkers on whom to focus. Here's the most recent statement of my "Philosophies of China" course syllabus: This course is a critical study of selected works and figures in the history of Chinese philosophy from the Warring States Period to the end of the nineteenth century. Periodically, the approach to this period is altered, and this semester we shall not follow the common procedure of studying philosophers and their writings historically. Rather, this term we will follow the development of some of the most basic and recurring fundamental questions of philosophy through the period, demarking the contributions made by a few of the major philosophers and texts during the period. After we complete one question, we will begin another, starting from the Warring States Period and working forward again. This semester, we will trace philosophical conversation on four questions. The questions we will consider are: (1) The question of knowledge and truth, (2) the question of

reality and nature, (3) the question of how human societies should be organized, and (4) the question of religion and the meaning of life and the universe.

- The course objective is to get an adequate understanding and possibly an appreciation of Chinese thought.
- Sorry this is finals and I do not have enough time to give this question the answer it deserves.
- For any philosophy course, my main goals are to teach students to formulate and analyze arguments, to reconstruct philosophical positions from primary texts, to clarify their own views, and to learn to write more clearly. For Chinese philosophy, I also hope students will have some knowledge of Chinese thought itself (e.g., be able to explain what Confucianism is) and will be able to use that to gain an alternative perspective on philosophical issues, as well as some understanding of the relationships between philosophy and cultural difference.
- The outcomes are the same as other general education courses in philosophy. This course satisfies the general education requirement for philosophy and religion. A key goal of courses under this requirement is that they develop in students an ability to examine philosophical texts, on the one hand, and religious texts and practices, on the other. Since this is a course in philosophy, we will focus on the first part of the general education goal, understanding that some of the texts we study have religious content. Examining philosophical texts specifically includes developing an ability to (a) interpret philosophical texts and provide textual evidence, (b) clarify key arguments, (c) identify reasonable criticisms, and (d) identify reasonable responses to possible criticisms and defend a conclusion. These requirements fall under roughly two crucial features of work in philosophy: the ideals of both understanding—ability (a) and ability (b)—and evaluating—ability (c) and ability (d)—the views in philosophical texts. Both of these are important in so far as it is impossible to successfully evaluate a view without having understood it. But it is incomplete to have understood a view without having evaluated it. This view of philosophy derives from Socrates's practice of *elenchus*, or discussion of fundamental claims, primarily about how best to live. This course will help you to learn how to do philosophy within the Socratic tradition, which, as you may know, was animated by the fundamental principle, from Plato's *Apology*, that the unexamined life is not worth living.
- My goal in any course devoted to East Asian thought is to help students become aware of, and conversant with, major issues in the history of East Asian intellectual and religious cultures. I try to accomplish this by focusing on the careful, contextualized reading of primary texts in translation. Students who succeed in such a course will acquire the habits of close reading, informed interpretation, and synthetic analysis. They will learn to (a) scrutinize texts for rhetorical strategy, underlying assumptions, audience, author identities, and agendas; (b) bear in mind cultural and historical contexts, including their own, when reading any text; and (c) constantly return to "big picture" questions such as: What is the overall impact of this particular text and its thought? What is its place within the historical culture that produced it? What role might it play in contemporary discourse?
- The course objective is to give the students fundamentals of the background, history, personalities, and ideas that would be essential to continuing with a study of the tradition,

either personally or in further academic courses. Students who did not know anything about Confucius, following Van Norden's advice, would be at a grave disadvantage in either respect. What successful students will learn in the course will be, of course, what is being taught. (I disapprove of the supine APA attitude towards the edu-babble gimmick of "student learning outcomes.")

- Students will learn to appreciate how intractably enigmatic and unfamiliar Asian thought is. Students will learn to see the strangeness and particularity of their own basic assumptions. Students will learn to articulate questions of the text independently of the instructor.
- Course objectives and student learning outcomes are the same: Get the students to understand the authors' views and to consider those views critically.
- Let me quote from my course objectives as stated in my syllabus: "One objective is that we shall familiarize ourselves with the basic concepts and terminology used in several classical systems of Chinese philosophy and distinguish the differences in meaning of terms common to these systems. Finally, I shall ask you to imagine ways in which these ideas may apply in your own life to enrich the quality of your experience. Another objective is that we shall also examine some key philosophical differences between Chinese ways of thought and Western ways of thought. You will be given the opportunity to make critical reflective judgments on what you take to be significant differences between these two traditions. We will accomplish this objective by critically analyzing major concepts and articulating the basic assumptions underlying them. Another objective of this course is that you will expand your abilities to view things from alternative perspectives. We will accomplish this objective by becoming more familiar with Chinese philosophy through an exploration of its major classical traditions: Daoism, Confucianism, and some others. Consequently, this study will increase your capacity to imaginatively think outside of your own social and cultural context. It will offer you a chance to critique this alternative perspective and to step outside of your own experience to get a new point of view."
- The course objectives will be to let the students (1) know the essentials of Confucianism, Daoism, and Mohism, (2) gain familiarity with the Chinese way of thinking, especially the peculiar way of argumentation, and (3) be able to do some comparative studies based on (1) and (2). I will expect the successful students to learn that there is really something valuable in the Chinese classics, something that has done the same work in a way as the Western philosophy has in a different way.
- For better or worse, I am still a fairly traditional philosophy teacher who would tend to concentrate on the philosophic ideas in the texts, the thinkers' arguments (including implied arguments), and the pros and cons of the views. At the same time, I would allow the students to explore related cultural phenomena in their research projects for the course. It would be interesting to set up some scenarios for class group discussions to get the students to play with the ideas, to debate them, to see more aspects of their life value.
- I would not substantially alter the course objectives and learning outcomes. The basic goal of an undergraduate course is to develop an appreciation for nuanced philosophical views, and to a lesser extent to develop some facility at making philosophical arguments (but the former

is much more achievable in a single semester than the latter, and the former is more likely to cultivate an enduring interest in philosophy, which is the greater good). These goals can be well served by a course in Western philosophy, but in many cases can be better served by a course that compares Western philosophy with Chinese philosophy.

- The same as other introductory courses. I only hope students can forget it is "Chinese" and be aware that it is "philosophy."
- The following is from my syllabus of "Asian Philosophy" (including classical Chinese philosophy and Indian philosophy). The quoted statements are the school's General Education objectives in the area to which the course "Asian Philosophy" belongs. This course has three GE Learning Objectives. *Learning Objectives 1 (LO1)*: "Students shall be able to compare systematically the ideas, values, images, cultural artifacts, economic structures, technological developments, or attitudes of people from more than one culture outside the U.S." To achieve this objective, the course takes a comparative approach. Sample activities for mastering this GE LO include a series of comparative examinations of distinct approaches within Asian philosophy and from different (Asian and Western) philosophical traditions. *Learning Objective 2 (LO2)*: "Students shall be able to identify the historical context of ideas and cultural traditions outside the U.S. and how they have influenced American culture." To achieve this objective, the course (1) pays due attention to the historical and cultural contexts in which the ideas and perspectives under examination have developed and (2) discusses how Asian philosophical ideas and visions bear on Western and American philosophy via aforementioned comparative approach, specially speaking, and American culture and society, generally speaking. Sample activities for mastering this GE LO include (1) introducing those historical and cultural contexts when examining the Asian philosophical ideas and visions under examination and (2) organizing a special discussion forum on how Asian philosophical ideas and visions have influenced Asian-American cultural tradition and American culture and society. *Learning Objective 3 (LO3)*: "Students shall be able to explain how a culture outside the U.S. has changed in response to internal and external pressures." To achieve this objective, the course examines how some movements of thought under examination have changed in response to internal and/or external pressures (if any). Sample activities for mastering this GE LO include examinations of the development of Confucianism from Confucius to Mencius and Xun Zi's approaches, development of Buddhism from its early version to some of its more recent movements (such as Chan/Zan Buddhism). The course has four performance objectives: (1) to develop the ability to enter and appreciate ways of thinking and perspectives that may be quite different from what you have already had; (2) to achieve new visions and perspectives for dealing philosophically with the important issues and values in the contemporary multicultural world; (3) to enhance understanding of how Asian philosophical traditions bear on Asian-American cultural traditions and American culture and society; and (4) to improve the ability to read and think critically and creatively and to write clearly and effectively.
- Instructor: (a) In the introductory lecture, present an outline of particular philosophical problems to be addressed, general commentary and history per each philosopher. *Shu-jing, Li-ji, Zuo Commentary [Zuo-zhuan]*,

philosophical parts of the *Yi-jing*, *Analec*t*s*, Mencius, Xun-zi, all the Daoists, etc. are chock-full of terrific stories both for discussion topics and as illustrations. No lack of excitement here! (b) Preparation as seminar discussion leader for selected readings/topics in Chinese philosophy. There is less classroom motivation needed because the onus is mostly on the student to defend his/her own understanding of the text by *participating* in seminar discussion in front of peers and the seminar leader. Lack of preparation is easy to spot when someone is trying to defend a point in public. The embarrassment is palpable when you are unprepared in a seminar, and very motivating, if that is what is required. (c) Assignment and critique of several short (1-2 page) papers on each philosopher or one long (30-40 page) paper on a mutually arrived at topic. (d) Probably do not use anything like pop quizzes, since in philosophy there are very few right answers to set up as quick Y/N responses. Student: (a) Close reading of selected texts in preparation for collaborative reading in seminar. Participation or lack of it will be reflected by grade received. (b) Active student involvement, lots of self-directed learning, research for paper writing. Philosophy is unbelievably exciting when you can involve yourself personally and apply the ideas to your own life. (c) Be prepared to defend written papers in oral argument by bringing research papers to the instructor and other students within seminar discussion format.

- I haven't formulated what get called student learning outcomes. My objectives for the course described in my answer to Question 4 above are: (a) To provide an in-depth, sustained study of the relation between philosophy (the commitment to free inquiry or self-realization) and society. (b) To explore the founding philosophical thought of one of the great non-Western traditions. (c) To form a more conscious and critical understanding of both the Chinese and the American inheritance of their respective philosophical traditions as revealed in everyday experiences of, for example, popular film, advertising, political rhetoric, government initiatives, etc. (d) To integrate reading of classics in Western and Chinese literature with issues that cross the disciplines of philosophy, history, political thought, and public policy.
- I have been teaching such a class for more than 20 years. Here are the student learning outcomes included in my syllabus: (a) Apply creative hermeneutics to fathom ever deeper levels of interpretation concerning Chinese primary texts standing under the unique assumptions of traditional Chinese thought, especially the fact of change as well as both/and logic. (b) Experience the rich diversity of Chinese philosophy. (c) Trace the dynamic transformation of schools of philosophy through the centuries of Chinese civilization. (d) Evaluate the contemporary relevance of Chinese philosophy and its potential for globalization.
- Its objective is mainly to give a general introduction to the major schools of Chinese philosophy. Most of the students want to have an authentic understanding of Chinese philosophy.
- My first challenge is putting the development into historical perspective. In my class, my first reader or anthology covers the development of Chinese history and culture. We then study the basic concepts of Chinese philosophy. Most, if not all, students know absolutely nothing about Chinese cultural history, so I spend several weeks just going over this important aspect in the development of Chinese philosophy. I then cover the Four Books in great detail,

having translated the key names and terms. For translations of all key documents, I relied heavily on the Chinese Text Project at <http://chinese.dsturgeon.net>.

- The three main objectives of teaching Chinese philosophy at a liberal arts college are (1) to demonstrate that there is philosophy in the Chinese tradition, (2) to introduce students to the diversity and wealth of Chinese philosophy, and (3) to explore intersections of and similarities between the philosophical traditions of Europe/America and Asia.
- Course objectives: intensive reading, reflection, and discussion on central passages and ideas in the classics. Student learning outcomes: knowledge of some essential aspects of certain Chinese philosophers, as well as reflection on and dynamic engagement with the ideas of these philosophers in relation to their own lives and worldviews.
- Course objectives would be to understand both the particular and universal aspects of each philosophy and how they relate to life. Students will develop a good sense of what it means, in an existential sense, to be Chinese, Japanese, etc. and what these philosophies add to a comprehensive understanding of life and meaning.
- Wittgenstein says that the limits of our language are the limits of our world. The course objectives will include teaching the students a new philosophical language. Student outcomes will include learning how to read original texts carefully and how to make responsible cultural comparisons.
- (1) Learning Objectives for Students: Upon completion of the course students demonstrate the ability to *analyze* arguments and theories, *identify* leading figures and theories of philosophy, and *evaluate* philosophical theories. (2) Methods of Evaluation: Methods of evaluation may include quizzes, tests, oral presentations, debates, and a final exam. In addition, the course may involve a series of written and oral assignments. Class projects are of a critical and reflective nature designed to help the student better understand and critically evaluate assorted philosophical problems. The student can expect to make oral presentations in class debates, work within a small group of fellow students and address specific issues, make evaluative comments on documentaries or films shown in class and on guest speakers presenting a particular point of view. (3) Methods for Student Learning Outcomes Assessment: Student learning outcomes assessment may be conducted by performing pretest-posttest comparisons or developing student profiles for the class that evidence growth.
- Objective: to offer an alternative way of answering familiar questions. Outcome: the ability to consider more alternatives in future conflicts.
- If "objectives" means "what the instructor will do in the course," then my objectives are to assign readings and discuss them with the students. I also have them read much of Fung Yu-Lan's *A Short History of Chinese Philosophy* to acquaint the students with important figures not covered in class. The hoped-for learning outcomes are for the students to understand and appreciate the philosophers studied. If they also achieve enlightenment, so much the better.
- My main objectives are always to get students to question their own presuppositions about what is ethical, moral, spiritual, etc., and to show how Chinese philosophy opens them up to a different way of thinking.

- Course objectives: To provide an introduction to Chinese philosophy (such as Confucianism, Daoism, and Buddhism) from a comparative perspective. Student learning outcomes: Student will read both primary and secondary texts in an effort to understand what Classical and Neo-Confucianism, Daoism, and Buddhism really are.
- First, presenting historical background of the Chunqiu and Zhanquo Periods, and then the attempts of answers by the *Baijia*. Second, making concrete examples with the present (for instance, relating the *bingfa* with the present rich literature on success in life, love, exam and with martial arts).
- For the introductory course, it almost has to be a Humanities course including history, language, literature, and of course philosophy. It has to be an all rounded introduction. Otherwise, students will not be prepared to read the philosophical materials. Unfortunately, most of the course materials aim at upper-division students. My learning objectives would be for the students to have a basic understanding of Chinese history, political system, literary culture, and main philosophical concerns. If by the end of the semester students could clearly delineate all these elements, they would be prepared to take more upper-division courses in Chinese philosophy later on.
- (1) Course objectives: To examine representative schools, main thinkers and writings, and the ideas they developed. An understanding of Chinese philosophical thought helps us to make explicit and self-conscious some of the radically different assumptions of our own intellectual traditions. It also provides background knowledge crucial to an informed understanding of many developments in modern and contemporary China. (2) Learning outcomes: Understanding key concepts in Chinese philosophy. Acquiring a different cultural perspective from which to view oneself, one's culture, and one's society. Integrating theoretical knowledge with empirical examples. Learning to engage with the ideas and perspectives of other learners. Learning to think critically. Learning analytic skills for developing and defending an argument. Developing skills in synthesizing and contextualizing new information. Skills to locate, analyze, evaluate, and synthesize information from a wide variety of sources, both Western and Asian.
- Course objectives: (1) Use appropriate methods of critical thinking to examine issues that arise in the academic study of Chinese philosophy. (2) Analyze the values embodied in the teachings of Chinese thinkers by relating them to the belief systems, social practices, and cultural contexts in which they are expressed. (3) Become familiar with the worldviews of Confucianism, Daoism, and Buddhism. Learning outcomes: (1) Differentiate between Confucian, Daoist, and Buddhist concepts and doctrines. (2) Correctly use relevant terminology to identify and discuss Chinese philosophy. (3) Identify the similarities and the differences among diverse Chinese philosophical traditions.
- My goal in any philosophy class is to get students to think. So in a Chinese Philosophy class, the goal is to think about the classical Chinese canon, and to philosophize on that basis.
- To make students interested in Chinese philosophy is the most important in such a course.
- Course objectives: ability to appreciate a very different way of doing philosophy, identify key ideas and philosophers, and learn and work with central ideas of Confucianism, Taoism, and Ch'an Buddhism. Student learning outcomes: ability to write thoughtful essays that not only cover and explain well the ideas from readings, lectures, and discussions, but also engage them critically (not necessarily negatively, of course) in terms of pros and cons, and relate them or make them relevant to their lives.
- I never liked the "objectives" and "outcomes" approach to teaching. When forced in 1974 to write the departmental objectives for our ethics course, I came up with 10. Number 10 was "To get into Heaven." But does this help? I once learned, in the NEH Summer Institute on Teaching the Chinese Classics in Translation (I think), that there are three stages of response to Chinese philosophy. (1) "This is *not* philosophy." (2) "This is philosophy—and very much like Western philosophy." (3) "This is very different from Western philosophy and yet it is excellent philosophy in its own right." It is one thing to say this. It is another to go through all three stages. I try to give my students that experience. I am also teaching philosophy which in both traditions has to do with being able to write a good essay. Therefore, to check if my goals are accomplished, I ask students to write an essay (at least one, sometimes one a week) in which they compare a Chinese philosopher to a Western one and recognize (1) what the two have in common, and that it may not be very important, (2) where the two are radically different, in important ways, and (3) how those two points give us a new perspective on their own tradition (and many of my students come from distinctly different traditions within the American culture).
- Course objectives will be to teach the differences between the Eastern and Western ways of thinking, why they are different, and how they are different. Students need to have some knowledge of historical and geographical background.
- I hate learning outcomes. Make your own course objectives and be true to the authors and subjects you teach. Don't concern yourself with what happens in your students' lives and heads. It's none of our business. "Happy people go to Heaven; angry people go to Hell." I suppose happiness is the essential learning outcome.
- The goal of my courses in—to a large extent—comparative philosophy (with a significant focus on Chinese traditions) consists in promoting proficiency in intercultural communication from a philosophical point of view. This includes a knowledge, sensitivity, and creative appropriation of philosophical arguments from different traditions.

Question #7: *Would you recommend any instructional materials (books, software, Web-based resources, etc.) for an undergraduate course introducing Chinese philosophy to Western students?*

The following are answers from survey respondents⁵:

- Robert E. Allinson, *Chuang-Tzu for Spiritual Transformation: An Analysis of the Inner Chapters* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1989).
- Robert E. Allinson, ed., *Understanding the Chinese Mind: The Philosophical Roots* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000). [2]
- Roger T. Ames, *Living Chinese Philosophy*, DVD (New York: Insight Media, 2007).

- Roger T. Ames, ed., *Philosophy East and West: A Quarterly of Comparative Philosophy* (Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press, 2011). [2]
- Roger T. Ames, trans., *Sun Tzu: The Art of Warfare* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1993). [5]
- Roger T. Ames, ed., *Wandering at Ease in the Zhuangzi* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1998).
- Roger T. Ames and David L. Hall, trans., *Dao De Jing: A Philosophical Translation* (New York: Ballantine Books, 2003). [3]
- Roger T. Ames and David L. Hall, trans., *Focusing the Familiar: A Translation and Philosophical Interpretation of the Zhongyong* (Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press, 2001). [4]
- Roger T. Ames and Henry Rosemont, Jr., trans., *The Analects of Confucius: A Philosophical Translation* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1998). [7]
- Jean-Jacques Annaud, dir., *The Lover*, DVD (Century City, LA: Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Inc., 2001).
- Association Française des Professeurs de Chinois (AFPC), *Chinese Classics and Translations* <http://www.afpc.asso.fr/wengu/wg/wengu.php?l=intro> (Accessed: January 31, 2011).
- H. Gene Blocker, *World Philosophy: An East-West Comparative Introduction to Philosophy* (New York: Prentice Hall, 1999).
- John Blofeld, trans., *I Ching: The Book of Change* (New York: Penguin, 1991).
- John Blofeld, trans., *The Zen Teaching of Huang-Po: On the Transmission of Mind* (New York: Grove Press, 1994).
- Stephen R. Bokenkamp, trans., *Early Daoist Scriptures* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1997).
- E. Bruce Brooks and A. Taeko Brooks, trans., *The Original Analects: Sayings of Confucius and His Successors* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1998). [2]
- Witter Bynner, trans., *The Way of Life According to Lao Tzu* (New York: Perigee Trade, 1986).
- Karen L. Carr and Philip J. Ivanhoe, *The Sense of Anti-Rationalism: The Religious Thought of Zhuangzi and Kierkegaard* (New York: Seven Bridges Press, 2000).
- Wing-Tsit Chan, trans., *A Source Book in Chinese Philosophy* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1969). [19]
- Chung-Yuan Chang, *Creativity and Taoism* (New York: HarperCollins, 1968).
- Chung-Yuan Chang, trans., *Tao: A New Way of Thinking* (New York: Harper and Row, 1975).
- Kaige Chen, dir., *Farewell My Concubine*, DVD (New York: Miramax Films, 1999).
- Chung-Ying Cheng, ed., *Journal of Chinese Philosophy* (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011). [2]
- Jacob Cheung, dir., *A Battle of Wits*, DVD (Hong Kong: Deltamac Entertainment, 2007).
- Annping Chin, *Confucius: A Life of Thought and Politics* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2009).
- Chinese Buddhist Electronic Text Association (CBETA), *CBETA's Homepage* <http://www.cbeta.org/> (Accessed: January 31, 2011).
- John James Clarke, *The Tao of the West: Western Transformations of Taoist Thought* (New York: Routledge, 2000). [2]
- Columbia University, East Asian Curriculum Project and Project on Asia in the Core Curriculum, *Asia for Educators* <http://afe.easia.columbia.edu/> (Accessed: January 31, 2011).
- Herrlee G. Creel, *Confucius and the Chinese Way* (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1960).
- Mark Csikszentmihalyi, trans., *Readings in Han Chinese Thought* (Indianapolis, IN: Hackett, 2006). [2]
- Mark Csikszentmihalyi and Philip J. Ivanhoe, eds., *Religious and Philosophical Aspects of the Laozi* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1999). [2]
- Arthur C. Danto, *Mysticism and Morality: Oriental Thought and Moral Philosophy* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1987).
- Gary D. DeAngelis and Warren G. Frisina, eds., *Teaching the Dao de Jing* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008). [3]
- Wm. Theodore de Bary, ed., *Sources of East Asian Tradition: Premodern Asia* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2008). [3]
- Wm. Theodore de Bary, ed., *Sources of East Asian Tradition: The Modern Period* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2007). [3]
- Wm. Theodore de Bary and Irene Bloom, eds., *Sources of Chinese Tradition, Volume 1: From Earliest Times to 1600* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999). [4]
- Wm. Theodore de Bary and Richard Lufrano, eds., *Sources of Chinese Tradition, Volume 2: From 1600 Through the Twentieth Century* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999). [2]
- John de Graaf, dir., *Affluenza* (Arlington, VA and Burbank, CA: Public Broadcasting Service, 1997), DVD (Reading, PA: Bullfrog Films, 2005).
- Patricia Buckley Ebrey, *A Visual Sourcebook of Chinese Civilization* <http://depts.washington.edu/chinaciv/> (Accessed: January 31, 2011).
- Ronald Eyre, perf., "Taoism: A Question of Balance-China," "Buddhism: Footprint of the Buddha-India," and "Buddhism: The Land of the Disappearing Buddha-Japan," in Ronald Eyre, dir., *The Long Search* (London: BBC & Time Life Films, 1978), DVD (New York: Ambrose Video Publishing, 2001).
- John King Fairbank and Merle Goldman, *China: A New History* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998).
- Gia-Fu Feng and Jane English, trans., *Tao Te Ching* (New York: Vintage Books, 1989).
- Herbert Fingarette, *Confucius: The Secular as Sacred* (New York: Harper and Row, 1972). [3]
- Yu-Lan Fung, *A Short History of Chinese Philosophy*, ed. Derk Bodde (New York: Free Press, 1997). [7]
- Xingjian Gao, *Soul Mountain*, trans. Mabel Lee (New York: Harper Perennial, 2001).
- Daniel K. Gardner, trans., *Chu Hsi: Learning to Be a Sage: Selections from the Conversations of Master Chu, Arranged Topically* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1990).
- Daniel Gardner, trans., *The Four Books: The Basic Teachings of the Later Confucian Tradition*, illus. ed. (Indianapolis, IN: Hackett, 2006). [2]
- Jenniphr Goodman, *The Tao of Steve* (Culver City, CA: Sony Pictures Classics, 2000).

- Angus C. Graham, trans., *Chuang-Tzu: The Inner Chapters* (Indianapolis, IN: Hackett, 2001). [3]
- Angus C. Graham, *Disputers of the Tao: Philosophical Argument in Ancient China* (LaSalle, IL: Open Court, 1989). [8]
- Angus C. Graham, trans., *The Book of Lieh-Tzu: A Classic of the Tao* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1990).
- Joseph Grange, *John Dewey, Confucius, and Global Philosophy* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2004).
- Joseph Grange, ed., *Tao and God, Special Issue of the Journal of Chinese Philosophy*, Volume 29, Issue 1 (2002).
- Samuel B. Griffith, trans., *Sun Tzu: The Illustrated Art of War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005).
- David L. Hall and Roger T. Ames, "Getting It Right: On Saving Confucius from the Confucians," *Philosophy East and West*, Volume 34, Number 1 (1984): 3-23.
- David L. Hall and Roger T. Ames, *The Democracy of the Dead: Dewey, Confucius, and the Hope for Democracy in China* (LaSalle, IL: Open Court, 1999).
- David L. Hall and Roger T. Ames, *Thinking Through Confucius* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1987).
- Chad Hansen, *A Daoist Theory of Chinese Thought: A Philosophical Interpretation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992).
- Chad Hansen, *Chinese Philosophy Pages* <http://www.hku.hk/philodep/ch/> (Accessed: January 31, 2011).
- Rick Harbaugh, *Zhongwen.com: Chinese Characters and Culture* <http://www.zhongwen.com/> (Accessed: January 31, 2011).
- John Bruno Hare, *The Internet Sacred Text Archive* <http://www.sacred-texts.com/> (Accessed: January 31, 2011).
- John Helde, dir., *Made in China* (Seattle, WA: Northwest Film Forum, 2007).
- Claude Helft, *Chinese Mythology: Stories of Creation and Invention* (New York: Enchanted Lion Books, 2007).
- Robert G. Henricks, trans., *Lao Tzu: Te-Tao Ching - A New Translation Based on the Recently Discovered Ma-Wang-Tui Texts* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1992).
- Benjamin Hoff, *The Tao of Pooh* (New York: Penguin Books, 1982).
- C. John Holcombe, "Translating Wang Wei" <http://www.textetc.com/workshop/wt-wang-wei-1.html> (Accessed: January 31, 2011).
- Kenneth W. Holloway, *Guodian: The Newly Discovered Seeds of Chinese Religious and Political Philosophy* (New York: Oxford University Press 2009).
- Shih Hu, *The Chinese Renaissance: The Haskell Lectures* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934).
- Yong Huang, ed., *Dao: A Journal of Comparative Philosophy* (Dordrecht Netherlands: Springer, 2011).
- Charles O. Hucker, *China's Imperial Past: An Introduction to Chinese History and Culture* (Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press, 1995).
- Eric L. Hutton, "Han Feizi's Criticism of Confucianism and Its Implications for Virtue Ethics," *Journal of Moral Philosophy*, Volume 5, Issue 3 (2008): 423-453.
- Eric L. Hutton, "Moral Connoisseurship in Mengzi," in Xiusheng Liu and Philip J. Ivanhoe, eds., *Essays on the Moral Philosophy of Mengzi* (Indianapolis, IN: Hackett, 2002), 163-186.
- Eric L. Hutton, "Moral Reasoning in Aristotle and Xunzi," *Journal of Chinese Philosophy*, Volume 29, Issue 3 (2002): 355-384.
- Manyul Im, *Chinese Philosophy Blog* <http://manyulim.wordpress.com/> (Accessed: January 31, 2011).
- Manyul Im et al, *Warp, Weft, and Way: A Group Blog of Chinese and Comparative Philosophy* <http://warpweftandway.wordpress.com/2009/11/08/welcome-to-the-group-blog/> (Accessed: January 31, 2011).
- Philip J. Ivanhoe, *Confucian Moral Self Cultivation*, rev. ed. (Indianapolis, IN: Hackett, 2000). [4]
- Philip J. Ivanhoe, *Ethics in the Confucian Tradition: The Thought of Mengzi and Wang Yangming*, rev. ed. (Indianapolis, IN: Hackett, 2002). [2]
- Philip J. Ivanhoe, trans., *Readings from the Lu-Wang School of Neo-Confucianism* (Indianapolis, IN: Hackett, 2009). [4]
- Philip J. Ivanhoe, trans., *The Daodejing of Laozi* (Indianapolis, IN: Hackett, 2003). [2]
- Philip J. Ivanhoe and Bryan W. Van Norden, eds., *Readings in Classical Chinese Philosophy*, 2nd ed. (Indianapolis, IN: Hackett, 2006). [19]
- Lionel M. Jensen, *Manufacturing Confucianism: Chinese Traditions and Universal Civilization* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1997).
- David Jones and E. R. Klein, eds., *Asian Texts - Asian Contexts: Encounters with Asian Philosophies and Religions* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2009).
- François Jullien, *The Propensity of Things: Toward a History of Efficacy in China*, trans. Janet Lloyd (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1995).
- François Jullien, *Treatise on Efficacy: Between Western and Chinese Thinking*, trans. Janet Lloyd (Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press, 2004).
- John Junkerman, dir., *Dream Window: Reflections on the Japanese Garden* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 1992).
- Richard T. Kaser, *The I Ching in Ten Minutes* (New York: Harper Perennial, 1994).
- Kim Ki Duk, dir., *Spring, Summer, Fall, Winter ... and Spring* (Culver City, CA: Sony Pictures Classics, 2003). [2]
- Paul Kjellberg and Philip J. Ivanhoe, eds., *Essays on Skepticism, Relativism, and Ethics in the Zhuangzi* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1996). [3]
- Thornton C. Kline and Philip J. Ivanhoe, eds., *Virtue, Nature, and Moral Agency in the Xunzi* (Indianapolis, IN: Hackett, 2000). [3]
- John Knoblock, trans., *Xunzi: A Translation and Study of the Complete Works, Volume I, Books 1-6* (Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press, 1988).
- John Knoblock, trans., *Xunzi: A Translation and Study of the Complete Works, Volume II, Books 7-16* (Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press, 1990).
- John Knoblock, trans., *Xunzi: A Translation and Study of the Complete Works, Volume III, Books 17-32* (Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press, 1994).
- Dieter Kuhn, *The Age of Confucian Rule: The Song Transformation of China* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009).

- Joel J. Kupperman, *Classic Asian Philosophy: A Guide to the Essential Texts*, 2nd ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006).
- Akira Kurosawa, dir., *Ikiru*, DVD (New York: The Criterion Collection, 2004).
- Akira Kurosawa and Ishirô Honda, dirs., *Akira Kurosawa's Dreams* (Burbank, CA: Warner Brothers Pictures, 1990), DVD (Burbank, CA: Warner Home Video, 2003).
- Karyn L. Lai, *An Introduction to Chinese Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008). [3]
- D. C. Lau, trans., *Chinese Classics: Tao Te Ching* (Hong Kong: Chinese University Press, 1982).
- D. C. Lau, trans., *Lao Tzu: Tao Te Ching* (Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books, 1963). [2]
- D. C. Lau, trans., *Mencius* (Hong Kong: Chinese University Press, 1984). [4]
- D. C. Lau, trans., *The Analects* (Hong Kong: Chinese University Press, 1983). [4]
- D. C. Lau and Roger T. Ames, trans., *Sun Pin: The Art of Warfare* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1996). [3]
- Ang Lee, dir., *Crouching Tiger, Hidden Dragon* (Culver City, CA: Columbia Pictures, 2000). [2]
- Chang-Dong Lee, dir., *Oasis*, DVD (Parsippany, NJ: Lifesize Home Entertainment, 2004).
- James Legge, trans., *The Works of Mencius* (New York: Dover Publications, 1970).
- Mark Edward Lewis, *China Between Empires: The Northern and Southern Dynasties* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009).
- Mark Edward Lewis, *China's Cosmopolitan Empire: The Tang Dynasty* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009).
- Mark Edward Lewis, *Sanctioned Violence in Early China* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1990).
- Mark Edward Lewis, *The Construction of Space in Early China* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2005).
- Mark Edward Lewis, *The Early Chinese Empires: Qin and Han* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007).
- Chenyang Li, ed., *The Sage and the Second Sex: Confucianism, Ethics, and Gender* (La Salle, IL: Open Court, 2000).
- Yang Li, dir., *Blind Shaft*, DVD (New York: Kino International, 2004).
- JeeLoo Liu, *An Introduction to Chinese Philosophy: From Ancient Philosophy to Chinese Buddhism* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2006). [4]
- Xiusheng Liu and Philip J. Ivanhoe, eds., *Essays on the Moral Philosophy of Mengzi* (Indianapolis, IN: Hackett, 2002). [3]
- Geoffrey Lloyd, *Adversaries and Authorities: Investigations into Ancient Greek and Chinese Science* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).
- Michael Loewe, *Everyday Life in Early Imperial China* (Indianapolis, IN: Hackett, 2005).
- Michael Loewe, *Faith, Myth, and Reason in Han China* (Indianapolis, IN: Hackett, 2005).
- Michael Loewe, *The Government of the Qin and Han Empires: 221 BCE - 220 CE* (Indianapolis, IN: Hackett, 2006).
- Xun Lu, *Diary of a Madman and Other Stories*, trans. William A. Lyell (Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press, 1990).
- Victor H. Mair, trans., *Wandering on the Way: Early Taoist Tales and Parables of Chuang Tzu* (Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press, 1998).
- Thomas Merton, *The Way of Chuang Tzu* (New York: New Directions Publishing Corporation, 1965).
- Hans-Georg Moeller, trans., *Daodejing: The New, Highly Readable Translation of the Life-Changing Ancient Scripture Formerly Known as the Tao Te Ching* (LaSalle, IL: Open Court, 2007).
- Fredrick W. Mote, *Imperial China 900-1800* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003). [2]
- Bo Mou, ed., *Chinese Philosophy A-Z* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009).
- Bo Mou, ed., *History of Chinese Philosophy* (London: Routledge, 2008).
- A. Charles Muller, *Resources for East Asian Language and Thought* <http://www.acmuller.net/> (Accessed: January 31, 2011).
- Donald J. Munro, *Images of Human Nature: A Sung Portrait* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1988).
- Donald J. Munro, *The Concept of Man in Early China* (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 2001).
- Robert C. Neville, *Ritual and Deference: Extending Chinese Philosophy in a Comparative Context* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2009).
- David S. Nivison, *The Ways of Confucianism: Investigations in Chinese Philosophy*, ed. Bryan W. Van Norden (La Salle, IL: Open Court, 1996).
- Raymond Olson, dir., *Blending with Nature: Classical Chinese Gardens in the Suzhou Style* (Vancouver, WA: Sacred Mountain Productions, 2007).
- Galia Patt-Shamir, *A Human Riddle: Human Nature and Chinese Philosophy* (Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University Press, 2004).
- Ming L. Pei, *China the Beautiful: Classical Chinese Art, Calligraphy, Poetry, History, Literature, Painting and Philosophy* <http://www.chinapage.com/china.html> (Accessed: January 31, 2011).
- Red Pine, trans., *The Zen Teaching of Bodhidharma* (San Francisco: North Point Press, 1989).
- Jeffrey L. Richey, ed., *Teaching Confucianism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008). [5]
- Jeremy Roberts, *Chinese Mythology A to Z* (Bel Air, CA: Facts on File, 2004).
- Kelley Ross, *Chinese Philosophy* <http://www.friesian.com/history.htm#china> (Accessed: January 31, 2011).
- Ben-Ami Scharfstein, *A Comparative History of World Philosophy: From the Upanishads to Kant* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1998).
- David R. Schiller, trans., *Confucius: Discussions/Conversation, or the Analects [Lun-Yu]*, CD-ROM (Charlton, MA: Saga Virtual Publishers, 2008).
- Benjamin I. Schwartz, *The World of Thought in Ancient China* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1985). [3]
- Edward G. Slingerland, trans., *Confucius: Analects with Selections from Traditional Commentaries* (Indianapolis, IN: Hackett, 2003). [5]

- Edward G. Slingerland, trans., *The Essential Analects: Selected Passages with Traditional Commentary* (Indianapolis, IN: Hackett, 2006). [3]
- Huston Smith, *The Religions of Man* (New York: Harper and Row, 1965).
- Joanna Handlin Smith, ed., *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard-Yenching Institute, 2011).
- Stanford University, Center for the Study of Language and Information, The Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, ed. Edward N. Zalta <http://plato.stanford.edu/> (Accessed: January 31, 2011).
- Donald Sturgeon, *Chinese Text Project* <http://chinese.dsturgeon.net/> (Accessed: January 31, 2011). [3]
- Hiroshi Teshigahara, dir., *Woman in the Dunes*, DVD (Chatsworth, CA: Image Entertainment, 2000).
- Laurence G. Thompson, *Chinese Religion: An Introduction*, 5th ed. (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1996).
- Hung Anh Tran, dir., *The Scent of Green Papaya*, DVD (Culver City, CA: Columbia TriStar, 2001).
- Chih Chung Tsai, *Confucius Speaks: Words to Live By*, trans. Brian Bruya (New York: Anchor Books, 1996).
- Chih Chung Tsai, *Sunzi Speaks: The Art of War*, trans. Brian Bruya (New York: Anchor Books, 1994).
- Chih Chung Tsai, *The Dao of Zhuangzi: The Harmony of Nature*, trans. Brian Bruya (New York: Anchor Books, 1997).
- Chih Chung Tsai, *The Tao Speaks: Lao-Tzu's Whispers of Wisdom*, trans. Brian Bruya (New York: Anchor Books, 1995).
- Chih Chung Tsai, *Wisdom of the Zen Masters: The Quest for Enlightenment*, trans. Brian Bruya (New York: Anchor Books, 1998).
- Chih Chung Tsai, *Zen Speaks: Shouts of Nothingness*, trans. Brian Bruya (New York: Anchor Books, 1994).
- Chih Chung Tsai, *Zhuangzi Speaks: The Music of Nature*, trans. Brian Bruya (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992).
- Mary Evelyn Tucker and John Berthrong, eds., *Confucianism and Ecology: The Interrelation of Heaven, Earth, and Humans* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998).
- University of Hawaii, Department of Philosophy, *Shuhai Wenyuan* <http://shuhai.dsturgeon.net/> (Accessed: January 31, 2011). [4]
- University of Tennessee at Martin, *The Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. James Fieser <http://www.iep.utm.edu/> (Accessed: January 31, 2011).
- Bryan W. Van Norden, ed., *Confucius and the Analects: New Essays* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001). [3]
- Bryan W. Van Norden, *Essential Readings on Chinese Philosophy* <http://faculty.vassar.edu/brvannor/bibliography.html> (Accessed: January 31, 2011). [3]
- Bryan W. Van Norden, trans., *Mengzi: With Selections from Traditional Commentaries* (Indianapolis, IN: Hackett, 2008). [4]
- Bryan W. Van Norden, trans., *The Essential Mengzi: Selected Passages with Traditional Commentary* (Indianapolis, IN: Hackett, 2009). [4]
- Bryan W. Van Norden, *Virtue Ethics and Consequentialism in Early Chinese Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).
- Andy Wachowski and Lana Wachowski, dirs., *The Matrix* (Burbank, CA: Warner Bros. Pictures, 1999).
- Arthur Waley, trans., *The Analects of Confucius* (New York: Vintage Books, 1989).
- Arthur Waley, trans., *Three Ways of Thought in Ancient China* (Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press, 1939).
- Robin Wang, ed., *Images of Women in Chinese Thought and Culture: Writings from the Pre-Qin Period Through the Song Dynasty* (Indianapolis, IN: Hackett, 2003).
- Ding Wangdao, *100 Chinese Myths and Fantasies* (Beijing: China Translation Publishing Company, 1991).
- Burton Watson, trans., *Basic Writings of Mo Tzu, Hsün Tzu, and Han Fei Tzu* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1967). [4]
- Burton Watson, trans., *Chuang Tzu: Basic Writings* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996). [7]
- Burton Watson, trans., *Han Fei Tzu: Basic Writings* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996). [4]
- Burton Watson, trans., *Hsün Tzu: Basic Writings*, rev. ed. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996). [4]
- Burton Watson, trans., *Mo Tzu: Basic Writings* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1963). [5]
- Burton Watson, trans., *The Complete Works of Chuang Tzu* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1968). [4]
- Burton Watson, trans., *Xunzi: Basic Writings* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2003). [4]
- Burton Watson, trans., *Zhuangzi: Basic Writings* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2003). [6]
- Sandra A. Wawrytko, ed., *Chinese Philosophy in Cultural Context: Selected Readings from Essential Sources*, rev. ed. (San Diego, CA: Aztec Shops, 2006).
- Eliot Weinberger and Octavio Paz, *Nineteen Ways of Looking at Wang Wei: How a Chinese Poem Is Translated* (Kingston, RI: Moyer Bell, 1987).
- Holmes Welch, *Taoism: The Parting of the Way*, rev. ed. (Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1971).
- Hellmut Wilhelm, *Eight Lectures on the I Ching* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1972).
- Michael Wood, perf., "China: The Mandate of Heaven" (1991), in Peter Spry-Leverton, dir., *Legacy: The Origins of Civilization*, DVD (Birmingham, England: Central Independent Television, 2003).
- Yang Xiao, "Reading the Analects with Davidson: Mood, Force, and Communicative Practice in Early China," in Bo Mou, ed., *Davidson's Philosophy and Chinese Philosophy: Constructive Engagement* (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill Academic Publishers, 2006), 247-268.
- Yang Xiao, "When Political Philosophy Meets Moral Psychology: Expressivism in the Mencius," *Dao: A Journal of Comparative Philosophy*, Volume 5, Number 2 (2006): 257-271.
- Anthony C. Yu, trans., *Journey to the West, Volume 1* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980).
- Anthony C. Yu, trans., *Journey to the West, Volume 2* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983).
- Anthony C. Yu, trans., *Journey to the West, Volume 3* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984).

- Anthony C. Yu, trans., *Journey to the West, Volume 4* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984).
- Anthony C. Yu, *State and Religion in China: Historical and Textual Perspectives* (La Salle, IL: Open Court, 2005).
- Hua Yu, *To Live: A Novel*, trans. Michael Berry (New York: Anchor Books, 2003).
- Yimou Zhang, dir., *To Live*, DVD (Century City, LA: Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Inc., 2003).
- Gu Zhengkun, trans., *Lao Zi: The Book of Tao and Teh* (Beijing: Beijing University Press, 1995).
- Brook Ziporyn, trans., *Zhuangzi: The Essential Writings with Selections from Traditional Commentaries* (Indianapolis, IN: Hackett, 2009). [3]

Question #8: *What are the rewards of teaching Chinese philosophy for you? And for your department?*

The following are answers from survey respondents:

- As far as my rewards are concerned, I find China and Chinese philosophy intellectually engaging and stimulating. It requires me to approach philosophy in a way different from that in which I have been trained and it offers lots of insights and alternatives along the way. I enjoy learning more about both in the course of my teaching. As far as my department is concerned, the rewards of including Asian philosophy in [course number deleted], the only course in which we regularly teach Chinese philosophy, were very great. Including Chinese philosophy in the course enabled the course to satisfy both the multicultural/global requirement and the humanities inquiry requirement in the core curriculum. The course quickly became very heavily enrolled. During some semesters it had the second largest enrollment of any course on campus. This enabled us to add two new positions in philosophy and to hire two permanent adjuncts. Since then, however, the course has changed and while there is now a diversity requirement, there is not a multicultural/global requirement. This means that it is no longer necessary to teach Asian philosophy in the course. Most of us, however, continue to do it because we find it satisfying. However, I assign more readings in Chinese philosophy than anyone else does.
- On top of all the normal rewards of teaching something one loves, it's been great to see how my department, my colleagues, and our students have come to broaden their view of what philosophy is and where it has been done. Courses get renamed (e.g., "Classical Philosophy" became "Classical Greek Philosophy"); colleagues gradually start referencing Chinese thinkers, texts, and ideas; and so on.
- Broadening the conceptual framework, understanding some important aspects of Asian culture, gaining a new perspective for those who were not familiar with Chinese thought, and appreciating one's own cultural background if the students are raised by Chinese parents or come from Asia. I believe the Confucian ethical concepts are quite important still today, regardless of whether one is Chinese or non-Chinese.
- Students who catch on to this material learn new ways to think about social problems, about how to think philosophically and what philosophical problems are and are not about, and about how to think about the nature of their own personhood differently. My department has had a good history of strongly emphasizing the study of Asian philosophical traditions, and incorporated such study into the requirements for graduate students, so classes in Chinese philosophy are part of the department's mission.
- Although my primary appointment is in the School of Theology, I teach my Introduction to Chinese Philosophy for the Philosophy Department. My colleagues in Philosophy are delighted to offer the course, as are my colleagues in such departments as History, Sociology, Anthropology, International Relations, and Comparative Literature. It is my chance to work with undergraduates and I find them inspiring in all the various ways they are so different from graduate students. Some of them have been the very best students I have had at the University. If I can reach those who are simply taking the course as a requirement in a college like Communications, then I take pride in my ability to teach (or entertain as the case may be). From time to time, I also really do learn something from them; a new insight and some text they find, usually on the Internet, that I have never seen before.
- The reward for me is simply the joy of teaching something I love. Some students become quite animated in their appreciation of being introduced to something they have had no exposure to but which they find very valuable—as if they have been given a precious jewel long hidden away. My department takes seriously our university's mission to embrace diversity and, therefore, appreciates how the Asian tradition contributes to philosophy as a global enterprise.
- It is a good feeling to introduce Chinese culture to American students. I believe this kind of cultural exchange is a benefit to everyone. For my department, the course satisfies the diversity requirement in the core/general education curriculum.
- Having the opportunity to introduce students to (and for me to reflect more deeply on) schools of thought that help them to reflect more on the importance of thinking about human nature and ethics, especially the importance of the family and virtues like filial piety which are often neglected by Western philosophers and in Western culture more generally.
- It helps to reflect.
- The rewards of teaching Chinese philosophy for me? It's fun for me and illuminating for the students.
- I enjoy seeing students recognize and appreciate (no need to accept) that China has an incredibly old and developed civilization. It decenters the West and helps them, if they are open to the ideas, to see that Western triumphalism in the modern age is but one historical moment. In the History Department, this contributes to our goal of making majors aware that the historical development of cultures/philosophies still has a tremendous influence in today's world and that there are very good grounds upon which some reject Western values.
- I think they have the best insights, and enjoy sharing them with others who are unaware of them.
- I am in the History Department at my school, but the Philosophy Department has allowed me to teach a course solely in their area (i.e., without cross-listing for History credit) and feels that it is an important offering for majors in philosophy. The course has spawned many junior and senior thesis projects and led some into the field of Chinese studies. On a personal level, teaching the course has allowed me to "stay alive" in the field and publish books, journal articles, and encyclopedia sections in Chinese thought, participate in seminars and conferences dealing

with Chinese philosophy, and also enrich other course offerings in Chinese history.

- To help students understand the beauty and importance of Chinese philosophy (which they can comprehend only by reading the original sources), and secondarily to make them recognize that the Greeks were not the only philosophers on the planet.
- For myself, having taught the greats in Western philosophy for 25 years and then having the opportunity to do the same for the Chinese greats for 15 years, my sense of genuine philosophy has been enlarged and my understanding of the broad swath cut by “the spiritual” deepened. The inclusion of the spiritual dimension is among the great tasks facing contemporary American citizens and this is a superb way to do it.
- By figuring out how to connect it to undergrads, I was able to pitch my book [reference deleted] to a wider audience.
- Our department’s budget is tied directly to student enrollment. My classes on Chinese philosophy tend to draw not only philosophy majors, but also students from History, Literature, Asian Studies, etc., so the department is happy to have the extra income. Since not many departments offer courses on Chinese philosophy at the graduate level, our ability to do so gives us a distinct profile among graduate programs, which has likewise helped to draw students. For me personally, I enjoy being able to share my love of the subject with others, but I also value being able to promote greater awareness of and sensitivity to other cultures through teaching Chinese philosophy.
- Helping students of Asian immigrants to understand their cultural background and sometimes their own parents. Helping students see the world in different ways.
- I enjoy introducing students to a very different set of philosophical texts and problems than the one they are used to discussing. I feel like they are better citizens of the world because of it. My department benefits by having more contribution to the diversity goals and curricular requirements of the University.
- It is particularly rewarding to see students grasp and come to appreciate a range of views that offer distinctive answers to questions that are in many cases familiar to them and in some cases new but accessible. Such classes have the potential to lead students, especially American students, out of their provincial comfort zones and into different philosophical and cultural points of view. The students are capable of doing this, both intellectually and in terms of character, but the narrow guild mentality, often fueled by a general lack of understanding and fear of what is new and challenging, regularly prevents their teachers from embarking on a similar journey of discovery and enrichment and leads them to deny this opportunity to their young charges. Given the current state of the world, it is baffling how intelligent people can fail to see the screaming imperative we have, as educators, to inculcate in our students a critical ability to understand and appreciate radically different points of view. Philosophy departments are uniquely equipped to nurture such attitudes and skills. Another distinctive satisfaction in teaching East Asian material in general is the common response of legacy students. Students of East Asian ancestry often discover not just their “roots” but the depth and strength of these roots. It is a new experience for almost all of them to engage their tradition through philosophical method, and often they discover just how remarkable and powerful many aspects of these views truly are. In the process they come to understand their ancestors, parents, peers, and themselves in new and profound ways. It is an honor and a joy to play some role in this process.
- No rewards for the department—they could care less! Personally, giving some voice to the Chinese as being major contributors to thinking and living.
- I understand it better after teaching it. And I get to address issues to which students are not going to give canned responses, learned from other classes. It is one of the most popular courses.
- My course is cross-listed in History (my Ph.D. field) and in Philosophy. I adapt classical Chinese academy pedagogy to liberal arts teaching. By keeping personal journals of reactions to reading and tutorials, there develops a revitalization of the passages that ultimately make the student and teacher co-learners. The personal rewards of assisting the students as these ancient texts come alive are rich, and send me home on Fridays with a broad, deep smile.
- 四海之內皆兄弟也。I like developing the sense of kinship between people in different places and times.
- It enhances my research by (a) helping me think clearly through issues that I need to explain to my students; (b) forcing me to keep in touch with up-to-date research in the entire field whereas in my research I specialize in particular areas within the field of Chinese philosophy; and (c) opening up questions of method and argumentation that I must think about in my approach to teaching—this informs my research. The course enhances the philosophy curriculum as it introduces philosophy from a non-Western perspective. Typically, as one would expect, in [name of country deleted] philosophy curricula, there is a predominance of courses that cover philosophy in the Anglo-American and Continental European traditions as well as those areas that are critical to the history of Western philosophy. My department is the only one *Philosophy* department in which Chinese philosophy is taught. There are other universities in [name of country deleted] that teach Chinese thought, but these are mostly in History or Asian Studies departments. My university [name of university deleted] has acquired a reputation for teaching and research in Chinese philosophy. It has even attracted student prizes donated by members of the public who are keen to encourage student learning in the course.
- Get paid as part of my workload (kidding). Teaching philosophy is rewarding itself. Fill a gap in the curriculum of my department.
- I can integrate teaching and researching. The Department takes a Chinese philosophy course as a feature on its hat. The Chinese philosophy course is also cross-listed with the Asian Studies Program.
- I find that Chinese philosophers often come at a fundamental question somewhat differently than do some Western philosophers, but as a whole, I must say that I simply believe strongly that if we are to tell the complete story of philosophy, we cannot neglect Asian traditions.
- Student’s interest.
- For my department, none—it keeps me happy and out of their hair. For me, it is my life’s blood and I need to share it.

- Students really enjoy it and, because it is different from what they usually study, it often has a very deep impact on their thinking. This may sound silly, but I enjoy having students to discuss the texts with, particularly people who are approaching the texts in the same direction as I am. I learn a lot from my students.
- Classical Chinese philosophy offers a way to think about philosophy that strikes my students as important, since it is focused on how to live well, and offers a range of views about human nature and ethics that make sense as a way to address questions about how to live well. The contribution of these courses to my department is that we are able to provide students with a window into another set of key texts in a centrally important tradition, with some compelling views about matters of fundamental human importance.
- Chinese philosophy seems to me in many ways pragmatic. Clearly American students (and professors) are too wrapped up in their Western thinking. It is fun to watch students realize that people are people.
- I find it rewarding to teach Chinese philosophy because it constitutes the intellectual expression of the most conspicuous and enduring alternative to the Judeo-Platonic-Christian-Kantian tradition that has dominated my own culture. I'm not sure how my department would respond to this question aside from crediting the inclusion of such material with accomplishing the nebulous goal of cross-cultural "coverage."
- The reward is the excitement of teaching something that the students don't know anything about otherwise and probably never will. There is also the benefit, as in all teaching, to think about matters anew as they are being taught, which leads to using Chinese examples to illustrate issues in Western philosophy also.
- There is a tremendous interest in religiously inflected philosophical alternatives to standard Western thought. Helping students access this material is very rewarding.
- It's fun. Classical Chinese philosophy focuses on timeless issues of interest to students and it tends to be written in styles that students enjoy and can learn from. And you can do fair justice to practically the whole tradition from beginning to end in a single course! My university is plurality Asian, so it's nice for the department to be able to offer a course that highlights Asian traditions.
- My answer to this question is directly related to my answer to Question 5. The Western method to gain (a diploma, or a degree, from students' point of view) is in contradiction to the Eastern method of teaching for the sake of intrinsic value. There are different presuppositions about teaching and learning involved. I teach Chinese philosophy because there is an intrinsic value in Chinese philosophy, not for my personal gain in teaching it. This answers Question 8 and Question 9.
- To me, it is a very precious thing to share this essence of Chinese culture with the students, so that they can learn and appreciate a deeper dimension of China, a dimension that still underlies so many phenomena in China and East Asia. I teach this course for the [name of American university deleted] International Program and I do believe that this course deepens and enriches the cultural experience and understanding of their students in Taiwan. I believe that this course works better than would a course taught in the [name of Taiwanese university deleted] philosophy department, because the local students come to the class with so much background knowledge that the American students lack. The local class takes for granted a lot of tacit knowledge about the field that is unknown and unavailable to the American students.
- From the point of view of my department, courses that devote much space to Chinese philosophy are a big draw, no matter the reputation of the instructor. By offering courses in Chinese philosophy regularly, we also earn the right to advertise ourselves as working across a diverse range of traditions, which tends to make our program more appealing to students. The fact that we teach Chinese philosophy never fails to get mentioned on our department's website, in multiple places. Every year we offer about six courses that address Plato in depth, and about ten courses that focus substantially on contemporary epistemology. By comparison, we offer only two courses a year that focus substantially on Chinese philosophy. Yet our course offerings in Chinese philosophy are mentioned much more often in our promotional materials. This is telling indeed. Chinese philosophy is one of my principal areas of research, and I immensely enjoy teaching in my principal areas. The students in my Chinese philosophy courses tend to be more enthusiastic than the students in the other courses I teach. I confess that they are somewhat less philosophically astute than the students I get in my upper-division majors courses, but this is because a majority of the students taking Chinese philosophy are non-majors.
- To understand the texts better. I do not think there is any difference for the Philosophy Department. The Asian Studies Department is more interested.
- For me: (1) enhancing my research on Chinese philosophy through receiving students' questions and feedback; (2) engaging discussion in class; (3) explaining the related ideas in a clear and organized way. For the department: (1) having accessible to the department and faculty members distinct methodological approaches, substantial points of views, visions, and conceptual/explanatory resources from Chinese philosophical tradition; (2) enhancing the open-minded approach to philosophy; (3) enhancing academic connection with other relevant departments/programs and their relevant faculty members whose teaching are somehow related to Chinese thought.
- I love to see the surprise when people realize that (a) this stuff is quite often a really novel way of thinking about things, and (b) these ideas can be thought about and applied in everyday life.
- Students like the course; they like having the mystery that surrounds their understanding of a major philosophical tradition and a major world power lifted somewhat.
- It is essential that the discipline of philosophy engage in ongoing dialogues with all traditions available if it is to have any relevance in a globalizing world. We do a disservice to our students if we confine them to increasingly obsolete Amero-Eurocentric assumptions and prejudices.
- I am happy to be able to help Western students to understand Chinese philosophy. Since our department has a tradition of emphasizing Philosophy East and West in [name of country deleted], this is also part of our program.
- I have been doing this for ages, which must mean that I absolutely love teaching the subject matter.
- My courses fulfill the all-college requirement in the field of intercultural studies. We attempt to increase our course offerings in Asian Studies (so far mostly courses in History,

Religion, and Modern Languages) and perhaps offer a minor in Asian Studies in the future. In general, students seem to enjoy the opportunity to learn about religious and philosophical traditions outside of Europe and America. Occasionally, a student even proceeds to earn a Ph.D. in one of these fields. Some students develop enough interest in the study of the religious traditions of South and East Asia that they decide to write their senior thesis on topics in the field of comparative philosophy and/or religion. It seems that my courses encourage students to explore a variety of traditions; they thus do not restrict their inquiries to one specific philosophical tradition but draw from a multiplicity of traditions in their discussion of various topics, be they in the field of metaphysics, epistemology, ethics, political philosophy, or philosophy of religion. Personally, I believe that the study of a multiplicity of philosophical traditions is not only essential to a liberal arts education, but it also enriches the discussion of every philosophical topic.

- Teaching Chinese philosophy has brought me the opportunity to think deeply about its meaning and relevance for contemporary life, which is rewarding for my research and career development. It also enriches the diversity of courses my department is able to contribute for the liberal arts education.
- To open students up to other ways of understanding life and other ways of acquiring knowledge.
- I sincerely believe that there are many things about being a modern American that allows me to celebrate the Emersonian soul and the tradition that has inspired it. I also believe that there is much in the Chinese tradition of enormous worth for our contemporary society, in particular, the notion of the relationally constituted person located in family as a foil to an individualism that has gone too far.
- It helps to keep me active in my field. I enjoy watching the students when they get it.
- For me, having to deal with a form of life that isn't my own makes me able to better understand others. For me and my department, teaching Chinese philosophy quenches the thirst of many [nationality deleted] to learn about life and thought in East Asia.
- I find the students very receptive and that there's a rewarding level of enthusiasm in the classroom. For the department, it means a course with healthy enrollment (usually capped at around 70).
- The biggest rewards come from getting students to see that there is no single way of looking at things.
- I learn a lot through teaching and it helps my research. Teaching Western students Chinese philosophy helps my department to be recognized internationally.
- Ha ha, Question 8 and Question 9 deserve a long discussion. I would just say that the first benefit is a better understanding of the Western philosophy we studied in the schools.
- It enables me to continue doing research in the area of Chinese philosophy, which is one of my specialties. As for my department, teaching comparative philosophy is one of our strengths, so there is no doubt that the school will continue to teach Chinese philosophy.
- For me, to be able to teach in an area aligned with my research interests. For my department, to have expertise in this area.
- I get to teach an approach to philosophy that remains relevant and accessible to any human, a philosophy truly related to practical problems that everyone faces in their

life. I am not sure my department cares much about Chinese philosophy or any other world philosophy except what they mean by "Western," which in fact is the Anglo-American view of philosophy with a little bit of French and German thought, not much though. The truth is that I have to teach Chinese philosophy somewhat undercover, within a survey course entitled "Religions of China and Japan."

- I love teaching, period. I love watching students getting excited about learning.
- As China opens to the world, more and more Chinese students will go to America to study. Teaching Chinese philosophy will benefit Western students in communicating with Chinese students. And for the department, there will be an increase in the number of students. Some of Chinese philosophy will attract students who are interested in Chinese culture.
- I get to discuss a philosophy I am passionate about. It is plain fun. It expands the areas the department can offer courses in, and this proves popular with students.
- I have learned a lot and had a great deal of fun. My department may, in the next two or three decades, enter the second half of the 20th century.
- When students come to recognize cultural differences, it is a moment of great reward for me, and I believe it is also academic responsibility.
- It takes me, and many students, out of the Western rut and opens a whole different view of life—and non-life.
- Teaching Chinese philosophy as a professor originating from [name of country deleted] to predominantly [names of ethnic groups deleted] creates interesting symbiotic effects. The students tend to appreciate learning about a Western perspective of their own traditions and vice versa. Teaching Chinese philosophy has enabled me to put into perspective and see the limits of many of the primary concerns of Western metaphysics and ethics.

Question #9: *What are the rewards of learning Chinese philosophy for you? And for your students?*

The following are answers from survey respondents:

- I find Chinese philosophy fascinating in the same way that I find Western, Indian, African, etc. philosophy fascinating. Learning about it is for me an end in itself. My students generally find it more engaging than the Western philosophers (i.e., Plato, Mill, Kant, and Hare) that I assign. I think that teaching them something about Chinese philosophy helps prepare them for living in a multicultural world.
- My best answer: midway through a course on Neo-Confucianism some years ago, a student told me that she loved the class because it was the "most relevant" course she had taken in college. I was initially flabbergasted. Most relevant? Zhu Xi's 12th-century Neo-Confucianism? But I came to see what she meant: this was a class in which we were learning a vocabulary to talk about values, relations with others, relations with the wider world. Another philosophy course might have done the same thing for her, but the nature of Chinese thought made this personal reflection particularly accessible.
- The timelessness of the Confucian ethical concepts, the wonderful metaphysical ideas in Taoism—I enjoy them personally.

- Having been originally a specialist in classical Indian philosophy, what learning Chinese philosophy helped me to do was fundamentally shift my perspective on what philosophy was for, what human issues it was supposed to speak to. In classical India, Hindus and Buddhists conducted, for example, one debate that lasted for about a thousand years concerning whether cognition lasts one or two moments. While one can easily appreciate the great intellectual rigor such a debate demands, classical Indian philosophers tended to invest much more significance in such debates than can reasonably be obtained from them. Instead of focusing on very abstract and recondite epistemological and metaphysical issues, the Chinese tradition focuses its attention on vital issues in human experience, such as the nature of our social experience, the quest to extend goodness in personal relationships to society as a whole, the relationship of the person to natural life, and its emphasis on interconnectedness rather than identity. In short, studying Chinese philosophy fundamentally revolutionized the way I understand what philosophy is for, and I try to communicate this to my students in my courses.
- I love to teach Chinese philosophy and have done so for forty years. What reward for my students? That their sense of the global reach of philosophy is expanded. From time to time, I even had students who go on for graduate work in Asian thought or comparative philosophy. But what is most rewarding is the letter from a business student who accepts a post in Hong Kong or Taipei or Shanghai or Seoul or Tokyo, because they would like to see how Asian philosophy is alive today in the world of global commerce. I even had one student who tried to apply Daoism to teaching Second Grade but told me that she then developed a much more robust appreciation of Confucian pedagogy after about four weeks of *wuwei*.
- Chinese philosophy promises the reward of learning how to profitably challenge the dominant trends in classic and current Western academic thinking. Let me give you an example. For more than thirty years, the prominent psychologist Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi has been researching the attentional phenomenon commonly known as flow. A few years ago when I was a member of a research project of his, I scoured the cognitive scientific literature (including philosophy) for any treatments of cognition and flow. There was nothing. Why? Because flow, despite its confirmed validity as an operational concept in behavioral psychology, does not fit into the predetermined conceptual boxes and methods of cognitive science. Attention in flow is perceived as effortless, yet most scholars presume attention is effortful and so have largely missed effortless attention in the way that Kuhn says we miss data that fall outside our paradigms. By coming from Chinese philosophy, however, in which effortless attention is the highest form of attention, I was able to see it and expand on it. There are many opportunities for early Chinese philosophy to contribute to current issues in academics, if we are willing to isolate and recognize the presuppositions of the various traditions.
- It helps me to build up my own philosophy and helps my students to learn more different things (especially different cultures).
- It helps to reflect and to read.
- The rewards of learning Chinese philosophy for me? It's fun.
- Chinese philosophy provides a foil for Western values and ideas. It causes us to question what we think are universals by introducing a new vocabulary for understanding the world. We may, in the end, return to our original beliefs, but we do so with a much deeper appreciation of why we hold those values dear; or we may find that we need to modify our views of how the world works and how we ought to respond to it.
- Chinese philosophers discussed some of the most important problems facing humanity, and did so with remarkable sophistication and literary brilliance.
- Enlargement of reflexive experience, inclusion of other cultural ways, and most of all the opportunity to *live* a philosophical orientation. My students and I experience this every time we engage Chinese philosophy in a concrete way.
- For me personally, the study of Chinese philosophy has made me re-think my values in several cases, because it seems to me that the Chinese thinkers have a number of valuable insights. It has also given me a new perspective from which to conduct research on Western philosophy. For my students, I think the material opens their eyes to different ways of thinking about things. It makes them more sensitive to some matters that they might take for granted (e.g., ritual), while also giving them a basis to understand and appreciate Asian culture.
- For me, I found the study of Confucianism, Daoism, and Buddhism for more than 30 years has provided me with the resources with which to deal with some of life's crises, including the death of my wife seven years ago.
- I enjoy figuring out the interpretive puzzles and thinking about ethical issues from a different perspective than the Western traditions. I hope the students gain the same rewards.
- The *Book of Rites* tells us that "teaching is the other half of learning." There are many respects in which this is true and this question reveals one of them. The rewards are very much the same as the rewards of teaching.
- Better understanding of one's cultural presuppositions. Learning a new style of philosophizing (more cooperative than confrontational).
- Increased depth in understanding and practicing humane behavior.
- I find it practically useful in guiding my course in the world.
- Here is one thing that seems to have made the course more rewarding for the brighter students. Rather than merely presenting the Asian readings in terms of their logic and implicit arguments, I also present them as representative of an area of philosophy that in recent years has been somewhat neglected: what used to be called "the Philosophy of Life." Students realize that if they accepted any of the major lines of thought in their Indian or Chinese readings, their lives would be transformed. Of course, a teacher has to be scrupulous in not taking sides in any of these matters. All the same, one can point out that if one accepted one of these philosophies, it would shape one's life. It also is possible then to talk about what might be argued to be the advantages, and about what could be argued to be the disadvantages. I quote to them Fung Yu-Lan's judgment that, after a while, many educated Chinese combined Confucian and Daoist elements in their lives. College students are at an age in which transformation of

life is an especially live possibility. This kind of presentation of Asian philosophies really can grab them.

- For me: It helps me to reflect on accepted conceptual frameworks, beliefs, and practices from another perspective. I am quite a “Chinese” person in many ways: working on the pragmatic rather than conceptual plane, careful in preparing for change, appreciating the value of practice. It is good to see the origins of some of my own beliefs. For students: The Chinese Philosophy course at [name of university deleted] has seen increasing enrollments each year since it was first taught in 1994. Student evaluations of the course consistently note the significance of having had the opportunity to study a non-Western philosophy. This opens up their way of thinking especially by challenging their beliefs and ways of life, which for many often go unchallenged.
- To me, it is like a hobby or an addiction. Students learn some fundamentals of Chinese culture while getting credits.
- Understand my inherited culture and better understand myself.
- Same as with other philosophy.
- For me, it is my life’s blood and I need to share it. For my students, they learn to understand the civilization of a major society that is non-Western but very important to their future.
- Most of all, it lies in getting a different perspective on philosophical issues.
- I find both Confucianism, with its focus on ritual, and Daoism, with its focus on spontaneity, to offer key solutions to the problems of life and ethics that I don’t find in any Western texts. These approaches are worth thinking about as significant challenges to what arguably is a one-sided approach to these problems in the Western tradition. They also can be used to illuminate aspects of Western life and culture that typical Western philosophy texts leave unaddressed.
- As I’ve just noted, Chinese philosophy then becomes a matter of comparison and dialogue in relation to the rest of the history of philosophy, whether Western or in India. There are also issues about how ideas from Chinese philosophy get used in East Asia. For instance, how Confucian *zhong*, “conscientiousness, loyalty,” becomes a duty of blind obedience to the government in Japan, as *chu*. I suspect this was already an emphasis in Neo-Confucianism but is contrary to the duty to always do what is right (*yi*) in Confucius himself. This was a matter of controversy even among the Japanese.
- Learning the patience of being a good reader is the most rewarding aspect of this work.
- I think one always gains perspective by stepping out of one’s familiar tradition. The Classical Chinese tradition is especially good in that way, due to its distance from the modern West and due to its focus on timeless issues without too much entanglement in concerns of narrower cultural interest (tiresome scholastic debates and endless jargon in Indian philosophy for example).
- Learning Chinese philosophy has been a lifelong journey for me beginning in the early 1970s. It has influenced my life and career in many ways, especially Daoism, but also Confucianism and Neo-Confucianism, and to a lesser extent Buddhism. I believe that many of my students become intrigued with Chinese philosophy and continue to pursue it in their own ways after taking my course. I believe that students who are more into the arts tend to love Daoism and maybe Chan Buddhism while those interested in politics and commerce are more into Confucianism and maybe Legalism.
- A big advantage of studying Chinese philosophy is to open our eyes to different ways of thinking and approaching problems. For most students, this simply helps them become better informed citizens of the world, but for a few, they learn something that changes something fundamental in their assumptions or in their relationships with others. It is important for us as teachers to be open to letting students explore and learn/adopt whatever they are able to from their current level of understanding and self-awareness. For instance, a student returned to sit in on one of my classes after he awoke from being beaten up while drunk because in that weakened state, some of what he had read in the *Mencius* began to make much more sense to him than it had when he took the course for credit. The students are a diverse lot, too, so it is important to give them room to explore and encourage them to think and evaluate for themselves. Chinese philosophy provides much new fertile ground for their cultivation, but I am concerned that sometimes those teaching in the field want to impose our own boundaries, etc., or those that we inherit from Chinese and other Asian traditions themselves. It is important for students to learn something of those established or imposed notions and mainstreams, but those things tend to stifle student interest.
- I find it very fulfilling to develop lines of inquiry that tend to be neglected in contemporary philosophy, of which many are well represented in the Chinese tradition (e.g., the role of spontaneity in moral agency and the importance of virtues neglected by Aristotelians and Humeans).
- For the first part of the question, to understand the texts better. For the second, American students do not feel anything particular. Students from Asia often claim that the class makes them understand their own culture better.
- For me, learning Chinese philosophy (1) has enhanced my understanding, and contributed to the treatment, of some philosophical issues and topics; (2) has enhanced my understanding of Chinese cultural tradition. For students, see the answer to Question 6.
- China is poised to be the next world superpower. It behooves students to understand what kind of thinking is behind this sociopolitical transition, no matter whether they are planning to oppose or support the changes that will be coming about.
- It presents the question, and helps one to consider, what it is one is doing when one does comparative Western/Chinese philosophy—a question that I think is at least as interesting as anything anyone addresses when they *do* comparative philosophy.
- I have committed my career to advancing the boundaries of philosophy and its encounter with the world in the fullest sense. My students report a sense of confusion, frustration, but also an expansiveness in their worldview. Most recently, a political science major from last semester came by to tell me his career goals had been radically revised by the Chinese philosophy class. He has urged his fellow political science students to take the plunge, but reported they felt intimidated by the subject.
- In terms of teaching, I can deepen my own understanding of Chinese philosophy. Students are happy to learn an

alternative culture from a philosophical perspective.

- I have to admit that I am not sure how to answer this question since it seems to me that, in academia, every field of study has its own role and value. I am not sure that the “rewards of learning Chinese philosophy” differ too much from the “rewards of learning Greek philosophy.” I am a scholar of East Asian philosophy. Currently, I am working on a dictionary and a textbook in the field of East Asian philosophy. As a member of and an officer in various academic associations, I strive to move philosophy beyond the politics that restricts East Asian philosophy to area studies and to promote a philosophical discourse on particular topics that draws from as many traditions as possible. Of course, there are always practical limitations. What limits scholars to the study of particular traditions is time and language proficiency. Therefore, we need more translation projects (such as the compilation of the *Sourcebook in Japanese Philosophy* by the Nanzan Institute for Religion and Culture) and the publication of guides written by philosophers for philosophers (such as the “Dao Companion” series edited by the editors of *Dao: A Journal of Comparative Philosophy*).
- Rewards are infinite with the unfolding of ideas and life. The more my students are engaged with Chinese philosophy with sincerity and conscientiousness, the more they are rewarded by this constant source of revelation and wisdom.
- To develop some understanding of what it means to be Chinese, Japanese, etc. and an ability to look at life and the world through their eyes. The same for students.
- Either Chinese philosophy is transformative of who we are as people, or one has understood it only superficially. The *Analects* is certainly directed at providing a vocabulary that enables us to think through ethical problems more cogently, but at the end of the day, its more important purpose is to provide a pathway for becoming better as people. I think the greatest reward for me and my students is personal growth and competency as a moral human being.
- It helps us improve our life and self-cultivation.
- More familiarity with forms of life that are not always familiar to us.
- It is remarkably interesting and meaningful material, which has helped improve my own understanding generally. The students too have often told me that they find the study of those texts to be transformative.
- I was trained in the continental European tradition. Many Western philosophers such as Heidegger are actually more easily understood through the lens of Chinese philosophy (particularly Daoism) than through the Western tradition. I also have a background in music. Chinese philosophy is more open to non-verbal ways of knowing and experiencing the world than much of Western philosophy and so dovetails with the sensitivity to the limits of language that I am aware of in music. The non-linear approach to many issues also appeals to me.
- I enjoy learning Chinese philosophy together with my students all the time.
- It provides the students alternative conceptual schemes and broadens their vision of the world. They often appreciate learning the so-called “non-Western” materials, in part because the materials seem exotic, but in part because the students are hungry for alternative beliefs as well.

- For me, to appreciate the diversity of the Chinese intellectual tradition. For my students, difficult to generalize; too many different motivations.
- Personally I find it refreshing and encouraging. Refreshing because like most Chinese thinkers I understand philosophy as a way of life intended to contribute to the transformation of both oneself and society. Encouraging because I believe that the practical approach of Chinese and Indian philosophies will help Euro-American philosophers to expand their current interpretations of philosophy, which tend to ignore the practical role of philosophy in antiquity, in which it was also a way of life and medicine for the soul. Many students learn to appreciate and respect different views of the self and the meaning of life. After the course, students are able to better understand and fruitfully interact with Confucian, Daoist, and Buddhist worldviews.
- I enjoy the puzzle of working out the meaning of classical Chinese texts, and the thrill of seeing their wisdom and relevance in a contemporary context.
- As a Chinese professor teaching Western philosophy in China, I am of course confident in my knowledge of Chinese philosophy and culture. Anyway, I should learn much more about them for comparative study in philosophy.
- I can read about and explore ideas that I find intuitively appealing and which inform my research in one way or another. Then I try to make these relevant to my students, enrich and broaden their way of thinking in a completely new way. Most of them actually report that they enjoy Chinese philosophy very much because it is different and refreshing, yet approachable once they relax and go with the flow.
- I hope they have had as much fun as I have, but they probably haven't. It will also prepare them for the 21st century, particularly if it is *not* another American Century. I was badly “burned out” on analytic philosophy. Mencius's use of inductive logic revitalized my love for logic. The Confucian tradition in general is a perfect “cure” for analytic ethics (why should a Martian return a library book?) and political theory (the preoccupation with whether we should realize the Difference Principle—our economic theory may explain why, although most American academics are left of Bill Clinton, the country is not—we became irrelevant).
- It allows me to better understand the “Chinese perspective” on issues such as international politics, minority rights, the relationship between nature and culture as well as the purpose of education.

Question #10: *Would you recommend any research (books, articles, reports, etc.) on any of the subjects that we have covered, especially research on the challenges of teaching Chinese philosophy to Western students?*

The following are answers from survey respondents⁶:

- Mortimer J. Adler, *The Paideia Proposal: An Educational Manifesto* (New York: Macmillan, 1982).
- Robert E. Allinson, “A Hermeneutic Reconstruction of the Child in the Well Example,” *Journal of Chinese Philosophy*, Volume 19, Number 3 (1992): 297-308.
- Robert E. Allinson, “Complementarity as a Model for East-West Integrative Philosophy,” *Journal of Chinese Philosophy*, Volume 25, Number 4 (1998): 505-517.
- Robert E. Allinson, “Hegelian, Yi-Jing, and Buddhist Transformational Models for Comparative Philosophy,”

- in Bo Mou, ed., *Comparative Approaches to Chinese Philosophy* (Aldershot, England: Ashgate Publishing, 2003), 60-85.
- Robert E. Allinson, "Hillel and Confucius: The Primacy of the Proscriptive Formulation of the Golden Rule in Jewish and Chinese Ethics," *Tao: A Journal of Comparative Philosophy*, Volume 3, Number 1 (2003): 29-42.
 - Robert E. Allinson, "Intercultural Hermeneutics, Chinese and Western Philosophy," in Antonio S. Cua, ed., *Encyclopedia of Chinese Philosophy* (London and New York: Routledge, 2002), 315-320.
 - Robert E. Allinson, "Moral Values and the Chinese Sage in the Tao De Ching," in Brian Carr, ed., *Morals and Society in Asian Philosophy* (London: Curzon Press, 1996), 156-168.
 - Robert E. Allinson, "On Chuang Tzu as a Deconstructionist with a Difference," *Journal of Chinese Philosophy*, Volume 30, Issue 3-4 (2003): 487-500.
 - Robert E. Allinson, "Taoism in the Light of Zen: An Exercise in Intercultural Hermeneutics," *Zen Buddhism Today*, Volume 6 (1988): 23-38.
 - Robert E. Allinson, "The Butterfly, the Mole, and the Sage," *Asian Philosophy* (forthcoming).
 - Robert E. Allinson, "The Concept of Harmony in Chuang-Tzu," in Shu-Hsien Liu and Robert E. Allinson, eds., *Harmony and Strife: Contemporary Perspectives, East and West* (Hong Kong: Chinese University Press, 1988), 169-183.
 - Robert E. Allinson, "The Debate between Mencius and Hsün-Tzu: Contemporary Applications," *Journal of Chinese Philosophy*, Volume 25, Number 1 (1998): 31-50.
 - Robert E. Allinson, "The General and the Master: The Subtext of the Philosophy of Emotion and Its Relationship to Obtaining Enlightenment in the Platform Sutra," *Revue Internationale de Philosophie*, Volume 59, Number 232 (2005): 213-229.
 - Robert E. Allinson, "The Golden Rule as the Core Value in Confucianism," *Asian Philosophy*, Volume 2, Number 1 (1992): 173-185.
 - Robert E. Allinson, "The Myth of Comparative Philosophy or the Comparative Philosophy Magré Lui," in Bo Mou, ed., *Two Roads to Wisdom? Chinese and Analytic Philosophical Traditions* (LaSalle, IL: Open Court, 2001), 269-292.
 - Robert E. Allinson, "The Negative Formulation of the Golden Rule in Confucius," *Journal of Chinese Philosophy*, Volume 12, Number 3 (1985): 305-315.
 - Robert E. Allinson, "Wittgenstein, Lao Tzu and Chuang Tzu: The Art of Circumlocution," *Asian Philosophy*, Volume 17, Number 1 (2007): 97-108.
 - APA Committee on the Status of Asian and Asian-American Philosophers and Philosophies, ed., *APA Newsletter on the Status of Asian and Asian-American Philosophers and Philosophies* (Newark, DE: American Philosophical Association, 2011). [2]
 - Association of Regional Centers for Asian Studies (ARCAS), *ARCAS's Homepage* <http://www.arcas-us.org/> (Accessed: January 31, 2011).
 - Patrick Boleyn-Fitzgerald, ed., *Teaching Philosophy: A Journal for Philosophy Teachers at All Levels* (Charlottesville, VA: Philosophy Documentation Center, 2011).
 - Wm. Theodore de Bary, "The *Four Books* and Greater Learning," unpublished manuscript (2009).
 - Wm. Theodore de Bary, "The *Platform Sutra* as a Chinese Classic," unpublished manuscript (2009).
 - Wm. Theodore de Bary, "Waiting for the Dawn (*Mingyi daifanglu*): Huang Zongxi's Critique of the Chinese Dynastic System," unpublished manuscript (2009).
 - Wm. Theodore de Bary, "Why We Read the *Analects* of Confucius?" *Conference on Liberal Education and Traditions*, National Chiao Tung University, Taiwan, November 28-30, 2008.
 - Wm. Theodore de Bary, "Xunxi," unpublished manuscript (2009).
 - Kenneth Dorter, "Metaphysics and Morality in Neo-Confucianism and Greece: Zhu Xi, Plato, Aristotle, and Plotinus," *Dao: A Journal of Comparative Philosophy*, Volume 8, Number 3 (2009): 255-276.
 - Kenneth Dorter, "The Concept of the Mean in Confucius and Plato," *Journal of Chinese Philosophy*, Volume 29, Issue 3 (2002): 317-335.
 - East-West Center and University of Hawaii, *Asian Studies Development Program (ASDP)* <http://www.eastwestcenter.org/education/asian-studies-development-program/> (Accessed: January 31, 2011).
 - Lucien Ellington, ed., *Education About Asia Magazine* (Ann Arbor, MI: Association for Asian Studies, 2011).
 - John J. Furlong, "Reenchanting Confucius: A Western-Trained Philosopher Teaches the *Analects*," in Jeffrey L. Richey, ed., *Teaching Confucianism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 187-201.
 - David Jones, "Teaching/Learning through Confucius: Navigating Our Way through the *Analects*," *Education About Asia*, Volume 5, Number 2 (2000): 4-13. [2]
 - Barry Keenan, "Revitalizing Liberal Learning: The Chinese Way," *Change*, Volume 30, Number 6 (1998): 38-42. [2]
 - Thomas Lutze and Irving Epstein, eds., *ASIANetwork EXCHANGE: A Journal for Asian Studies in the Liberal Arts* (Bloomington, IL: ASIANetwork, 2011).
 - Bo Mou, ed., *Davidson's Philosophy and Chinese Philosophy: Constructive Engagement* (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill Academic Publishers, 2006).
 - Bo Mou, ed., *Searle's Philosophy and Chinese Philosophy: Constructive Engagement* (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill Academic Publishers, 2008).
 - James Peterman, "A Strategy for Integrating Confucius's *Analects* into a Typical Introduction to Philosophy Course," in David Jones and E. R. Klein, eds., *Asian Texts - Asian Contexts: Encounters with Asian Philosophies and Religions* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2009), 258-272.
 - Aimin Shen, "A Short Guide to the Logic of Taoism," unpublished manuscript (2005).
 - Richard Smith, "Knowing the Self and Knowing the 'Other': The Epistemological and Heuristic Value of the Yijing (Classic of Changes)," *Journal of Chinese Philosophy*, Volume 33, Issue 4 (2006): 465-477.
 - Richard Smith, "The Yijing (Classic of Changes) in Global Perspective: Some Pedagogical Reflections," *Education About Asia*, Volume 8, Number 2 (2003): 5-10.
 - Haiming Wen, *Confucian Pragmatism as the Art of Contextualizing Personal Experience and World* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2009).⁷

Endnotes

1. Manyul Im and A. Minh Nguyen, "Teaching Chinese Philosophy: Lessons from a Survey" (in preparation).
2. Bryan W. Van Norden, "How to Add Chinese Philosophy to Your Introductory Course," *APA Newsletter on Asian and Asian-American Philosophers and Philosophies* 03, no. 1 (2003): 15-19, p. 16.
3. Including Hong Kong and Macau.
4. I attempt to present each answer in its original form. To enhance readability, I edit some of the answers without changing their contents.
5. The number in the square brackets is the number of survey respondents who recommend the item in question.
6. If an item has been recommended in response to Question #7, it won't be listed in this section. The total number of times it is recommended will be registered above.
7. I would like to thank all of the respondents who completed the survey in whole or in part. Their participation helps ensure the quality of our data. Chris Daniel, Tiffany McCain, and Patrick Puckett offered plenty of technical and clerical support, for which I'm grateful. I'm also grateful for the comments and suggestions which I received from Bethany Miller and Meagan Murray on an earlier draft of the questionnaire. Special thanks to Hal Blythe and Charlie Sweet, who read through multiple drafts, and to Lisa Kay, who helped me with statistics during all phases of the study. Above all, I would like to thank Nhi Huynh for her constant support and encouragement.

Report on "(Mis)Recognition: Race, Emotion, Embodiment" Panel

Falguni A. Sheth
Hampshire College

The panel, "(Mis)Recognition: Race, Emotion, Embodiment," was chaired by Gary Mar (SUNY Stony Brook) and consisted of two papers, one by Falguni A. Sheth (Hampshire College), "A Metaphysics of Misrecognition: From Acknowledgment to Superrecognition," and the other by Alia Al-Saji (McGill University), "A Phenomenology of Cultural Racism: Misrecognition and Embodiment." Due to flight cancellations resulting from inclement weather, David Kim and Darrell Moore could not participate on the panel as scheduled.

The philosophical literature on recognition has followed a dialogue that addresses Hegel's notion of recognition. Philosophers writing in this tradition include Jurgen Habermas, Richard Bernstein, Nancy Fraser, Axel Honneth, Seyla

Benhabib, Wendy Brown, and Judith Butler. More recently, a range of writings has emerged that addresses Frantz Fanon's classic critique of Hegel or offers an explicit challenge to conventional intersubjective frameworks of recognition. Much of this literature is being developed by philosophers writing in the areas of philosophy of race, postcolonial theory, and American discourses on race. In what ways has the dialogue on recognition preempted the possibility of expanding the concept to include disparities in intersubjective recognition, racial misrecognition, and existential fissures in recognition such as those that result in shame or disgust?

In "A Metaphysics of Misrecognition: From Acknowledgment to Superrecognition," Falguni Sheth argued in favor of a metaphysics of recognition which is divided into three categories, from the perspective of those who wish to be recognized: 1) acknowledgment (a category developed by Patchen Markell) that sees one's subjecthood, which is to be distinguished from Hegel's richer notion of recognition; 2) superrecognition, which emerges from being recognized as one aspiring to be seen publicly; and 3) misrecognition, which can be understood as the *negation of superrecognition: not being seen as one wishes to be seen*. Misrecognition is not necessarily an "incorrect" or completely "incorrect" recognition. Misrecognition can also be a key element in external recognition, that is, our recognition of others, our ascription of who others are—accurate or inaccurate, regardless of how they see themselves.

In "A Phenomenology of Cultural Racism: Misrecognition and Embodiment," Alia Al-Saji examined the phenomenology of "cultural racism" in an attempt to understand how it is a form of racism and explored the politics that frame this phenomenon as not really "racism." Her aim was to try to understand the process that undergirds cultural racism and to ask why it misunderstands itself, how it involves a necessary elision or misrecognition of itself as racism. She suggested that it has to do with the way in which bodies are perceived in cultural racism—a form of racialization that relies on a strict nature-culture division with respect to the body. This division enables a mode of self-justification by which the cause of intolerance or prejudice can be attributed to cultural material practices (clothing, food, behavior) rather than biological bodies (skin color, phenotype), hiding the racism at stake.

Through these papers, a conversation developed over the role that recognition plays in a range of fields of philosophy—including Asian-American philosophy, philosophy of race, aesthetics, political philosophy, and phenomenology—and a range of social practices in contemporary society.