A Letter from the Chair

Miriam Solomon

Dear Temple Philosophy Community,

Welcome (and welcome back) to the Philosophy Department for academic year 2018-19. This year we have a large group of new graduate students (Jason Cutmore, Ricardo Abend van Dalen, Manasa Gopakumar, Caleb Zimmerman, Theresa Klomp, and Jessica Brown for the PhD, and Johan De Jong, Mengting Wang, and Anna Bissinger for the MA), one new tenure-track faculty member (Assistant Professor Lee-Ann Chae), and one Postdoctoral Fellow (Shaeeda Mensah). We are looking forward to getting to know all of you.

This is a lively Philosophy Department which holds regular events to which all are invited. Colloquia, Works-in-Progress, and Workshops usually take place on Friday afternoons during the semester. First Friday pizza lunches for prospective and current majors/minors as well as graduate students and faculty are held monthly. There are also reading groups in particular areas of philosophy. We welcome your participation in events.

Our Department Coordinator, Ms. Sonia Lawson, staffs the Department Office and expertly handles our administrative needs, together with Ms. Belinda Wilson, who is an administrator for several Departments. The Graduate Student Representative to the Faculty in 2017-18 was Kate Brelje, and we are most grateful for her excellent work. She will be succeeded in 2018-19 by Michael Glass. This year will be my last year as Department Chair, after two terms as chair.

In the 2017-18 academic year, several faculty, graduate students, and undergraduate majors received honors. Graduate Student Katie Brennan was awarded the Nietzsche Society RJ Hollingdale Prize, for her paper “The
Wisdom of Silenus.” Kate Brelje received the Best Graduate Student Paper Award for her paper “Human Footprints and Green Cages: Oppression of non-human nature in ecofeminist theory” at the Greater Philadelphia Women’s Studies Consortium conference; Meryl Lumba’s paper “Hiya as Strategic Ignorance: Decolonizing the Filipino-American Mind” received Honorable Mention at the same conference. Graduate Student Ziqian Zhang was awarded the Nordev Prize for the best preliminary essay, “Malebranche on Moral Obligation.” Meryl Lumba and James Taplin were awarded First Summers Research Awards of $6,500 each from the Graduate School. Graduate students Meryl Lumba, Kate Brelje, and James Taplin were jointly awarded the Philosophy Graduate Student Teaching prize. Raciel Cuevas won a Center for Philosophical Studies Essay Prize Award, in association with the Rocky Mountain Division of the American Society for Aesthetics, for his paper, “Nature’s Spoiled Darling: Kant on Genius and Artistic Achievement.”

Graduating senior philosophy major Alexander Drusda was awarded the Lawrence Family Award for academic excellence. Graduating senior Alexandra Van der Gaag was awarded the Thomas Meyer Award for contributions to undergraduate philosophy community building.

During 2017-18 faculty gave talks at conferences and campuses all over the USA and overseas, including in Austria, Canada, Denmark, Egypt, Germany, Croatia, Israel, and Norway. Professor Espen Hammer published an edited volume, *Kafka’s The Trial* with Oxford University Press. Professor Kristin Gjesdal was elected to the Norwegian Academy of Science and Letters, as well as promoted from Associate Professor to Professor. Professor Gjesdal published *Ibsen’s Hedda Gabler: Philosophical Perspectives* (Oxford, 2017) and co-edited *The Cambridge Companion to Hermeneutics* (with Michael Forster) (Cambridge, 2018). Professor David Wolfsdorf was awarded a Grant-in-Aid of Research from Temple University for work on his book in progress, *On Goodness*. Assistant Professor Eugene Chislenko was awarded a LAURA award for research with an undergraduate student (Maura Edwards), a Summer Research Award from Temple.
University, and a CHAT Fellowship for 2018-19. Assistant Professor Lindsay Craig was voted Honors Professor of the Year by Temple Honors students.

In Fall 2017, a steering committee of four students (three graduate students and one undergraduate student) -- Racial Cuevas, Meryl Lumba, Daniel Remer, and Micaela Robelino Teran -- registered a Temple chapter of Minorities in Philosophy (MAP), and held events throughout 2017-18. Further events are being planned for 2018-19. Graduate students also continued their very successful undergraduate mentoring program, organized by James Taplin and Brooke Sharp, in which interested undergraduates are paired with graduate students for informal discussions about their concerns and interests in philosophy. Graduate students, led by Jake Jackson, ran an excellent graduate student conference on the topic of "Disorder" on April 7.

Undergraduates had another highly successful year of Philosophy Club discussions, organized by Alexandra Van Der Gaag, Colleen Boyd, Gabe Ullman and Alex Drusda, and held on Tuesday evenings. (In 2018-19 the Philosophy Club will be run by Brigit Anderson, Emily Beatty, John Harris, and Bonnie McClellan.) In addition, three undergraduate students started an organization called the Forum for Ethical Action, which aims to combine philosophical discussion with activism and community engagement. Meetings have been on Thursday evenings. The current (last year’s and next year’s) officers are Mary Saunders, Reese Cogswell, and John Anderson Harris.

This Fall, we are planning several talks and events, beginning with an international conference on 19th Century Women Philosophers (September 14-15). Our Distinguished Visiting Speaker (November 8-9) will be Marcy Lascano (California State University Long Beach), and we will also have talks given by Kate Withy (Georgetown), Robert Hopkins (NYU) and Dean Moyar (Johns Hopkins). For more details about the times and places of our talks, please ask our Coordinator, Ms. Sonia Lawson (slawson@temple.edu), to be included on the e-list for announcements, and check the Philosophy Department website for events. All are welcome.

Best wishes to you all for 2018-19.

Miriam
Visiting Speakers

AY 2017-2018

- Nomy Arpaly (Brown): “On Benevolence”
- Andrew Chignell (Penn): “Empirical Knowledge and Noumenal Ignorance”
- Philip Kitcher (Columbia): “Progress in the Sciences and in the Arts”
- Kieran Setiya (MIT): “Ignorance, Beneficence, and Rights”
- The Annual Monroe Beardsley Lecture: Murray Smith (Kent): “Philosophical Naturalism, Aesthetic Experience, and Aesthetic Value”

AY 2006-2017

Karl Ameriks (Notre Dame), Frederick Beiser (Syracuse), Jay Bernstein (New School), Paul Boghossian (NYU), Andrew Bowie (Royal Holloway), John Burgess (Princeton), Simon Critchley (New School), Michael Forster (Chicago), Paul Franks (Yale), Markus Gabriel (Bonn), Daniel Garber (Princeton), Sebastian Gardner (UCL), Lloyd Gerson (Toronto), Hannah Ginsborg (Berkeley), Lydia Goehr (Columbia), Paul Guyer (Brown), Barbara Herman (UCLA), Wolfram Hinzen (Pompeu Fabra), Wolfgang Mann (Columbia), Yitzhak Melamed (Johns Hopkins), Christia Mercer (Columbia), Richard Moran (Harvard), Terry Pinkard (Georgetown), Robert Pippin (Chicago), Allison Simmons (Harvard), Michael Smith (Princeton), Susan Wolf (UNC Chapel Hill), etc.

Temple’s Morgan Hall with City Skyline
Recent Hosted Conference

- Author Meets Critics: Miriam Solomon, Making Medical Knowledge, October 2017
- “Nietzsche’s Birth of Tragedy: Philosophy, Theater, Music,” April 2016
- Joseph Margolis’s 90th Birthday Conference, May 2014
- 11th Annual Meeting of the Eastern Study Group of the North American Kant Society, May 2014
- 37th Annual Ancient Philosophy Workshop, April 2014
- The Eastern Division Meeting of the American Society for Aesthetics, March 2014
- The 2nd Annual Adorno Studies Meeting, March 2013

Graduate Courses

2018 Fall

- Philosophy of Medicine (Miriam Solomon)
- Social and Political Philosophy (Lee-Ann Chae)
- Philosophy of Mind (Gerald Vision)
- 19th Century Philosophy (Kristin Gjesdal)
- Seminar in Greek Philosophy (David Wolfsdorf)
- Seminar in Continental Rationalism (Colin Chamberlain)

2018 Spring

- Philosophy of Science (Miriam Solomon)
- Philosophy of History (Espen Hammer)
- Philosophy of Language (Gerald Vision)
- Themes in Existentialism (Kristin Gjesdal)
- Recent Work on Evil (Eugene Chislenko)
Faculty Research

• **Philip Atkins:** I’ve done work in the theory of knowledge and moral philosophy, but most of my research is in the philosophy of language. In the theory of knowledge, I’ve written on external world skepticism, which is the view that we don’t really know anything about the world around us. In moral philosophy, I’ve written on when it’s morally acceptable to harm someone who’s being used as a human shield by someone else. In the philosophy of language, I’ve worked mostly on the semantics of psychological attitude reports, such as “Hillary believes that Donald is corrupt.” Like many philosophers I’m interested in the relation between language and reality. I wonder whether and how our words represent our world. In graduate school I became interested in the more specific topic of the relation between language and mind. What exactly is the relation between our ordinary psychological attitude reports (“Hillary believes that Donald is corrupt”) and the psychological attitudes themselves ( Hillary’s belief that Donald is corrupt)? Building on the work of Nathan Salmón, David Kaplan, and Erin Eaker, among many others, I’ve come to conclude that the relation is not at all straightforward. There are essential facts about our psychological attitudes that aren’t reflected in the semantics of ordinary psychological attitude reports. I’ve suggested as much in one of my recent publications and plan to defend this view in future work.


**Faculty Research**

- **Lee-Ann Chae:** I work in ethics and in social and political philosophy, focusing on questions about nonviolent conflict resolution, trust and moral deliberation, and hope for a peaceful future. My current work defends pacifism and nonviolent resistance, and offers a critique of just war theory. In particular, I am examining how and why we should hope for a peaceful future; how preparations for defensive war corrupt our moral imagination, and restrict our possibilities for a peaceful future; and whether some kinds of contingency plans are morally impermissible because they undermine trust between communities.


- **Colin Chamberlain:** I work on early modern philosophy, focusing especially on Descartes and Malebranche. Recently, I have been working on Margaret Cavendish’s account of color, which has been great fun. I’ve got a few projects on the go. One of my projects is concerned with the phenomenology of embodiment. Both Descartes and Malebranche, I argue, have interesting things to say about (a) the way we experience our connections to our bodies, and (b) the way our bodies inform our experience of everything else. According to my reading of Malebranche, for example, the senses are restricted to representing various kinds of relations to our bodies. My second main project is concerned with the metaphysics of embodiment in Descartes, focusing especially on the subject of sensory representation. My third project is about Margaret Cavendish on color. I’m arguing that Cavendish is one of the few early modern philosophers to defend color realism – viz. the view that material objects are colored in (roughly) the way they visually appear.


**Faculty Research**

- **Eugene Chislenko:** I specialize in moral philosophy and moral psychology, and in related topics in the philosophy of mind, philosophy of action, aesthetics, and the history of philosophy, especially Kant and existentialism. I am working on a book manuscript on moral motivation, entitled *The Guise of the Good*, and a series of papers about the ethics of blame.

  - Representative publications: “A Solution for Buridan’s Ass” (*Ethics*, January 2016) and “Moore’s Paradox and Akratic Belief” (*Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, May 2016)

- **Lindsay Craig:** My specializations are philosophy of evolutionary biology and philosophy of science. My interests include scientific pluralism, scientific explanation, scientific change, and values in science. I don’t have any current research projects, but it might be worth mentioning that I won the CLA Teaching Award for Instructional Faculty in 2016, and I was voted the Honors Professor of the Year this year. Indeed, my project is teaching well. I’m also the Director of the Graduate Student Teaching Program in Philosophy.


- **Paul Crowe:** My background is in continental philosophy, particularly phenomenology, but for some time I have been teaching philosophy of law and political philosophy. More recently I have been investigating philosophy of economics. My interest is in the liberal conceptual paradigm in all three areas. I am currently reading about economics, economic history and economic philosophy (political economy as opposed to economics).

Faculty Research

- **Kristin Gjesdal**: Most of my work is in aesthetics, phenomenology, nineteenth-century philosophy, and German Idealism. My research concentrates on questions in hermeneutics and the resources of the tradition from Herder, Schleiermacher, Hegel, Nietzsche, and Dilthey. I also work in philosophy of literature, with a special emphasis on Shakespeare and Ibsen. I am currently working to complete a book-length manuscript on Ibsen, Hegel, and Nietzsche. The working title of this project is *Staging the Nineteenth Century: Ibsen, Hegel, and Nietzsche on History and Life*. I am interested in how the works and perspectives of Hegel and, later, Nietzsche came to resonate in European drama and literature, especially in the work of Henrik Ibsen. Other projects include a book-length manuscript on the hermeneutic tradition from romanticism to phenomenology. I am in the process of editing two volumes: *The Cambridge Companion to Hermeneutics* (with Michael Forster) and *Philosophy of Sculpture: Historical Perspectives; Contemporary Problems* (with Fred Rush and Ingvild Torsen). A final project I am quite excited about is a volume for Oxford University Press with translations of original contributions by women philosophers in the Nineteenth Century (mostly in Germany). The volume, co-edited with my colleague Dalia Nassar, is entitled (ed.) *Women Philosophers in the Long Nineteenth Century: The German Tradition.*

- My publications this academic year include a monograph and an edited volume. *Herder’s Hermeneutics: History, Poetry, Enlightenment* was published in 2017 with Cambridge University Press. My edited volume *Ibsen’s Hedda Gabler: Philosophical Perspective* was published in January this year. As a sabbatical project last year, I also co-published a book with a Norwegian artist, Jeannette Christensen, professor at the Academy of Arts in Oslo. (I wrote the text accompanying Christensen’s work). Other articles and chapters this year include “Imagining Hedda Gabler: Munch and Ibsen on Art and Modern Life,” *Text Matters* vol. 7, 2017 (special issue edited by Mieke Bal); “The Theater of Thought: A. W. Schlegel on Shakespeare, Modern Drama, and Romantic Criticism,” in Tom Stern (ed.), *The Philosophy of Theater, Drama, and Acting*. London: Rowman and Littlefield, 2017; “Interpreting Hamlet,” in Tzachi Zamir (ed.), *Hamlet: Philosophical Perspectives*, Oxford: Oxford University Press;
Faculty Research


- Espen Hammer: My research focuses on the European tradition from Kant and Hegel to Heidegger and Adorno. I have interests in social and political philosophy, epistemology, phenomenology, and aesthetics. I am working on a project dealing with the implications of secularism and secularization in nineteenth-century figures such as Hegel, Feuerbach, Marx, and Nietzsche.


Faculty Research

• **Han-Kyul Kim**: I specialize in the history of early modern philosophy. My current research interests include an analysis of Locke’s philosophy of mind in terms of his distinction between nominal and real essence, and an examination of the relevance of his views to contemporary issues and debate. My book titled *Locke’s Ideas of Mind and Body* (New York and Oxford: Routledge) will be published in 2019. This book addresses an interpretive challenge of Locke’s philosophy of mind and explores the relevance of some overlooked views of Locke’s to contemporary debates, including Donald Davidson’s anomalous monism, David Lewis’ Ramseyan Humility, and Colin McGinn’s cognitive closure.


• **Joseph Margolis**: My main interests are in philosophy of culture, pragmatism and American philosophy, epistemology and metaphysics, moral and political philosophy, philosophy of mind, philosophy of language and history, philosophy of art and interpretation, comparative philosophy, theory of the person. My most recent publication is *Three Paradoxes of Personhood: The Venetian Lectures* (Mimesis International, 2017).

  • Representative publications: *Toward a Metaphysics of Culture* (Routledge, 2016); *Pragmatism Ascendent: A Yard of Narrative, A Touch of Prophecy* (Stanford UP, 2012); *The Cultural Space of the Arts and the Infelicities of Reductionism* (Columbia UP, 2010); *Pragmatism’s Advantage: American and European Philosophy at the End of the Twentieth Century* (Stanford UP, 2010); *The Arts and the Definition of the Human: Toward a Philosophical Anthropology* (Stanford UP, 2008).
Faculty Research

- **Lara Ostaric:** My areas of specialty are Kant, German Idealism, and aesthetics. My research focus has been mostly Kant’s third *Critique* and its place in Kant’s critical system (the relation of theoretical and practical reason and the problem of causal efficacy of reason in nature). This is why my research often extends to both Kant’s practical and theoretical philosophy. I am also interested in the reception of the philosophical problems introduced in Kant’s third *Critique* by German Idealism and Early Romanticism. I am currently completing my book manuscript titled “Critique of Judgment and the Unity of Kant’s Critical System.” I am also working on couple of articles for edited volumes: 1) on the possibility of history and moral progress in Schelling’s philosophy, and 2) Kant’s proof of God’s existence in the third *Critique*.


Faculty Research


- **Miriam Solomon:** My research interests are in philosophy of science, philosophy of medicine, gender and science, bioethics and epistemology. I am currently working on a paper critiquing the Russo-Williamson thesis and the EBM+ project, a paper on the social epistemology of stem cell clinics, and a paper on the best criteria to use in revisions of the DSM.


Faculty Research

- **Michael Szekely:** My primary research and teaching interests are in Cultural and Critical Theory, Aesthetics (especially the philosophy of music), and Contemporary Continental Philosophy, with more particular interests in French poststructuralism (especially Gilles Deleuze and Roland Barthes) and the Frankfurt School (especially Walter Benjamin). I am currently writing a book on poststructuralism and music. *Gesture, pulsion,* and *grain* are some of the cross-pollinating notions (to name but a few) typically attributed to Barthes’ engagement with texts (or “Text”), with writing, with linguistics, with semiology and semiotics, etc. They also happen to comprise his overarching taxonomy of musical elements, which will guide this project. In essence, what we wish to address is how music—through these three crucial milieus Barthes offers us—serves as both a theoretical barometer and conceptual impasse for some of the critical treatments across what we will cautiously call a continental aesthetics of music.


- **Gerald Vision:** Areas in which I’ve been working recently. (1) The place of consciousness in an otherwise thoroughly dominant material world. It is commonly known in philosophy as “the hard problem”. (The title, and subject, adopted by Tom Stoppard for a recent play.) (2) My larger career project has been to map out our cognitive relations to the world outside of us. That involves the direction of us to the world via language and thought (the philosophy of language and conceptual resources) and in the other direction (world to us) such as perception and potentially innate ideas (epistemology) (3) I am also continually thinking about issues in long-term, abiding interests, such as (a) the history of early modern philosophy, roughly
from Descartes and Hobbes to Hume (b) a number of figures in mainstream Anglophone twentieth century philosophy (c) various in meta-ethical questions (e.g., the character of moral judgment). I am currently working on the reference of singular terms (philosophy of language). In particular, I’m considering how those, like myself, who hold direct views can accommodate obviously true negative existentials, such as that Sherlock Holmes doesn’t (never did) exist, without getting entangled in even worse complexities. This also involves questions about the predication of existence.


Faculty Research

- **David Wolfsdorf:** My research till about 2010 focused exclusively on ancient philosophy. Since then I have increasingly been working on topics relating to the semantics of evaluative language. Much of this work is in linguistics. Sub topics include: lexical ambiguity, gradable and multi-dimensional adjectives, context sensitive expressions, mass nouns, and bare noun phrases. Connecting these two, seemingly totally unrelated areas, one could say that I am interested in the historical and theoretical foundations of value theory and action. I’m currently completing two large projects. One, in ancient philosophy, is as editor of and contributor to a collection of 25 essays entitled *Early Greek Ethics* (Oxford University Press). This work focuses primarily on ancient Greek ethical philosophy prior to Plato. The other project is a book entitled *On Goodness* (Oxford University Press). Here I am pursuing the question “What is goodness?” by focusing on the semantic questions what do “good” and “goodness” mean?

Faculty Research


Interviewing Lee-Ann Chae

![Lee-Ann Chae](Image)

**What made you become a pacifist?**

**LC:** I’ve always been puzzled by this discrepancy: If we all agree that war is terrible, why do we spend so much time defending it? And if it’s true that what we desire is peace, why do we organize so much of our lives around war?

Professor Lee-Ann Chae works in ethics and in social and political philosophy, focusing on questions about nonviolent conflict resolution, trust and moral deliberation, and hope for a peaceful future. Her current work defends pacifism and nonviolent resistance, and offers a critique of just war theory.

The scale of devastation caused by war is perhaps impossible for anyone to comprehend. The costs we tend to focus on are lives lost on the battlefield, and the price of war machines. But there are other material costs – e.g., we direct a tremendous amount of resources away from the alleviation of poverty and the
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provision of healthcare and education, and towards the preparation for war – as well as moral costs. What does a society that’s constantly prepared for violence look like? Is the celebration of martial virtue consistent with democratic virtues? What happens to our collective imagination when we imagine more and more extreme worst-case scenarios to justify war preparation?

We take for granted the necessity of political violence, perhaps because the legitimacy of political violence is part and parcel of our understanding of political authority. But is it true that violence is really necessary (or even justifiable)? If we reject the framework that just war theory has set up for us – namely, taking for granted that war is sometimes necessary and/or justified, and asking under what circumstances we should go to war – a whole other set of questions comes into view. And then we can start the project of asking what a world built on cooperation and mutual aid, instead of domination and coercion, might look like.

Before looking at how you defend pacifism, can you say something about why you think just war theory’s justification for defensive war is problematic?

LC: According to contemporary just war theory (“JWT”), the aim of a just war is peace. But almost no attention is paid to developing a positive conception of peace. In trying to understand why, in the domain of war and peace, our focus has been so narrowly concentrated on war, it would be useful to consider what JWT’s foundational assumptions are, how those assumptions affect what questions are asked, and how this combination of assumptions and questions determine its methodology.

One of the most fundamental assumptions of JWT is that war is inevitable, and so must be accepted as a part of life. Given war’s inevitability, we can only restrict its lawful outbreak and mitigate its horrors. If this is the world as JWT finds it, then it makes sense that the central question is how, when we’re
attacked by others, we can fight a defensive war well, i.e., justly. The methodology of JWT, then, is one that is driven by fear or suspicion of others, and an understanding of one’s own community as holding the moral high ground.

Then we can see why we might use “peacetime” to further develop our techniques of warfare. We prepare for a victory that is as quick as possible, so that when the inevitable war does break out, we can reinstall “peace” as quickly as possible. We live by the maxim, If you want peace, prepare for war. If peace just is the absence of open warfare, then it makes sense to try and fight our way to peace. One side, or all sides, will lose, and whoever loses has to stop fighting. If peace just is the absence of open warfare, then it also makes sense to build up huge armaments and armies, since we can then intimidate others into peace by vigilantly and at all times threatening war.

And so we see that JWT creates a framework for us to ask a very particular set of questions once fighting a war becomes imminent: Who is the aggressor, and so who is at fault? What means of killing are humane, and so permissible? Who counts as innocent, and so should not be directly targeted? But one question that just war theory cannot answer is whether or not we should have war at all.

For me, the question of whether we should have war is the question of whether we, as a community of human beings, should continue to organize ourselves into subgroups that kill each other. And the answer must be no. What we need to do now is to kindle our hope for a peaceful future, and to resist seeing wars as inevitable. War is the result of complex historical, social, economic, and political processes, which are themselves influenced by innumerable choices that we have made, individually and collectively. If we could see that war is the result of choice, then we could see that we can choose differently.
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Even though just war theories continue to dominate the philosophical literature, there seems a revival of interest in pacifism in recent years. Can you sketch out the landscape here?

LC: Very briefly, there are two general lines of questions for pacifists.

First, is it ever permissible to kill? May I kill to save myself, to save someone else, to save a group of people? A person might believe that she shouldn’t kill in self-defense, but that killing in war is justified; we could call her an “individual” pacifist. Or, a person might believe that it’s permissible to kill in self-defense, but not in war; we could call her an “anti-war” pacifist. Or, if you’re like me, you might be skeptical as to whether killing in either self-defense or in war is permissible.

And second, what’s wrong with killing in war? Here we find a distinction between “moral” “contingent,” and “pragmatic” pacifists. Moral pacifists believe that it’s wrong to kill in war because there is something morally wrong with killing and being prepared to kill. (This is the line of argument I advance in my paper, “Pacific Resistance.”) For contingent pacifists, even if a just war is theoretically justifiable, any conceivable war that humans might fight will almost certainly kill and harm innocent bystanders, and so any actual war cannot be justified. Finally, pragmatic pacifists believe that war, as an empirical matter, has not been shown to be more successful than nonviolence. There’s a lot of empirical work coming out in political science journals arguing that nonviolence is at least as effective a tool for political change as war, both in terms of “winning” against an aggressor, and in terms of establishing and maintaining a democratic society.

Pacifism is often considered a philosophically untenable position, can you say something about why you think it is a real moral alternative to killing? Relatedly, why might pacifism be an even superior option to killing?

LC: Just war theorists often argue that using violence to defend one’s right not
to be killed is necessary, either as a practical or moral matter. Practically speaking, defensive violence is required because it holds the only realistic prospect for repelling aggressive violence. Morally speaking, defensive violence is required as the proper expression of intolerance for injustice.

Defensive war is often justified by analogy to self-defensive killing – just as a victim may kill her aggressor in order to defend her right not be killed, a state may prosecute a defensive war in order to defend its right to sovereignty. But I think that locating the wrong of aggressive killing in the violation of a right not to be killed does not provide the fullest explanation of why aggressive killing is morally impermissible.

As Barbara Herman has argued, what’s wrong with aggressive killing is the aggressor’s attempt to use the victim and her death as a mere means for the aggressor’s own, private end. If the victim must resist in order to avoid complicity in her own subjugation, we might conclude that the victim must kill the aggressor. But I argue that the proper form of resistance requires that we respond to aggression nonviolently. This is because the aggressor, in confronting the victim with lethal aggression, is attempting to force upon her the following choice: kill or be killed. To choose either option is to accede to the aggressor’s terms.

Nonviolent resistance is the only way to squarely address the wrong with which the victim is being confronted and to reject the coercive choice the aggressor attempts to impose. The victim resists, then, by recognizing the aggression as impermissible and condemning the aggression (silently or out loud), while limiting her own counter-violence for the sake of the aggressor as a member of her moral community, and hoping that others will continue her resistance by pursuing justice on her behalf. Similarly, the state facing aggression must refuse to accede to the terms of the aggressing state and must resist being baited into the activity of strategic, mass killing. Instead, the pacific state might respond by staging mass strikes, engaging in civil
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disobedience, and excluding invaders from civil society. In the face of aggression, the pacific state resists while keeping an eye towards repairing the moral breach. Through their nonviolence, they simultaneously demonstrate their trustworthiness and make the first gesture of trust, thereby illuminating that there is a moral conversation to be had.

And so, if it’s true that what we desire as a society is peace, then pacifism must be the way for us. This means that our central question cannot be how we are to prosecute a war justly. In fact, I am extremely suspect of just war theorists’ assumption that a just society’s character qua just society will remain unscathed by its preparation for, and execution of, mass violence. And this is because of the intuition that the means and the end must cohere. An analogy that Gandhi was fond of using was that the means are to the end as the seed is to the tree. That is, the means reflect the end in process. So then the questions that concern us should have to do with how to understand peace as a positive ideal, and how that ideal should bear on our practical reasoning about what to do in our actual world.

Can you spell out what your conception of pacific resistance consists in? Relatedly, what is distinctive about your conception of resistance?

LC: For me, the question of resistance is not necessarily about how to resist a particular war, but about how to break away from the institution of war. And I argue that the first step is to hope for peace. I suspect that for many just war theorists, given the world as it is, to hope for peace might just seem like wishful thinking. But I don’t think that’s right. Unlike wishful thinking, which is a kind of escapism, hoping involves our agency. When we hope for peace, we learn to interpret the world in ways that sustain our hopes, and to be creative in the face of obstacles. Hope not only shapes the scope of our activities, but it also gives our activities a meaning they wouldn’t otherwise have had. In acting on our hope, we reach out towards a possible future, and draw the value of that
Interviewing Lee-Ann Chae

Are there books that you could recommend that will take us further into your philosophical world?

LC: Barbara Herman, Practice of Moral Judgment; Margaret Urban Walker, Moral Repair: Reconstructing Moral Relations after Wrongdoing; David Rodin, War and Self-Defense; Hannah Arendt, On Violence; Jane Addams, Newer Ideals of Peace; Robert L. Holmes, On War and Morality; Martin Luther King, Jr., A Testament of Hope: The Essential Writings of Martin Luther King, Jr.

(Lee-Ann Chae interviewed by Ziqian Zhang)

possible good future into what we’re doing now. When we act on hope, we see our hopeful action as a moment that could be a part of the hoped for end, and so the action has a different meaning for us.

When I can bring myself to hope for peace, I meet violence with nonviolence because I see my action as prefiguring the world that I hope will one day attain, where the members of the human community will live together peacefully. In acting on the hope that we will cease to kill each other out of mutual fear, I resist my aggressor by being a potential part of the moral community that will eventually come to reject violence, including my aggressor’s.

If it’s true that our hope for peace gives us a way to live meaningful lives in a bloody world, and offers us a way to lay the foundation for the peaceful society that we seek, then it would be well worth turning our philosophical attention away from fear of war and towards hope for peace.
Graduate Student Accomplishments

Kate Brelje: Conference Presentations: a) Greater Philadelphia Women’s Studies Consortium Gender and Women’s Studies Student Research Conference, April 2018, Villanova University, PA; b) FEMMSS 7, August 2018, University of Oregon, Corvallis, OR; External Awards: c) GPWSC Gender and Women’s Studies Student Research Conference Best Graduate Student Paper Award; d) GRASP grant, Temple University Office of Sustainability; Departmental Award: e) Graduate Student Teaching Prize, 2018; Other: f) Inside-Out Training Assistant, July 2018 (This is a type of internship for the Inside-Out Prison Teaching Program).


Jessica Brown: Conference Presentation at the Midsouth Philosophy Conference titled “The Role of Intimacy in Communication: Domination as Antithetical to Dialogue”; Margaret L. Bates award from the gender studies department at New College of Florida; presentation on the Back to the Things Themselves panel held by the Society for Existential Theory and Culture at the 2018 Congress of the Humanities held at the University of Regina. The paper I presented at the panel was titled “Phenomenological Investigation on the Distinct Experiences of the Intercorporeal Sexual Act and a Masturbatory One.”

Raciel Cuevas: Conference Presentations - paper presentation at the American Society for Aesthetics Rocky Mountain Division Meeting July 6-8; External Awards - CLA travel grant, ASA Rocky Mountain Division travel grant, Irene H. Chayes travel grant, “Center for Philosophical Studies Best Graduate Student in Philosophy Essay Prize” funded by Lamar University; Departmental Awards - a travel grant from the department; commented at the ASA Eastern.
Graduate Student Accomplishments

Ricardo Abend Van Dalen: I was awarded a University Fellowship by Temple; Apart from that, the Hispanic Scholarship Fund (HSF) has designated me as a waitlisted HSF Scholar for the 2018-2019 academic year. (This is a $500 to $5,000 merit scholarship for which Hispanic students can apply each year; the precise amount of funds I’m getting has not been determined). If all goes well, I should get $5,000 sometime in the spring. The “waitlisted” part does not mean I am not a full HSF Scholar; it just means that my scholarship has a lower priority relative to the HSF scholarships awarded to undergraduates. My receiving funds is contingent on all the undergrad HSF Scholars getting their funds first.


Meryl Lumba: Presentations: (1) GenEd ILCT Colloquium at Temple University (November 2017); (2) I presented my paper, “Hiya as Strategic Ignorance: Decolonizing the Filipino-American Mind,” on the Global Gender Politics panel at the GWS Conference at Villanova University (April 2018). I received the Greater Philadelphia Women Studies Consortium "Honorable Mention Award" for this paper; Departmental Awards: (1) Ira Lawrence Scholarship; (2) Graduate Student Prize for Excellence in Teaching & Undergraduate Mentoring; University Fellowships: (1) FSRI Award (Summer 2018); (2) CLA Advanced Scholar Fellowship (2018-2019); Miscellaneous: (1) Chapter Representative & Organizer of Minorities and Philosophy (MAP).

James Taplin: First Summers Research Grant: “Women Scholarship in the History of Nineteenth-Century Philosophy: A Case Study in Underrepresentation”; Philosophy Graduate Teaching Award; ASA Eastern Session Chair.

Organizations

- **WIPS:** The “Works in Progress Series” is a graduate run program in which students have the opportunity to share their own work in a professional and friendly setting. The purpose of this series is to help graduate students receive critical feedback as well as improve their research and presentation skills. Some projects to consider presenting would be seminar papers, prelim papers, dissertation chapters, or any other papers you wish to submit either for a conference or publication.

  - **Coordinator:** Raciel Cuevas

- **PMP:** The “Philosophy Mentor Program” connects graduate students with undergraduates who are interested in philosophy. The purpose of PMP is to create more open dialogue and stronger relations between the undergraduate and graduate communities at Temple. Graduate volunteers are connected with undergraduate mentees. PMP gives graduate students an opportunity to share their love of philosophy with undergraduate peers.

  - **Coordinators:** Arthur Krieger and Brooke Sharp

- **MAP:** “Minorities and Philosophy” is a student oriented group whose goal is to examine and address issues of minority participation in academic philosophy. Though primarily led by graduate students, MAP also relies on faculty support and encourages undergraduate participation. MAP aims to address minority issues in philosophy regarding philosophy of gender, race, sexual orientation, class, and disability, as well as philosophy done from minority perspectives. Meeting formats include reading groups, film screenings, mentorship events for undergraduates or graduates, panel discussions, and workshops on issues including teaching and diversity, communication techniques, navigating stereotype threat or implicit bias. (Website: [https://sites.temple.edu/minoritiesandphilosophy/](https://sites.temple.edu/minoritiesandphilosophy/)).

  - **Board Members:** Meryl Lumba, Kate Brelje, Raciel Cuevas, Kara Bowen, Daniel Remer
Reading Groups

- Early Modern Philosophy Reading Group: Margaret Cavendish, Anne Conway
- Islamic Philosophy Reading Group: Al-Farabi, Avicenna (Ibn Sina), Nasir Khusraw, Al-Ghazali, Averroes (Ibn Rushd), Ibn Khaldun
- “Minorities and Philosophy” (MAP) Reading Group: Sally Haslanger, Andrew Higgins, Emily S. Lee, Peter Levine
- Hegel Reading Group: Phenomenology of Spirit

Sample Flyers

MAP
MINORITIES AND PHILOSOPHY

Reading Group & General Meeting
Friday, 9/22 • 12-2pm
Philosophy Lounge / 7th Floor of Anderson Hall

Join us as we discuss:

“Relational Mapping of Minorities in Philosophy”
by Andrew Higgins, &

“The Lack of Diversity in Philosophy is Blocking its Progress”
by Peter Levine

Readings are available online through our website via
https://sites.temple.edu/minoritiesandphilosophy/

Questions? Email us – mapattemple@gmail.com

IDENTITY-IN-DIFFERENCE TO AVOID INDIFFERENCE
- EMILY S. LEE

“WITHOUT AN UNDERSTANDING OF OUR COMMON HUMANITY,
SIGNS OF INDIFFERENCE PREVAIL REGARDING PEOPLE
CONSIDERED TO BE DIFFERENT”

READING GROUP
FRIDAY, APRIL 13TH, 2018
11:00 AM - 1:00 PM
PHILOSOPHY LOUNGE
(ANDERSON HALL 7TH FLOOR)

FOR MORE INFO EMAIL MAPatTemple@gmail.com
Greater Philadelphia Philosophy Consortium

- In the rich intellectual tradition of Philadelphia, philosophy has played a vital role ever since delegates to the Constitutional Convention debated in City Tavern. Today we find a larger number of colleges and universities in the greater Philadelphia region than in any other American city, and their programs in philosophy are diverse and nationally recognized. Building upon this tradition and diversity, Michael Krausz (Bryn Mawr College) and Joseph Margolis (Temple University) together founded The Greater Philadelphia Philosophy Consortium (GPPC) in 1980. Today the GPPC continues its work by fostering cooperation among philosophers throughout the Delaware Valley and sharing the insights and methods of philosophy with a larger public. The GPPC offers varied programs to scholars in the humanities disciplines and opportunities to a larger public for interaction with leading researchers in philosophy and related disciplines.


- **The GPPC 2017-2018 Discussion Groups:** Asian and Comparative Philosophy Discussion Group; History & Philosophy of Science Reading Group; Philosophy of Religion Reading Group; Philadelphia Philosophy of Psychiatry Working Group; Work in Progress in Epistemology.

- The GPPC provides an expanded course option for Temple University graduate students. During their matriculation at Temple University, Temple graduate students may receive credit for graduate level courses taken at University of Pennsylvania and Villanova University.

- For more information, check out [http://www.thegppc.org/](http://www.thegppc.org/)
Art Gala Night
What Are We Reading?

- **Philip Atkins:** When it comes to philosophy, I read more journal articles than I do books. But the most recent book that I’ve read was pretty good. It was a short work by Jennifer Saul called *Lying, Misleading and What is Said*. It explores the intuitive distinction between lying to someone and merely misleading someone, and then tries to use the distinction to make progress on certain problems in the philosophy of language. The other books I’ve recently read are mostly comics (Tom King’s run on *Batman* has been great) and collections of scary stories (revisiting Alvin Schwartz’s *Scary Stories to Tell in the Dark*).

- **Lee-Ann Chae:** I just finished reading *Autonomous*, by Annalee Newitz. The story takes place in the near future, where humans live and work alongside robots. These robots are objects that can be owned, even though they’re equipped with artificial intelligence and so are capable of living autonomously. One unexpected consequence of robot ownership is the commodification of humans – since autonomy doesn’t protect robots from indentured servitude, it doesn’t protect humans, either. There are some really great questions in this book: In such a world of unfettered capitalism, how is it possible to live autonomously? Can humans develop intimate, loving relationships with genderless, mechanical creatures?

- **Colin Chamberlain:** I just finished *The Signature of All Things*, by Elizabeth Gilbert. It’s about a family of botanists living in Philadelphia in the 19th century, and is a fun read. Moss features prominently in the story!

- **Eugene Chislenko:** Naomi Klein, *This Changes Everything*. A phenomenally rich, honest, hopeful, urgent and illuminating picture of what has happened around climate change and what needs to happen.

- **Lindsay Craig:** I think all students interested in social and political philosophy and philosophy of race should consider reading *The Autobiography of Malcolm X* (1987) coauthored by Alex Haley. *Time* named it one of the 20th century’s most important pieces of nonfiction for a reason. For me, it does a lot of work to clear up common misconceptions about Malcolm X, his worldview, and his role in the American Civil Rights Movement.

- **Paul Crowe:** Elizabeth Anderson, *Private Government*. Her reading of John Locke and Adam Smith is particularly interesting.
What Are We Reading?

- **Kristin Gjesdal:** I just got Kate Manne’s *Down Girl* from the bookstore. The book was recommended by one of the job candidates who visited campus recently and it sounded like mandatory reading. Another philosophy book I have finished this spring is Elizabeth Anderson’s *Private Government*. Beyond academic philosophy, I have been reading James Baldwin over the past months. I’m excited to learn that philosophers and political scientists are turning to his work.

- **Espen Hammer:** David Foster Wallace, *Everything and More: A Compact History of Infinity*. Pretty irresistible once you get into it. The history of the concept of infinity from the Greeks to Cantor and beyond.

- **Miriam Solomon:** Sherry Turkle, *Alone Together: Why we expect more from technology and less from each other* (Basic Books, 2011). I’m reading it to try to understand the zeitgeist better.

- **Michael Szekeley:** Judith Becker, *Deep Listeners: Music, Emotion, and Trancing*. In *Deep Listeners*, the ethnomusicologist Judith Becker reminds us that, although “the English term ‘aesthetics’ has come to mean the study of the basis of evaluating objects designated as ‘artistic’ that have been isolated from their cultural context, that was not the original Greek meaning (*aesthetikos* ‘of sense perception’), nor is it the meaning of comparable terms used in India and Southeast Asia.” This key insight articulates one of the general concerns informing the orientation of my current research in applying such an ontology to aesthetics in general, and musical aesthetics in particular: moving away from an ontology of “the work” and toward an ontology of how the work works.

- **Gerald Vision:** I am currently reading a book by a mathematician, Karl Sigmund, *Exact Thinking in Demented Times*. It’s an account of European intellectual history—especially in science and philosophy—roughly in the twentieth century up to the beginning of World War II.

- **David Wolfsdorf:** For pleasure, I read a lot of Scandinavian noir. I’m currently working through the eleven or so books in Håkan Nesser’s Van Veetern series. *The G File* is particularly good.