

**International Virtual Conference  
on the theme  
“Comparative Philosophy toward World Philosophy”**

**April 19-23, 2022**

[CPWP International Conference Series-2022 /  
SJSU CCP Workshop-Conference Series-2022]

**Program**

(2022-3-14 version /  
parts of this version might be updated/modified)

*Co-organizers:*

The International Society for Comparative Philosophy toward World Philosophy (‘CPWP’)

<[www.cpwponline.org](http://www.cpwponline.org)>

The international journal, *Comparative Philosophy* <[www.comparativephilosophy.org](http://www.comparativephilosophy.org)> (‘CP’)

*Co-sponsor and host:*

The Center for Comparative Philosophy, San Jose State University, USA (‘CCP-SJSU’), with the support of the Dr. Chaote Lin Endowment at SJSU, USA (with the CPWP’s back-up funding)

**Time: 19 (Tuesday)-23 (Saturday) April 2022**

*Conference channel:* through Zoom channels set by the host party [free]

*Pre-Registration:* any interested participants can, and are encouraged to, make (free) pre-registration for the individual session(s) [not for the whole conference] in which they plan to participate (either as a discussant or as an attendee) by 1 April 2022 for two purposes: <1> to receive warming-up preview materials of the registered sessions(s) (the speakers’ talk papers or detailed outlines, relevant background readings, etc.) at least one week ahead of the conference; <2> to enable the host party to set up the Zoom setting for each of the sessions in an adequate way sensitive to the estimated number of the attendees. [The “Pre-Registration Form for Conference Sessions” is available at the “Conferences” section of CPWP website <[www.cpwponline.org](http://www.cpwponline.org)> or, in some cases, sent together with the conference program.]

**Goal, Emphasis and Focus of the Conference:**

To fulfill the shared concern and emphasis by the co-organizer/co-sponsor parties in their missions, this international conference is issue/topic oriented with emphasis on contribution to the contemporary development of philosophy (instead of historical figure or specific doctrine oriented) and of contemporary society, focusing on a range of philosophical issues/topics in various areas of philosophy that are or can be jointly concerned and approached in a way of cross-tradition engagement (via appropriate philosophical interpretation and from a higher and/or broader philosophical vantage point): how distinct approaches and resources from different philosophical traditions (whether distinguished culturally or by style/orientation), or from some (ancient) philosophical tradition and contemporary scholarship (philosophy or other intellectual pursuits), can talk to (rather than failing to communicate and understand), engage with (rather than passing by) and learn from (rather than totally rejecting or dismissing) each other and constructively make joint contributions to the development of philosophy and of contemporary society on the addressed jointly-concerned issues/topics.

## Strategy and Format:

(1) To effectively fulfill the foregoing goal, emphasis and focus of this conference, a range of issues/topics in various main areas of philosophy are set to be philosophically interesting to the general members of the co-organizer/co-sponsor parties, instead of being only locally interesting to ones working merely in one tradition or merely on historical/descriptive topics. This conference is thus arranged with the session format “cross-tradition engagement in [a range of main areas of philosophical exploration]” / “[a range of foundational and meta-methodological issues in/for] cross-tradition engagement in philosophy”, which would effectively allow inclusive coverage and provide the constructively engaging setting for the speakers/discussants’ distinct perspectives on some jointly-concerned issues/topics to talk to, engage with and learn from each other and make possible joint contribution to the development of philosophy in the addressed issues/topics (whether their talks/papers explicitly or implicitly address each other’s views and resources).

(2) Partially with consideration of the COVID-19 situation, partially to enable the participating parties to focus on relevant academic things without worries and distraction to such non-academic things as travel related difficulties/expenses, and in view of the recent well-developed Zoom-like internet means as a powerful channel for effective communication and academic discussion, this international conference is <1> to be held in the virtual format via a range of coordinated Zoom panel sessions, <2> to arrange panel sessions in a more optimal way (2or 3 sessions each day throughout the week, instead of all sessions one by one crowdedly within one or two days, so that interested participants in multiple sessions can have more time for warming-up readings and better prepar themselves for these sessions), and <3> to arrange the timelines for the different Zoom panel sessions in a way sensitive to the constitutions of participants and their hours in different international time zones during the conference period.

Contact:

Bo Mou, coordinator of the program

[bo.mou@sjsu.edu](mailto:bo.mou@sjsu.edu)

**19 April 2022, Tuesday**

### Opening Session:

Time: 4/19, Tuesday, 3:00-3:15pm US Pacific time

*Opening Remarks from Host Party:*

**MILLER, Shannon** (Dean of the College of Humanities & Arts, San Jose State University, USA)

**STEMWEDEL, Janet** (Chair of Philosophy Department, San Jose State University, USA)

**MOU, Bo** (on behalf of CPWP, CP and CCP-SJSU)

### Session 1 Conference-Theme Session

Topic: “**Comparative Philosophy Toward World Philosophy: Theme Introduction and Illustrating Cases Worldwide: Balkans, China, and India**”

Time: 4/19, Tuesday, 3:15-5:00pm, US Pacific time (11:15pm-1:00am, Central Europe time / 4/20, 6:15-8:00am, Beijing time / 4/20, 3:45-5:30am, Indian time)

*Chair:*

**SCHILTZ, Elizabeth** (College of Wooster, USA)

*Speakers:*

<1> *Theme Intro:*

**MOU, Bo** (San Jose State University, USA)

<2> *Doing Philosophy Comparatively (through Cross-tradition Engagement) Worldwide: Illustrating Cases of Balkans, China, and India*

**KAHTERAN, Nevad** (University of Sarajevo, Bosnia & Herzegovina)

“Doing Philosophy Comparatively in the Balkans: Western, Islamic and Eastern Philosophical Traditions in Engagement”

**SUN, Wei** (Beijing Academy of Social Sciences, China)

“Doing Philosophy Comparatively in China: Classical Chinese, Western, and Marxist Philosophical Traditions in Engagement”

**KAIPAYIL, Joseph** (Jeevalaya Institute of Philosophy, India)

“Doing Philosophy Comparatively in India: Classical Indian and Western Philosophical Traditions in Engagement”

**Subject, concern and feature of this session:**

This session presents a general explanatory examination of the conference theme and several distinct sample cases in different regions worldwide for illustration of “how comparative philosophy as a general way of doing philosophy through cross-tradition engagement toward world philosophy is possible”.

**Session 2:** Roundtable Discussion Panel

Topic: **“The Strategies for Teaching Comparative Philosophy (Taking Cross-Tradition-Engagement Approach) in Philosophy Curriculum”**

Time: 4/19, Tuesday, 5:30-7:00pm, US Pacific time [8:30-10:00pm, US Eastern Time]

*Chair:*

**MOU, Bo** (San Jose State University, USA)

*Speakers:*

**BILIMORIA, Purushottama** (University of Melbourne, Australia)

**CONNOLLY, Timothy** (East Stroudsburg University, USA)

*Discussants* [open to be added]

**Subject, concern and feature of this session:**

This roundtable panel discusses how to effectively take cross-tradition-engagement approach in college/university philosophy curriculum both through the “comparative philosophy” course and through including (instead of ignoring and dismissing) philosophically interesting and significant resources from some other philosophical tradition(s) (understood broadly) that are relevant and engaging on various topics of philosophy courses. The participants will share and discuss teaching and curriculum strategies in this connection. [Note: Timothy Connolly and Bo Mou are the authors of the recent texts respectively for the “comparative philosophy” course at the level of a comprehensive introduction (*Doing Philosophy Comparatively*, Bloomsbury 2015) and at the upper level (*Cross-Tradition Engagement in Philosophy*, Routledge 2020); they will share their systematic considerations for teaching comparative philosophy when working on the books.]

**Session 3:** Roundtable Discussion Panel

Topic: **“Philosophical Interpretation and Translation in Cross-Tradition Engagement: The Issue of Identity/Sameness and Difference in Philosophical Interpretation and Translation”**

Time: 4/19, Tuesday, 7:30–9:00pm, US Pacific time [10:30am-12:00pm Beijing/Hong Kong time]

*Speakers:*

**AMES, Roger T.** (Peking University, China / University of Hawai'i at Manoa, USA)

**ZHANG, Longxi** (City University of Hong Kong, HongKong, China)

**SANCHEZ, Carlos** (San Jose State University, USA)

*Discussants* [open to be added]:

**MOU, Bo** (San Jose State University, USA)

**Subject, concern and feature of this session:**

There are various types of interpretation of texts in view of distinct strategic purposes in reflective pursuits, although they share the common goal, i.e., to understand the addressed object under interpretation. In view of distinct strategic purposes, there are historical interpretation, literary interpretation, religious interpretation, philosophical interpretation, and so on. What distinguishes “philosophical interpretation” from the other types of interpretation, conceptually speaking, lies in its distinct purpose: simply speaking, doing philosophy. One primary concern in cross-tradition engagement through philosophical interpretation in translating texts of a target tradition into a home tradition (or the other way round) is the issue of identity/sameness and difference: <1> it is one basic jointly concerned issue in philosophical interpretation and translation; <2> the participating speakers and discussant have their more or less distinct ideas on the issue, at least some parts of which can be constructively complementary; <3> the issue of identity (sameness and difference) is a cross-the-board issue in philosophy, especially involved in cross-tradition engagement, as shown in some of the subsequent roundtable discussion panels.

**20 April 2022, Wednesday**

**Session 4:** Roundtable Discussion Panel

Topic: **“Cross-tradition Engagement on Philosophy as a Way of life and Worldview: Perspectives from African, Islamic, Latin-American and Western Perspectives”**

Time: **4/20, Wednesday, 9:30am-11:30am US Pacific time** [12:30-2:30pm, US Eastern Time / 5:30-7:30pm, Africa (Nigeria) time / 5:30-7:30pm, Central Europe time]

*Chair:*

**KAHTERAN, Nevad** (University of Sarajevo, Bosnia & Herzegovina)

*Speakers:*

**AZADPUR, Mohammad** (San Francisco State University, USA)

“Prophetic Philosophy as a Way of Life”

**OJIMBA, Anthony Chimankpam** (University of Nigeria, Africa)

“Ubuntu Ontology and ‘Will to Power’: Nietzsche and Ramose on the Fundamental Nature of Reality”

**VARGAS, Manuel** (University of California at San Diego, USA)

“Philosophy as Way of Life and World View: Latin American Instances and Provocations”

**WOODLING, Casey** (Coastal Carolina University, USA):

“Malagasy Worldview”

*Discussants* [open to be added]

**Subject, concern and feature of this session:**

Philosophical explorations started, and are still somehow made, in folk discourses through ordinary peoples’ (explicit or implicit) reflective thoughts on ways of life and their worldviews in different cultural traditions via various channels. Some of them are so fundamental and widespread that they constitute common grounds or bases on which peoples throughout the world communicate, understand and learn from each other; some others play so significant explanatory role in our folk and reflective lives that they constitute people’s pre-theoretic understandings of some important concepts on which more systematic philosophical elaborations are bases in theoretic accounts; still

some others are related to distinct social and cultural settings in different traditions, underlie distinct approaches and resources in different philosophical traditions that are associated with different cultural traditions, and provide guideline channels through which to understand and capture more specific treatments in different traditions. In this roundtable panel, the participating speakers will present distinct perspectives on the way of life and worldviews respectively from African, Islamic, Latin-American philosophical traditions in engaging view of some perspectives from the Western philosophical tradition.

**Session 5** Roundtable Discussion Panel

Topic: **“Cross-tradition Engagement in Metaphysics, Philosophy of Mind, and Philosophy of Language: Buddhist (earlier Indian and later Chinese), Daoist, Hinduist and Western Perspectives on the Issue of the Self”**

Time: **4/20, Wednesday, 12:30-2:30pm, US Pacific time** [3:30-5:30pm, US Eastern time / 7:30-9:30pm, UK time / 8:30-10:30pm, Central Europe time]

*Chair:*

**STRUHL, Karstern** (New School for Public Engagement, USA)

*Speakers:*

**JONES, Richard H.** (Independent Scholar, USA)

“On Brahman, Atman, and the Self in Vedantic Philosophy”

**KLOTZ, Jerome** (University of Nottingham, UK)

“From No-thing, All Things Come: The Logic of Emptiness in Daoism and Zen”

**MULLER, Fabien** (Heidelberg University, Germany)

“Caducitas and Śūnyatā. A Neoplatonist Reading of Nāgārjuna”

*Discussants* [open to be added]:

**MOU, Bo** (San Jose State University, USA)

**VAIDYA, Anand** (San Jose State University, USA)

**Subject, concern and feature of this session:**

This roundtable panel discusses the issue of the human self (whole) as one jointly-addressed issue in metaphysics (the metaphysical nature of the self as part of this natural world), philosophy of mind (the self in view of its “mind” part), and philosophy of language (the self as the competent language agent who makes the semantic connection between thought, language and the world of which humans with the self are parts). The panel participants jointly explore the issue of the self in view of the relevant perspectives and resources from earlier Buddhist approach, Daoist approach, later (Chinese) Buddhist approach, and those from the Western tradition and contemporary philosophy.

**Session 6:** Roundtable Discussion Panel

Topic: **“Normative Bases for Cross-Tradition Engagement in Philosophy”**

Time: **4/20, Wednesday, 3:15pm-4:00pm, US Pacific time** [6:15-8:00am, Beijing/Hong Kong time / 11:15pm-1:00am, Central Europe time]

*Chair:*

**ZHENG, Yujian** (Chinese University of Hong Kong, China)

*Speakers:*

**DONKERS, Harry** (Independent Scholar, the Netherlands)

“Seeking Harmony in Comparative Philosophy Using the *Yi-Jing* Cosmic Model

**NORIEGA, Raymond Lewis** (San Jose State University, USA)

“A Perspective of Meta-phenomenological Hermeneutics”

*Discussants* [open to be added]:

**BANKA, Rafal** (Oxford University, UK)

**MOU, Bo** (San Jose State University, USA)

**Subject, concern and feature of this session:**

In philosophical exploration, we neither can start from nowhere nor should have “anything goes”; there is a general need for due normative bases on which distinct approaches in philosophical exploration can talk with and learn from each other and make joint contribution to our understanding and treatment of a range of issues in philosophy. So the general issue here is this: how due normative bases is possible in philosophical exploration, given the thorough critical character of philosophical exploration and its justification demand. The issue becomes prominent and crucial as the foregoing need is serious in cross-tradition philosophical engagement: distinct approaches from different traditions (understood broadly, distinguished culturally, by orientation/style, or by identities of movements of thought) are typically so different that they are sometimes taken to talk about different things and thus pass by each other without genuine philosophical engagement. The purpose of this roundtable panel is this: to discuss the issue for the sake of having adequate foundation via due normative bases for philosophical engagement, generally speaking, and for cross-tradition philosophical engagement, specially speaking.

**21 April 2022, Thursday**

**Section 7** Roundtable Discussion Panel

Topic: **“Cross-tradition Engagement in Epistemology and Cognitive Science: Perspectives from Buddhist, Chinese, Islamic and Western Traditions”**

Time: **4/21, Thursday, 12:30–2:00pm, US Pacific time** [8:30-10pm, Europe time / 11pm-12:30am, Iran time / 4/22, 6:30-8am, Australia Sidney time]

*Speakers:*

**DIVINO, Federico** (University of Bergamo, Italy)

“A New Way to Study the Cognitive Philosophy of Ancient Buddhism”

**LAI, Karyn** (University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia)

“Knowing-How and Knowing-To: Perspective from Chinese Tradition”

**SHIRVANI, Meysam** (University of Tehran, Iran)

“How al-Farabi’s Interpretative Method can Engage with Aristotle’s Method in Cognition and Practical Philosophy”

*Discussants* [open to be added]:

**MOU, Bo** (San Jose State University, USA)

**VAIDYA, Anand** (San Jose State University, USA)

**Subject, concern and feature of this session:**

The philosophical concern with and theoretic exploration of knowledge (epistemology) and its closely related scientific exploration of human cognition (cognitive science) include their concerns with such questions as “what is knowledge/human cognition?”, “what constitute adequate objects of knowledge/human cognition?”, “what are adequate sources of knowledge/human cognition?”, “what are suitable means by which to achieve knowledge?”, “what constitutes adequate justification for knowledge?”, etc. This roundtable panel explore some issues in epistemology and cognitive science from distinct perspectives respectively based on relevant resources in Buddhist philosophy, classical Chinese philosophy, and Islamic philosophy in view of relevant approaches in Western tradition, among others.

**Section 8** Roundtable Discussion Panel

Topic: **“Cross-tradition Engagement in Aesthetics: Perspectives from East-Asian, Indian and Western Traditions”**

Time: **4/21, Thursday, 2:30–4:30pm, US Pacific time** [5:30-7:30pm, US Eastern Time / 11:30am-1:30pm, US Hawaii time / 10:30pm-12:30am Central Europe time]

*Speakers:*

**NGUYEN, A. Minh** (USA):

Perspectives in Japanese Aesthetics”

**WENNING, Mario** (Loyola University, Spain):

“Hut Existence or Urban Dwelling? Deprovincializing Heidegger from the East”

**WIDDISON, Lisa** (University of Hawai‘i at West O‘ahu, USA):

“Aestheticized Tragedy (Karunārāsa) as an Intellectual Virtue”

*Discussants* [open to be added]:

**LIU, Yuedi** (Institute of Philosophy, Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, China)

**WISEMAN, Mary** (City University of New York, USA)

**Subject, concern and feature of this session:**

This roundtable panel presents distinct aesthetic perspectives from Chinese, Indian, Japanese, and Western traditions and also provides a distinct opportunity for the participating scholars to talk to, engage with and learn from each other on their jointly concerned issues in aesthetics in a complementary way. The journal *Comparative Philosophy* contributes to this roundtable discussion panel this way: the three speakers are previous authors of the published pieces in the journal, and the two discussants are members of the journal’s editorial board with their expertise in aesthetics.

**Session 9:** Roundtable Discussion Panel

Topic: **“Cross-tradition Engagement in Metaphysics and Philosophy of Language: On Identities of the Ultimate Realities in Different Traditions”**

Time: **4/21, Thursday, 6:30–8pm, US Pacific time** [8:30-10am, Thailand time]

*Speakers:*

**Soraj Hongladarom** (Chulalongkorn University, Thailand)

**CHAN, Rebecca** (San Jose State University, USA)

*Discussants* [open to be added]:

**MOU, Bo** (San Jose State University, USA)

**Subject, concern and feature of this session:**

The ultimate reality (if any, no matter how to identify it, this natural world as a whole, the *Dao*, the *Brahman*, the God, the *karma*-related reality, etc.) of a philosophical tradition or a religious tradition with its partially philosophical concern/orientation constitutes one fundamental metaphysical foundation of, and one explanatory basis for, the tradition and thus also constitutes one possible fundamental common basis (if somehow shared more or less with some other traditions) on which cross-tradition communication, understanding, and engagement between these traditions can be carried on so that they can somehow talk fundamentally about the “same” thing differently, rather than vertically about different things (or even actually “anything goes”) at the fundamental level or horizontally “floating” around and passing by without genuine engagement. This roundtable panel is to explore the issue of identities of the ultimate realities, and their due relationship, in different traditions (philosophical traditions or religious traditions with their partially philosophical concern/orientations), as one significant part of the strategic exploration of the general philosophical issue of “how cross-tradition engagement is possible”.

**22 April 2022, Friday**

**Section 10:** Roundtable Discussion Panel

Topic: “**Cross-tradition Engagement on Social Justice, Equality and Impartiality: Daoist and Buddhist Approaches in Engaging with Contemporary Theories**”

Time: **4/22, Friday, 8:00-10:00am, US Pacific time** [11:00am-1:00pm, US Eastern time / Canada (Edmonton) time / 9:30-11:30pm, Indian time / 5:00-7:00pm, Europe time]

*Chair:*

**LI, Jingjing** (Leiden University, Netherlands)

*Speakers:*

**DAI, Yuanfang** (Michigan State University, USA)

“Beyond Confucianism: Feminist Scholarship on Daoism and Buddhism”

**DORSEY, Donna** (MacEwan University, Canada)

“Ethical Dimensions of Alterity, Impartiality and Partiality: Śāntideva's and the Contemporary Western Ethical Theories of Care”

*Discussants* [open to be added]

**Subject, concern and feature of this session:**

This roundtable panel is to discuss how distinct perspectives from different traditions can contribute to our understanding and treatment of a range of issues concerning social justice, equality and impartiality which involve both moral philosophy and social-political philosophy. More specifically, for the panel participants’ critical engaging discussion, Yuanfang Dai will present her recent research work on how Daoist and Buddhist approaches can engage with and contribute to the contemporary Feminist scholarship concerning social justice and equality, while Donna Dorsey will present her recent research work on how Buddhist resources can engage with and contribute to the contemporary Western ethical theories of care and impartiality.

**Section 11:** Roundtable Discussion Panel

Topic: “**Cross-tradition Engagement in Philosophy of Language, Logic, and metaphysics: Engaging with *Catuṣkoṭi* and Dialetheism**”

Time: **4/22, Friday, 12:30-2:30pm, US Pacific time** [3:30-5:30pm US Eastern/Canada (Ottawa) time / 9:30-11:30pm, Europe time]

*Speakers:*

**KAPSNER, Andreas** (Munich Center for Mathematical Philosophy, Germany)

“Ineffability, Emptiness and Aesthetics of Logic”

**MOU, Bo** (San Jose State University, USA)

“Double Reference, Enhanced Relative Identity, and Refined Law of Non-Contradiction: From Gongsun Long’s and Later Mohist Approaches to Modern Logic”

**PRIEST, Graham** (CUNY Graduate Center, USA / University of Melbourne, Australia)

“Further Thoughts on *Catuṣkoṭi* and Dialetheism”

*Discussants* [open to be added]:

**YI, Byeong-uk** (University of Toronto, Canada)

**Subject, concern and feature of this session** (a bit more explanation for understanding with consideration of its involving some logical stuffs)

Graham Priest is one of the most pioneering philosophers in this century who do important philosophical work across major borders of different traditions, the formal and philosophical, the historical and the contemporary. In this roundtable panel, though agreeing to many of Priest’s ideas, two participating speakers, Andreas Kapsner and Bo Mou, engage with some of his treatments respectively related to *Catuṣkoṭi* and dialetheism [*Catuṣkoṭi*, at its simplest, is a view of Buddhist

logic that claims can be true, false, both or neither, labeled ‘four corners’, which evolves to its fifth corner for ineffability and emptiness, labeled ‘5/4’; dialetheism, simply speaking, is a view that some contradictions really exist (or in its “semantic-ascent” terms, some contradictory statements are true), which Priest considers to be one major support for rejecting the law of non-contradictions, though this treatment seems stronger than that of paraconsistent logic according to which the hypothesis of a contradiction does not entail everything]. Kapsner explains why he thinks that the real nature of Priest’s treatment of the fifth corner is not a purely logical analysis but a logical reconstruction that is relatively unconcerned with logical consequence but aims more for an allegorical, suggestive and aesthetic endeavor. Based on his recent work on double reference and an enhanced treatment of relative identity, Mou makes the distinction of referential contradictions and predicative contradictions and explains why the former is primary while the latter secondary and how an enhanced law of non-contradictions can work well with the former. Priest will further explain his thoughts on *Catuskoṭi* and dialetheism. So to speak, the addressed engaging disagreements lie in distinct perspectives in some connections, which might or can be complementary, while what is at issue is how to look at the relation between the addressed distinct perspectives at the guiding-principle level of each of these approaches. The goal of this panel is thus for the constructive engagement among the participating speakers, instead of mere critique for criticism.

### **Section 12:** Roundtable Discussion Panel

Topic: **“Cross-tradition Engagement in Moral Philosophy:**

**Situationism and Virtue-Ethics—Critiques and Perspectives from Confucian Ethics”**

Time: 4/22, Friday 5:00-7:00pm, US Pacific time [8:00am-10am, Beijing/Singapore time]

*Chair:*

**ROBERTSON, Seth** (Harvard University, USA)

*Speakers:*

**HU, Jianping** (Nanyang Technological University, Singapore):

“The Absence of Longitudinal Studies in Situationism: What Can We Learn from a Xunzian Four-Stage Moral Development Model?”

**JACKSON, Jordan** (University of California-Riverside, USA):

“Mastering Your Domain: Confucius, Aristotle, and the Problem of Character-Situationism”

**LEUNG, Yat-hung** (East China Normal University, China):

“Zhu Xi and the Debate between Virtue Ethicists and Situationists: Virtue Cultivation as a Possible, Practical, and Necessary Enterprise”

*Discussants* [open to be added]

**Subject, concern and feature of this session:**

Situationism, as one of the most influential and recent critiques of Aristotelian virtue ethics, argues that people generally do not have consistent and stable character traits, and individual actions are more often determined by external situational factors (see John Doris and Gilbert Harman). This debate has caught the attention of scholars across various disciplines and cultures: virtue ethics, personality psychology, education, Confucianism, etc. The goal of this roundtable discussion panel is to respond to the situationist critiques of virtue ethics from the perspectives of early Confucian and Neo-Confucian ethics.

**23 April 2022, Saturday**

**Session 13** Roundtable Discussion Panel

Topic: **“Cross-tradition Engagement in Political Philosophy: Eastern and Western Perspectives”**

Time: **4/23, Saturday, 5:00-6:30pm, US Pacific time** [4/24, 8:00-9:00am, Singapore/Beijing time]

*Chair:*

**LUO, Shirong** (Simmons University, USA)

*Speaker:*

**JIN, Yutang** (Princeton University, USA)

“Confucian Leadership Democracy: A Roadmap”

**PARK, John J.** (California State University at Sacramento, USA)

“The Best Hybrid Meritocracy-Democracy for Liberal Democracies”

*Discussants* [open to be added]:

**TAN, Sor-soon** (Singapore Management University, Singapore)

**Subject, concern and feature of this session:**

In political philosophy, there is the debate on the relationship between meritocracy and democracy (more specifically, between Confucian-style meritocracy and Western liberal democracy) and what is a best approach that would best fit for current liberal democracies. The two speakers respectively present their views on the issue, which have substantial theoretic and practical significance to the contemporary society.

**Session 14:** Roundtable Discussion Panel

Topic: **“How to Look at Contraries Within and Beyond Social-Political Areas: Harmony-Seeking Approach and Overall-Complementarity-Seeking Approach”**

Time: **4/23, Saturday, 7:00–8:30pm, US Pacific time** [4/24, 10:00-11:30pm, Singapore time]

*Speakers:*

**LI, Chenyang** (Nanyang Technological University, Singapore)

“On Harmony-Seeking Approach”

**MOU, Bo** (San Jose State University, USA)

“On an Overall-Complementarity-Seeking Approach”

*Discussants* [open to be added]

**Subject, concern and feature of this session:**

The addressed harmony-seeking approach is originally presented in Chenyang Li 2014 (primarily based on relevant resources from Confucianism) as one approach in social-political philosophy “for guidance in dealing with creative tension between Confucianism and democracy”; the addressed overall-complementarity-seeking approach is originally presented in Bo Mou 2020 (ch. 4), (primarily based on relevant methodological resources from the *Yi-Jing* philosophy and Hegelian philosophy) as an across-the-board approach to how to look at tensions/conflicts. This roundtable panel explores two strategic fronts on which the addressed harmony-seeking approach and overall-complementarity-seeking approach might be constructively engaged with each other: some strategic engaging fronts: <1> within the social-political area, what is the relation between the harmony-seeking and the overall-complementarity seeking in treating tensions and conflicts? <2> beyond the social-political area, what is the relation between the harmony-seeking and the overall-complementarity seeking in treating tensions and conflicts?

[End]