Preface

This volume is the "official" Report of the work of the Fourth East-West Philosophers' Conference, held at the University of Hawaii during the summer of 1964. The volume is composed primarily of the papers presented at the formal meetings of the Conference (plus some of the Public Lectures). The essence of the work of the Conference was provided by these formal papers, and so this volume presents the substance of the Conference in its essentials. It contains also—in the form of questions and answers—some of the substantial and extensive, and also enlightening and frequently controversial, discussion that took place at formal meetings, informal and special coffee hours, five receptions, and six weeks of constant personal interchange among the some 125 members of the Conference. Of course, no volume of this type could do full justice to a Conference which involved so much constant give-and-take discussion and formal and informal intellectual encounter and dialogue.

This Conference was like the three preceding East-West Philosophers' conferences, except that, this time, the work was centered around one basic problem—namely, the comparative status of the individual in the major philosophical and cultural traditions of Asia and the West. As at the earlier Conferences, the work of the 1964 Conference was divided into six "Sections," in each of which one special aspect of the over-all problem was presented in formal papers and discussed extensively and in depth for an entire week—such discussion involving, as already said, not only that which took place at the formal meetings, but also that which occurred at informal coffee hours (which, by the way, were unanimously considered of great value), and that at informal—and practically continuous—personal discussions. This division of the work into six major Sections, each dealing with one of the basic aspects of the problem, provided the opportunity for concentrated explanation and discussion—although, as is stated in the Introduction to this volume, such rather strict demarcation, calling for possibly artificial divisions of the problem, was questionable and may have been somewhat misleading for the members from Asia.

In format, this fourth Conference resembled the previous Conferences. This consisted of (1) formal Conference meetings (four nights per week), at each of which, on most occasions, one formal paper was read in its entirety by its author and then discussed, first and primarily by the Panel Members, and then by the general

membership (unfortunately, for too short a period of time); (2) daily coffee hours, at which the paper presented at the formal meeting the night before was discussed by the full membership in informal fashion and in much more detail than was possible at the formal meeting alone; (3) one Public Lecture by a Panel Member each of the last five weeks of the Conference; and (4) a few special coffee hours, at which supplementary papers or lectures (or papers which could not be included in the formal program because of the time factor) were presented and fully discussed.

The format of this volume, in general, conforms with that of the Conference, and the order of the papers follows the order of their presentation at the formal meetings of the Conference and in the Conference program—Section by Section. (Professor William Ernest Hocking's paper—sent to the Conference and read by his son, Dr. Richard Hocking, because of Professor Hocking's inability to follow through on his original intention of participating in the Conference—is included in Section I, because it deals primarily with the metaphysical aspect of the problem.) At the end of most papers there are some Questions and Answers to represent what the authors considered the most important items in the discussion of their papers. Following the formal papers are some of the Public Lectures. (The lectures by Dr. Chan and Dr. Tara Chand are not published herein, since these two Conference members have formal papers in the earlier Sections of the book.)

One of the rather serious difficulties of organizing and editing this volume has been the matter of the length of the individual papers. This has been at times a rather delicate matter in some cases. The "rules of the game" called for papers of such length that they could be read at the formal Conference meetings within a 45-minute time limit—so as to provide the writer ample time for the presentation of basic pertinent ideas and also to provide for significant discussion. It was very difficult in some cases for the writer to restrict himself to this limit—and some did not do so. Accordingly—and unfortunately—the papers in this volume are of unequal length. In fairness to those who kept the length of their papers within prescribed limits, some attempt has been made to edit a few of the papers so as to bring them more into line with the "required" limits of length. This was most difficult, sometimes unsuccessful, and at times practically impossible.

The technical problems of editing a volume like this are immense, because of the very nature of its contents, in terms of the variety of language and cultural perspectives, the necessity for Asian members to express themselves in sometimes difficult English terminology, the variety of styles which the several authors individually prefer in such matters as italics, capitals, hyphenation, personal names, trans-

literation, translations of the same words or titles from Asian languages, dates, etc. While consistency of style in all such matters is clearly the ideal—for the sake of clarity in reading—the editor has not felt that consistency throughout the volume is of such importance as to justify ignoring or rejecting the technical stylistic preferences of the outstanding scholars whose papers comprise this volume. This is not to say that the volume presents a carelessly permissive miscellany of styles. Consistency of style is sought as far as feasible, and consistency within each paper has been achieved.

An attempt was made to achieve uniformity or consistency of style in the transliteration in the papers on the Far East without violating the expressed professional preferences of the authors. This attempt was unsuccessful. It was decided, therefore, to leave names and titles—including capitalization and hyphenation—in the papers and in the footnotes as the authors presented them. Uniformity of style will be achieved in the index, in spite of necessary conflict between entries there and the corresponding items in the text.

Capitalization and hyphenation have been constant causes of concern to the perhaps overzealous editor. In neither case has precise uniformity been insisted upon or achieved, except within the several papers.

Hyphenation has been used rather abundantly—wherever it seemed advisable for ease of reading on the part of those not too familiar with Asian languages, but not at the cost of technical accuracy. Technically, there is no precisely correct style of hyphenation, nor, in many cases, any consistent system of uniformity, in any of the Asian languages. “Correct” hyphenation in titles of books and articles proved next to impossible of achievement in the uniformity of styles preferred by authors. This was especially true in the footnotes. In some papers, hyphenation (and capitalization) was not changed at all in the editing process. Also, in some cases, footnotes were left unedited.

Capitalization is decidedly “inconsistent” in the volume as a whole, and occasionally within individual papers. These differences are not inaccuracies. The capital and the lower case, in most instances, are used to indicate different meanings or statuses of the words underlined—metaphysical status usually calling for the capital, empirical status for the lower-case letter. Examples are numerous: Heaven or heaven, *Nirvāṇa* or *nirvāṇa*, *Dharma* or *dharma*, the Buddha and *buddha*-nature (and related terms), *Sūnyatā* or *śūnyatā*, Soul and/or Self (*Ātman* and *ātman*), State, Nature, Moral Law, etc.

Following the wishes of authors of papers in this volume, italics for emphasis have been generally retained.

Sometimes technically inaccurate styles have been used, for ease

of reading and in deference to common usage; for example, the formation of plurals of Sanskrit words by the terminal "s" (e.g., *brāhmaṇas*); and such terms (very occasionally) as "*brāhmin*" instead of the correct "*brāhmaṇa*"; also e.g., *ātman* and *karma* (instead of *karman*).

It has not been considered the prerogative of the editor—in this case, possibly less than sufficiently "strict"—to insist upon any mandatory or arbitrary style for the volume as a whole, partly because in many cases there is no "correct" style, but primarily out of respect for the judgment of the outstanding authorities responsible for the papers that make up this volume, and also because of the very nature of the volume, a symposium of papers by representatives of various traditions and cultures who do not think or write or express themselves in any one restricted manner.

However, the editor assumes full responsibility for revising usage employed by some Chinese authors—and common usage—in cases of published items—called "*chuans*"—which are in fact articles or chapters or parts of standard works. These are enclosed within quotation marks and are not italicized.

It should probably be mentioned that, since this book is in English, an effort has been made in the editing to make it as readable and intelligible as feasible, without committing too-gross violations of accuracy. For example, the aforementioned general Western practice of adding a final "s" to form plurals of Asian terms has been employed, although it is not technically accurate. Also, as mentioned, common usage has been followed occasionally. Also, there is some inconsistency in the matter of italicizing foreign words—sometimes common Asian words are italicized, sometimes not. These are matters of individual preference, complicated by an editor's somewhat obligatory reliance upon English dictionaries in the case of terms which have become matters of common usage in English. It is not felt, however, that any of these discrepancies will cause serious confusion—in fact, the opposite has been the purpose of the editing practices adopted.

Small superior letters, comparable to footnote numbers, will be encountered frequently in articles by representatives of China and Japan. These letters indicate Chinese and/or Japanese characters which are provided at the end of the respective articles. Sanskrit, Pali, Chinese, Japanese, and Arabic terms, especially in cases where there is any possible doubt of translation, will be found within parentheses after the English (or the English will be in parentheses after the Asian terms, if the author prefers that style). Both in the text and in the footnotes, English equivalents of all terms, titles, and expressions in Asian languages will be given.

In many instances—for the sake of clarity and historical perspective—dates are provided for some historical periods and outstanding thinkers in the Asian fields.

Recognition—and sincere thanks—should be given here to those who have been so significantly helpful in the preparation of the papers and of the volume for publication, and there are many who deserve special mention and commendation.

Without going into detail concerning specific ways in which they were helpful—and most co-operative—the editor personally wishes to express his appreciation to Professor Wing-tsit Chan, the editor's constant guide and advisor, Professor Kenneth K. Inada, Professor S. K. Saksena, Professor Chung-ying Cheng, Professor Richard P. Haynes, and to Professor Beatrice Yamasaki (who assumed responsibility for preparation of the Who's Who items found in the Appendix)—for specific and valuable help with editing chores; to Mr. Thomas Nickerson, Director of the University of Hawaii Press; to Mr. Robert Sparks, Managing Editor of the University of Hawaii Press; and to those authors of papers and lectures who co-operated so well in the editing of their contributions. Dr. Inada went far beyond "the call of duty," examining, with the editor, almost innumerable detailed and specific problems in the Asian papers during a final re-checking of all papers just before publication. He has been extremely helpful and deserves and hereby receives the editor's enthusiastic appreciation. (The editor, of course, assumes sole responsibility.)

A special expression of appreciation must go to Mrs. Aldyth V. Morris, the "very special assistant" to the editor of this volume—as she was also of the volumes from the two preceding conferences (*Essays in East-West Philosophy*, 1949; and *Philosophy and Culture—East and West*, 1959). An attempt to recognize her unusually significant contribution has been made by citing her on the title page.

The editor's secretary, Mrs. Floris Sakamoto, must also be included in this list and thanked for her industriousness, co-operative spirit, and patience throughout the long and difficult and confusing, and at times frustrating problems of typing and re-typing parts of the manuscript, and the many other chores involved—and there were many.

To all who have been helpful, my sincere appreciation. To those who may find the editing too far short of perfection, my apologies. The editor assumes full responsibility for all errors for which editors are responsible—but not for discrepancies which were more or less beyond his control. To take one's work as editor as a very serious responsibility and at the same time to recognize the high scholarly

xvi Preface

stature of those whose work constitutes the body of a volume—that is a rather precarious predicament.

CHARLES A. MOORE

Honolulu

September 1, 1965

Video and audio tapes and 16-mm. films of many of the activities of the Conference are available for purchase—at cost. These include the reading of the formal papers, the discussion at formal meetings, the public lectures, and weekly summaries (plus an introductory statement and an over-all summary). For detailed information, please write to University of Hawaii Communications Center, University of Hawaii, Honolulu.