2010

Practicing Public Philosophy

Report from a meeting convened in San Francisco on April 2, 2010

(co-sponsored by the American Philosophical Association's committee on public philosophy and George Mason University's Center for Global Ethics)

Sharon M. Meagher and Ellen K. Feder

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

Executive Summary

What is the value of public philosophy? In what ways is philosophy, when engaged with various publics, transformative, i.e., how can or does philosophy improve public life? In what ways is philosophy transformed when engaged with various publics, i.e., how does/might public engagement inform philosophical concepts and understanding and/or alter disciplinary boundaries?

And, if public philosophy is valuable—then how might we promote and sustain its practice? How can we insure the highest quality and most ethical practices?

To discuss these and related questions, the American Philosophical Association's Committee on Public Philosophy and George Mason University's Center for Global Ethics convened a day-long meeting in conjunction with the 2010 Pacific Division meetings on "Practicing Public Philosophy." The objective of these sessions was to extend the conversations begun by the APA Committee on Public Philosophy and to lay the groundwork for development of wider-ranging projects and increased collaboration.

Conveners Sharon M. Meagher and Ellen K. Feder facilitated discussion about the nature of public philosophy as well as the practical concerns and challenges that need to be addressed so that we might encourage and support the highest quality practices of public philosophy. What follows is a report of the conference discussion and the group's recommendations for next steps.

The specific objectives of the mini-conference were therefore twofold: 1) to create a democratized space where reflection on public philosophy could take place, that is, a space of mutual learning and support for publically engaged philosophers and those who wish to do publically engaged work in the field; and 2) to support philosophers, especially junior scholars, who do publically engaged work by providing them with the opportunity to cultivate networks of mentors of senior scholars engaged in work identifiable as public philosophy and of peers with whom to develop this work.

The meeting participants—who ranged from distinguished senior professors well-known as public philosophers to undergraduate students—worked to think about how philosophical engagement with various publics has been—and can be—valuable. Three positions were advocated by discussants; they are not mutually exclusive:

- Philosophical practice is a public good and should therefore be practiced in and with various publics
- Public philosophy is philosophy that has the explicit aim of benefiting public life

- Public philosophy should be liberatory, i.e., it should assist and empower those who are most vulnerable and suffer injustice, particularly through a critical analysis of power structures.

After discussion of other related concerns, including varying definitions of "public" and the challenges to practicing public philosophy, we worked to address those challenges.

Ultimately the group both made recommendations to the APA's Committee on Public Philosophy and agreed that there was a need for a **Public Philosophy Network**.

MAIN REPORT

Introduction: the intellectual context and rationale for the meeting

Despite the public perception that continues to share Aristophanes' view that philosophers remain "in the clouds," incapable of doing publically relevant work, at least some philosophers have remained committed to a Socratic model of philosophy that is engaged with public life. Some key philosophical traditions, notably the American Pragmatist tradition and, in Europe, the Frankfurt School, remain vibrant and have embraced a commitment to publically engaged scholarship. Admittedly many other philosophers (including some adherents to these traditions) have lost sight of this model and rarely engage the public. Yet as the discipline of philosophy has been transformed—by the concern for (and growing legitimacy of) practical and applied ethics, feminist and critical race theories, and other new sub-disciplines—a new generation of publically engaged philosophers has emerged. This is a development that has been promoted by the changing demographics of the discipline: As more women of all ethnicities and races, more men of color, and more working class persons have entered the discipline, they have insisted that philosophy be practiced in ways that address the questions salient to their experiences and their histories. Together with the allies they have cultivated, these thinkers have transformed the discipline in multiple ways to insure its relevance.

We live in a time when a growing number of philosophers are doing what may be called "public philosophy," but it is not always recognized as "legitimate" philosophy by all within the discipline and also goes largely unnoticed by the general public. In response, the American Philosophical Association created the Committee on Public Philosophy, an initiative that mirrored initiatives of its sister academic associations in fields such as history and anthropology. While the changes in the discipline itself demand that we engage in philosophical reflection on the public value of our work, the establishment of a committee on public philosophy is particularly timely; in difficult economic times, academics are likely to face greater scrutiny as the wider public wonders why investing in the humanities is a worthwhile thing to do. They ask what the public significance of our work is, or what bearing our work has on the crises of the day.

In that spirit, the APA Committee on Public Philosophy and George Mason University's Center for Global Ethics sponsored a double session at the 2010 Pacific Division meetings on "Practicing Public Philosophy." The objective of these sessions was to extend the conversations begun by the APA Committee on Public Philosophy and to lay the groundwork for development of wider-ranging projects and increased collaboration. Sessions previously sponsored by that committee have featured the work of well-known philosophers who are public intellectuals; the panels have been very well attended, but were too short to give audience members—most of whom were philosophers who do public work though on a less visible stage—time to really

discuss their experiences and their ideas. Moreover, a typical conference panel structure is too restrictive to provide a space to make new opportunities in public philosophy possible.

We met at the Villa Florence Hotel and conducted the sessions as a day-long retreat in which the conveners, Sharon M. Meagher and Ellen K. Feder, facilitated discussion about the nature of public philosophy as well as the practical concerns and challenges that need to be addressed so that we might encourage and support the highest quality practices of public philosophy. What follows is a report of the conference discussion and the group's recommendations for next steps.

Conference Overview

Goals and Objectives of the Conference

The overall goal of the conference sessions was to engage in an extended conversation to take account of professional philosophers' engagement in public life (assuming multiple publics and multiple types of engagement and to reflect philosophically on the concept of "public philosophy").

The specific objectives of the mini-conference were therefore twofold: 1) to create a democratized space where reflection on public philosophy could take place, that is, a space of mutual learning and support for publically engaged philosophers and those who wish to do publically engaged work in the field; and 2) to support philosophers, especially junior scholars, who do publically engaged work by providing them with the opportunity to cultivate networks of mentors of senior scholars engaged in work identifiable as public philosophy and of peers with whom to develop this work. The aim of these sessions was not to produce public philosophy as such, but to encourage reflection on the very concept and explore possibilities for developing this work and our understanding of it. Both aims work from the premise that we can only do public philosophy if we learn to collaborate with one another more effectively.

Structure and Organization of the Conference

More than thirty-five philosophers—ranging from some of the most distinguished senior professionals in the field to undergraduate students with a passion for public philosophy—participated in the full day. A few others who were registered for the Pacific APA meeting dropped in for morning and/or afternoon sessions. The conveners invited several key public philosophers to serve as "catalyst" speakers; those persons were provided with the morning discussion questions in advance and were tasked with the goal of spurring high quality reflection and discussion throughout the day. That said, all conference attendees participated freely and equally in the discussion.

We began the day with self-introductions; attendees identified themselves and their interest in "public philosophy." The latter served to launch a fuller discussion on participants' thinking about what public philosophy is. During the remaining time in the morning session, the full group discussed the nature of public philosophy. At morning's end, the facilitator asked participants to suggest topics for smaller working groups to address during lunch. Participants then organized around the working groups of 5-6 participants. After lunch, the full group reconvened. Each working group reported their discussion and findings to the full group. During the remainder of the afternoon the full group discussed practical considerations and next steps, including recommendations to the American Philosophical Association, individual or affinity group initiatives, and the possibility of forming a public philosophy network and holding a follow-up meeting.

Conveners and Catalyst Speakers

The day-long session was organized and convened by Ellen K. Feder, American University, and Sharon M. Meagher, University of Scranton, in partnership with the American Philosophical Association's Committee on Public Philosophy (particularly chair Elizabeth K. Minnich) and George Mason University's Center for Global Ethics (and director Andrew Light).

The invited speakers, who served as catalysts for discussion were:

- ❖ John Lachs, Centennial Professor of Philosophy, Vanderbilt University

- ❖ Andrew Light, Director of the Center for Global Ethics at George Mason University and a Senior Fellow at the Center for American Progress

- ❖ Linda Martín Alcoff, Professor of Philosophy, Hunter College and CUNY Graduate Center

- ❖ Noëlle McAfee, Associate Research Professor of Philosophy and Conflict Analysis, Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution, George Mason University (Emory University, effective Fall 2011)

- ❖ Eduardo Mendieta, Professor of Philosophy, Stony Brook University

- ❖ Elizabeth K. Minnich, Senior Scholar, Association of American Colleges and Universities

- ❖ William Sullivan, Senior Scholar, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching

- ❖ Nancy Tuana, DuPont/Class of 1949 Professor of Philosophy and Director, Rock Ethics Institute, Pennsylvania State University

Summary of Day's Discussions

Morning: Philosophical Discussion on the Nature of Public Philosophy

Philosophers have not had sufficient opportunity to reflect on the nature of public philosophy, and to discuss with one another what public engagement entails. For these reasons, it is important to devote time to engage this question philosophically within the profession, to ask what "public philosophy" is, and to examine ways that individual philosophers are already engaged in efforts to put philosophy to work in public. The morning discussion was devoted to these questions, asking what is the value of public philosophy?

The questions we raised for discussion were as follows:

1. What is "public philosophy"? (how should we define it? Or should we avoid defining it?) How should we define "public" as it modifies "philosophy"? Is there or are there public roles for philosophy? Is there or are there philosophical work(s) that take(s) the public realm seriously?
2. In what sense(s) do you practice public philosophy? Or, do you identify as a public philosopher?
3. How has Western philosophy developed in ways that help or hinder publically engaged philosophical work? Which traditions/figures/trends seem most supportive? Which traditions/figures/trends have undermined or deterred philosophers from public engagement?
4. Is applied philosophy and public philosophy the same thing?
5. Is engaging in public philosophy identical with being a public intellectual?

A consensus quickly emerged that we should not aim to define the term in ways that provided some sort of litmus test on whether someone was engaged in public philosophy or some project could claim the label. *Rather, we worked to think about how philosophical engagement with various publics has been—and can be—valuable.* Three key positions emerged; these views are not mutually exclusive, and many participants endorsed all three views. Others argued for one view over another. All three positions suggest further directions for investigation, analysis, and proposals for work in this reemerging area of philosophical engagement.

The value of public philosophy

Some argued that philosophy is itself a public good, and that various publics benefit when philosophers work with non-academics in public domains, introducing philosophical concepts and methodology. Examples of such public work include conducting organized philosophical discussions in bookstores, cafes and bars, or teaching philosophy in non-traditional locations such as prisons. Public philosophy in this sense entails doing philosophy in public spaces and/or engaging the public in the practices of philosophy. Historically, philosophy has played an

important role in fostering inter- and multi-disciplinary problem-solving, and participants argue that it is important to maintain this role.

Some argued that public philosophy is philosophy that has the explicit aim of benefiting public life. In this sense, public philosophy is not simply any philosophy conducted outside the "ivory tower," but rather is directed toward specific improvements. In this sense public philosophy is philosophical engagement with respect to public concerns. The philosopher may be called upon as a public intellectual, a commentator on public issues. Or the philosopher may simply write in ways help makes sense of jumbled conversations. In this context, some invoked John Dewey's idea of the philosopher's task in finding meaning; others cited Hannah Arendt's metaphor of the philosopher as "pearl diver" who brings sedimented meanings to the surface.

Some argued that public philosophy is philosophy that is liberatory, i.e., it should assist and empower those who are most vulnerable and suffer injustice, particularly through a critical analysis of power structures. One participant noted that philosophical practices can work to create publics, and that such practices can be empowering when directed toward the recognition of previously marginalized persons as members of a public. Philosophers can and should create discursive spaces where persons can become subjects/agents. Another liberatory aspect invoked was the idea of philosopher as fearless truth teller, speaking truth to power. Meeting participants who favored this view tended to define the public philosopher as a "scholar-activist."

Those who emphasized the liberatory potential of philosophers were most likely to call for a transformation of the discipline of philosophy, arguing that participatory philosophy, a philosophy that is embedded in social and public practices, must be critical and self-reflexive. In this sense, public engagement transforms the discipline of philosophy. Several participants argued that the public philosopher can and must resist the "disciplining" of philosophy, that is, the narrowing of what counts as legitimate philosophy to debates internal to the discipline and/or the academy.

The concept of "public"

Discussants noted that any discussion of "public philosophy" necessitates that we think about what we mean by "public." We agreed that the "public" is not a static form; publics are brought into being through discourse and various practices. Some participants tended to work from the Deweyan idea that publics emerge when a sufficiently large group of persons are indirectly affected by a particular social transaction and come together out of their common interest in solving the problem. Social movements (and the philosophers who work with them) often invoke this sense of "public." On the other hand, those philosophers who are more directly engaged with public policy often define "public" in terms of the institutionalization of modes of public discourse.

Obstacles to the practice of public philosophy

We worked to identify challenges to engaging in public philosophy at the level of our discipline, the academy, and within society. Many noted that philosophy is not valued in society, particularly in the United States. The language of values in Washington, DC is driven by economists. Anti-intellectualism renders philosophy suspect. Philosophy departments are being cut or eliminated. There are questions about the value or purpose of philosophy. Part of the problem is how philosophers see themselves; most do not see themselves as affected by larger social forces or as called to respond to larger social and political concerns. But another problem is a failure to recognize areas of thought that our discipline can help to illuminate beyond its bounds. Social scientists and the policy their work informs often fail to recognize or reckon with the non-rational aspect of our lives. There also has been a confusion of precision with accuracy in these realms, as well as within the discipline. Philosophy needs to find ways to be meaningful as well as valid. Many discussants argued that there have always been some philosophical schools or traditions that bucked the tendencies toward provincialism. Nevertheless, institutional norms of evaluation of philosophical scholarship have tended to devalue work that aims to engage beyond the narrowing bounds of the discipline.

Lunch Break-Out Sessions

Recognizing the need for various participants to network with other attendees who share particular concerns and interests, the discussion facilitator solicited ideas for working group topics just prior to lunch. Participants chose a working group based on interest, and worked through lunch. Reports were shared with the full group immediately after. These working groups generated further questions and proposals for future action and consideration

Group A: **"Identifying and Overcoming Institutional Barriers to Public Philosophy"** (summary of oral report by Linda Martín Alcoff): Our group focused on the prevailing structure of rewards and incentives for publically engaged work in the discipline. We focused on the national changes taking place to alter existing tenure/promotion structures. Syracuse University is a good case in point, where a fourth category of "public scholarship" has been approved. Public scholarship has typically been construed as service, but such work is some other kind of contribution that fits neither into established understandings of the category of service nor of scholarship. The argument for adding a new category is that public scholarship already exists but we have lack effective mechanisms to document and evaluate the work. While some colleagues are resistant to the introduction of a new category for fear that it would become a new *de facto* requirement that everyone engage in this work, assurances can be put in place "traditional" scholarship will remain centrally important and that no faculty member will be required to do public scholarship. It is also important to argue against "an either/or"

understanding of public vs. professional scholarly contribution. Making visible work that is happening is critical, and providing opportunities for evaluation are integral to such visibility. Valuation of this category furthermore helps increase the retention of diverse faculty, as minority faculty members get called to do public scholarship more often than do others. Administrators are sympathetic to these arguments. It would also be possible to expand the current category of "research" to include public scholarship. Institutions such as the University of Pennsylvania are taking the lead in establishing what appears to be a national trend that includes defending the liberal arts and its "value added." The concern about assessment of public scholarship is not trivial, but challenges should not get in the way of engaging in these discussions. Alison Jaggar's exchange with Christina Hoff Sommers was an engagement of differences and Jagger's contribution constituted rigorous philosophical evaluation of Hoff Sommers' arguments. Alcoff will post her recent article from *Metaethics* addressing intellectual integrity of public scholarship as a means of fostering further discussion. While we may agree that not all publically engaged work is scholarly, much is and should be regarded as such. Consider Foucault's work on prisons—his fieldwork developed new conceptual thinking; this fieldwork informed his philosophy. Work like this is not simply an application of philosophical concepts, but constitutes an interaction with community, which is a kind of philosophical fieldwork. It is possible to assess the work intellectually.

The Leiter report has become dominant document in the field, and has begun to affect decisions in searches and hiring and sometimes affects a department's willingness to support publicly engaged philosophical work. The APA and SPEP have legitimate reasons for declining a rating/evaluation system of departments. Linda Martín Alcoff, Bill Wilkerson, and others have launched an initiative to form an alternative. Departments will not be ranked by "graded" on eight categories that will likely expand, e.g. is a department supportive of feminist philosophy? Of women? Of critical race theory? Of racial minorities? Queer theory? Glbtq persons? Evaluation will be conducted with the help of several distinct advisory boards. Reliability and comprehensiveness of reports will depend on individuals' completion of questionnaires. Such a report will be more systematic and furthermore informative.

Our group recommends that we also work to create APA and other philosophy association awards that recognize public philosophy. We also urge the creation of a movement analogous to the philosophy pluralism movement of the 1980s, working to form APA policy that would support public philosophy practices.

 Group B "Why Don't We Do More Public Philosophy?" (summary of oral report by Eduardo Mendieta): Philosophers are trained to be (individual) stars—a romantic individualistic model that moves against public philosophy, not only because it is most often a kind of collaboration, but because it also implies a passive recipient of knowledge. The matter of the paucity of collaborative work dovetails with the matters of institutional change discussed earlier. It isn't that there is no collaborative work in the discipline. Examples include Deleuze and Guattari, bell hooks and Cornell West, Bourdieu's work with a number of collaborators, as well as Chomsky's;

the Social Text Collective, and the Radical Philosophy collective in England. The Tanner lectures were endowed to encourage public philosophy; Foucault's work and that of the GIP collective generates new forms of knowledge. These examples teach us to develop incentives to do collective/collaborative work. Collaborative work is valued in other disciplines, but not our own, and we should look to sciences and social sciences to figure out how to value it. We teach individual thinkers rather than intellectual movements.

What is the distinctive contribution of philosophy? We're demystifiers; we create new understandings; we can unpack ideological assumptions and presuppositions; good philosophers are ecumenical, that is, we create bridges between publics (e.g. feminism began specifically to create a space of discussion between and among women, but opened up to broader publics); we have to empower; we engage in mutual pedagogy; education should be recognized as a two-way street.

Group C: "Public Philosophy as Liberatory" (summary of oral report by Shay Welch): Our group thought about how and why we might do public philosophy in ways that are liberating. We discussed our interests in uncovering inequity and putting philosophy to work to make meaningful interventions to effect social change. Philosophy can: 1) introduce language that enables communication among and between groups; 2) help communities identify problems, but not tell them what they are; 3) recognize consciousness raising as contributing to a phenomenology of the oppressed. But "how" is the biggest concern: need we worry about blurring the lines between "scholar" and "activist"? Our group recommends utilizing the press as well as new media like blogs, podcasts and facebook to engage the public in philosophical thinking aimed at social justice.

Group D "Institutional Change and Interdisciplinary Engagement" (summary of oral report by Kyle Whyte): Our group discussed strategic matters with respect to securing grants to advance the work of public philosophy. 1) We must learn to communicate clearly the relevance of philosophy. Its value/contribution is rarely spelled out. One way that philosophy is valuable is to lay bare the value judgments embedded in existing discourses concerning those matters we want to discuss. 2) We must integrate distinctive methodologies in our collaborations with others and clarify the value of philosophical methods. 3) We must learn how to evaluate project outcomes, as this is a requirement of most granting agencies. Why is publication important or useful? 4) We must clarify why our work in and with other disciplines is valuable, and seek means of securing credit for articles we write in other fields. 5) We must evaluate incentive structures more carefully.

Group E "How to Communicate Philosophy Beyond the Academy" (summary of oral report by Ann Garry): Professional philosophers have skills that we already use to hone messages; we need to learn to apply those skills for communicating with new audiences. These include conceptual analysis and the framing of arguments. To these we must add brevity, entertainment, "seeding" knowledge. We must recognize that whether we are communicating

to the press or other audiences, that those listening are not passive receivers of information. We should develop a more careful understanding and account of different types of communities and methods of communication. We might catalog the types of communication we need to learn: e.g., policy wonk, press interviews and conferences, participatory communities, political campaigns.

Group F "Field Philosophy" (summary of oral report by Nancy Tuana): We discussed locations for doing field philosophy, from prisons, to within one's community, to scientific teams. But how do we get from the ideal of field work to reality? We developed three suggestions: 1) APA give us sufficient funding to consider the development of a session along the lines of an NEH summer seminar which would encourage and equip faculty to train graduate students in methods of philosophical field work. To develop such an idea, we need to work together to figure out what we're doing and how to create this work and invite students into projects of this sort. We furthermore need some sort of degree programs (or certificate, a dual degree?) to facilitate summer training that graduate students can do that isn't necessarily based at their own institution, e.g. internships that could run the gamut from fieldwork in Chile to working with or within a specific community (e.g. María Lugones' work in the Escuela Popular) where graduate students would get mentored. (David Schraeder responded that the APA doesn't have the budget or staff of other organizations, but could help facilitate the development of an NEH seminar. Andrew Light added that for any topic on science, technology, or environment, funding from NSF is available; the Carnegie Institute for Ethics and Public Affairs is another possibility. Discussion has begun with Bob Frodeman to appeal to NSF for funding that will be more focused on STEM practices.

Afternoon discussion: Practical Considerations and Next Steps

Having obtained a better sense of the issues and challenges we need to address if we are to support a wide range of practices that might fit under the umbrella "public philosophy," and shared reports from small groups with specific practical recommendations, we spent the remainder of the afternoon focused on the following questions:

1) should we encourage public philosophy? If so, how? What can or should the profession do? What can or should institutions do? What can various publics or members of the public do?
2) what should be the next steps for both individuals present and/or the group as a whole?

Meeting participants identified a number of needs if we are to support high quality public philosophy practices. There are needs for:

- The development of ethical principles for public philosophical practice
- The creation of an internship networks that would facilitate placement of philosophy students interested in doing public work

- A workshop for mentoring mentors so that philosophers who do public philosophy can most effectively mentor others
- A special, edited journal issue or book that highlights various models of doing public philosophy
- *A mechanism for those who practice public philosophy to be able to network with one another and to make contact with practitioners who might benefit from their work*

The establishment of a Public Philosophy Network would help meeting participants and those who join us work together to fulfill these identified needs. Furthermore, it would provide a mechanism for continuing discussion for overcoming challenges of public philosophy, in particular barriers within academic settings regarding the evaluation of public philosophy and its impact on promotion/tenure, and professional recognition. It would also allow for on-going conversation about how we might encourage philosophically talented students to pursue non-academic careers in which their philosophical training would be valuable. We might begin to think about "service" or activism that's philosophically informed as public philosophy. Discussions also could continue about how we might transform the discipline of philosophy to recognize public engagement as a legitimate—even desirable—philosophical practice.

Participants envisioned a network that would have a visible internet presence and follow-on meetings that would bring together a wide range of public philosophers.

Next Steps: A Proposal Gleaned from Discussion and Recommendations

Recommendations to the APA and Actions Undertaken by the APA Committee on Public Philosophy

The meeting participants suggested that the APA Committee on Public Philosophy gather information from philosophy departments to determine "best practices" in the recognition and evaluation of public philosophy. At the group's recommendation, the following notice was published in the next APA proceedings:

Public Philosophy/Public Scholarship Project

The Committee on Public Philosophy is seeking examples of official departmental and/or institution-wide policy statements in support of public scholarship. Statements directly supporting public philosophy are particularly welcome, as are policies explicitly connecting public philosophy (or scholarship more generally) to hiring, promotion, and tenure considerations.

For example, Syracuse University refers positively to, "community activism related to professional work" in its promotion and tenure documents (College of Arts and Sciences). Under "Service," it also has new language: "Faculty members are expected to apply their knowledge

and talents in the interest of society as a whole...Service may be to their profession, to the university, or to the community at large. It can best be accomplished by making those special abilities of faculty members available as professionals in their field."

The CPP will compile statements received and make them available to colleagues who also wish to support engaged philosophy as service, but now even more as significant scholarship the quality of which can be evaluated by knowledgeable scholars as part of all important institutional reviews of faculty work.

The Chancellor of Syracuse University, Nancy Cantor, has written:

"Momentum is growing to take public scholarship seriously as a movement," and, "If we intend to pursue the vision of the university as a public good, with broad benefits for our knowledge society -- especially for the understanding and practice of democracy and the values of diversity, social justice and peace -- we must initiate and support these new kinds of engagement."

Send useful examples of actual policy statements to:

Elizabeth Minnich: elizamin@aol.com

Chair, Committee on Public Philosophy

Thank you.

Launching a New Network?

Satellite Conferences and Groups; Building Partnerships

We urge attendees to foster and develop satellite meetings of particular interest to them on some area, issue or concern of public philosophy (broadly construed). For example, the University of North Texas is planning a conference on public philosophy and the STEM disciplines; SUNY Stony Brook and The University of Scranton will convene a one-day conference on public philosophy and/in the city in Manhattan in February 2011. Andrew Light is exploring the possibility of hosting a meeting on progressive philosophy and politics at the Center for American Progress. Existing like-minded projects and groups will be invited to affiliate with the public philosophy network. We also ask public philosophy network members to consider holding an informational meeting/discussion at other associations to which they belong where their members might be interested in public philosophy (e.g., Radical Philosophy Association, FEAST, SPEP, SAAP). Network members who host such meetings will be asked to post either meeting minutes and/or a report on the Public Philosophy network website [which we expect to be operational sometime during July 2011], together with any other interesting links, projects of related interest/concern to conference topic, etc.

Follow-on Conference Proposal

We plan to host a conference that will officially launch the Public Philosophy Network and serve as a follow-on conference to the meeting reported here. After consulting with some of the San Francisco meeting attendees, Ellen Feder and Sharon Meagher propose the following format for the follow-on conference:

We propose a two-day conference to be held in Washington, DC in April or May 2011. The first day would focus on creating spaces and opportunities for the practice of public philosophy; the second day would focus on the formal launching of the Public Philosophy Network. Conference attendees could choose to attend one or both days, depending upon their needs and interests.

Day 1: We would hold workshops on various issues in practical philosophy. *The goals for such sessions* would be to foster meaningful and substantive dialogue between philosophers and "practitioners" (public policy makers, government officials, grassroots activists, nonprofit leaders, etc.) and foster partnerships and projects, whether new or ongoing. Persons would submit proposals for a specific workshop on an issue that they work on/would like to discuss, e.g., bioethics, philosophy in/on prisons, philosophy and housing policy, deliberative democracy, environmental ethics, queer politics, and so on. Both session proposers and conference organizers would work to bring non-profit and government leaders into the discussion. The workshops would then be advertised widely, and individuals would register in advance to participate in particular workshops.

In addition, lunchtime sessions would focus on more general questions and concerns common to most public philosophy projects, such as retaining one's "identity" as a philosopher when working in the public realm, ethical issues involved with public engagement, developing model rank and tenure criteria and evaluation models for philosophers who are scholar-activists.

Day 1 night/banquet: We would hold a banquet featuring a high profile public figure/practitioner as a keynote speaker with two philosophers serving as discussants.

Day 2: Launching the Public Philosophy Network. This day would be devoted to building the public philosophy network and its attendant projects. We would invite the organizers/proposers of each workshop from day 1 as well as a representative from any satellite conferences and/or affiliated groups to represent their projects and/or groups at the meeting.

In the morning, we would engage in the following activities:

- oral reports and group discussion of day 1 workshops
- discussion of satellite meeting reports (already provided on the web)
- the solicitation and development of ideas for future meetings and workshops

The point of these discussions is to:
- inform network members of various public philosophy projects and resources

- foster these projects and other meetings by giving other network members the opportunity to make suggestions, help provide contacts, funding suggestions, new directions, etc

Day 2 Lunch time sessions would feature additional general break-out discussions on interests/issues that cut across various public philosophy practices (as in day 1).

Day 2 afternoon sessions would focus on network business and joint projects such as:

- grant opportunities

- getting others involved

- planning of next network meeting

- developing a journal or potential book series

- planning possible summer seminars on public philosophy for graduate students, faculty, etc.

Structure and Support for Public Philosophy Network

Meeting participants were clear that they did not want to form a new academic association, but rather wanted a network that would encourage a wide range of public philosophy practitioners to join and in turn would support a wide range of public philosophy practices. Nevertheless, the development of a communications and outreach strategy and the hosting of a follow-on conference that will officially launch the network requires some organization planning. Sharon Meagher and Ellen Feder are committed to continuing this organizational work and will be seeking volunteers who are willing to assist them in various ways—including conference planning, fundraising, and communications.

Appendix: List of Meeting Participants

Bill Anelli, Modesto Junior College

Lawrence C. Becker, Bookwork, LLC, Hollins College and College of William and Mary (emeritus)

Adam Briggle, University of North Texas

Joan Callahan, University of Kentucky

E. Joí Cox, San Francisco State

Chris Cuomo, University of Georgia

Markate Daly, Center for Public Philosophy

Ellen Feder, American University

Andrew Fiala, California State University, Fresno

Robert Frodeman, University of North Texas

Ann Garry, California State Los Angeles

Jeff Gauthier, University of Portland

Richard Hart, Bloomfield College

Rachel Hart, BA in philosophy and film and works in film industry

Brady Hines, new PhD, Stony Brook University

Alison Jaggar, University of Colorado Boulder

Amber L. Katherine, Santa Monica College

Shirley Lachs

John Lachs, Vanderbilt University

Andrew Light, George Mason University and Center for American Progress

Linda Martín Alcoff, Hunter College and CUNY Graduate Center

Noelle McAfee, Kettering Foundation and George Mason University

Alison McBride, undergraduate student, San Francisco State University

Sharon Meagher, University of Scranton

Eduardo Mendieta, Stony Brook University

Elizabeth Minnich, The Association of American Colleges & Universities

Joseph Monast, Modesto Junior College

Michael Monahan, Marquette University

James Pack, Modesto Junior College

Jeffrey Paris, University of San Francisco

Mickaella Perina, University of Massachusetts Boston

Dan Ralph, Evergreen State University

Sandra Schrader

David Schrader, Executive Director, American Philosophical Association

Falguni Sheth, Hampshire College

Anita Silvers, San Francisco State University

William Sullivan, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching

Nancy Tuana, Pennsylvania State University

Virginia Warren, Chapman University

Shay Welch, Williams College

Kyle White, Michigan State University

John Yang, undergraduate student