

STUDI E INTERVENTI

EUROPEAN HUMANITIES IN TIMES OF GLOBALIZED PAROCHIALISM¹

di Gereon Wolters

Abstract: In this talk I would like to give a sober and unadorned analysis of the asymmetrical situation between native English speakers (NES) and non-native English speakers (NoNES) in the (non-Anglophone) European Humanities using the example of philosophy of science. Globalization in the world of learning has led to an ever increasing use of the English language also in the humanities, and here particularly in disciplines like logic and philosophy of science. In the humanities, too, English has become the *lingua franca*. In order to be noticed, scholars have to wrap their ideas in English. The talk mentions seven negative wrapping effects for NoNES, most importantly that the agenda in philosophy of science is set in the Anglophone world, particularly in the US. As a consequence European approaches are largely marginalized and not even taken notice of in other European countries, since the “relay station” of being noticed is the recognition and discussion of such approaches by major Anglophone figures. Part of the marginalization is the *European Reference Index for the Humanities* (ERIH). As a matter of principle the asymmetry cannot be completely removed, since its cause will remain: for some the *lingua franca* is their mother tongue, for others not. The talk concludes with six recommendations for improving this unsatisfying situation.

Keywords: *lingua franca*, intellectual globalization, structural asymmetry, marginalization of European scholarship, ERIH-Index

1. *Globalization: its Impact on the Humanities*

Let me start with a story that triggered the considerations I am going to present to you today. Some ten years ago I was writing a paper that dealt with

¹ Talk at the University of Helsinki (May 2012). This talk draws on a longer paper: *Is There a European Philosophy of Science? – A Wake-Up Call*, in F. Stadler & M.C. Galavotti (eds.), *Philosophy of Science in Europe – European Philosophy of Science and the Viennese Heritage*, Springer, Dordrecht-Heidelberg 2013 (forthcoming).

Logical Empiricism, which is perhaps the most revolutionary philosophical movement of the 20th century. Probably every philosopher on the European continent knows that Logical Empiricism originated mostly in Vienna in the 1920s and 1930s of the last century².

As a former co-editor of a philosophical encyclopaedia I habitually consult encyclopaedias about topics I am working on. This I also did with “Logical Empiricism” in Robert Audi’s much used *Cambridge Dictionary of Philosophy*, second edition of 1999. The author is Richard A. Fumerton, F. Wendell Miller professor of philosophy at the University of Iowa. Here is a quote from the first section (p. 514):

Logical positivism, also called positivism, a philosophical movement inspired by empiricism and verificationism; it began in the 1920s and flourished for about twenty or thirty years. [...] In some ways logical positivism can be seen as a natural outgrowth of radical or British empiricism and logical atomism. The driving force of positivism may well have been adherence to the verifiability criterion for the meaningfulness of cognitive statements.

What are we supposed to learn from this?³ Well, we learn that logical empiricism has completely British roots. It is characterized as “a natural outgrowth” of radical or British empiricism and logical atomism. As everybody will agree “radical or British empiricism” is somehow essentially British, and for “logical atomism” the *Cambridge Dictionary* unsurprisingly refers to “Russell” who is described (p. 699) as “British philosopher, logician, social reformer, and man of letters, one of the founders of analytical philosophy”. So I think it to be no exaggeration to conclude that logical empiricism is characterized in the *Dictionary* as a philosophical movement with exclusively British or Anglo-Saxon roots. I should add that the rest of the article does not use any proper names or indexicals that could give a hint to possible historical influences that are *not* of a British origin.⁴ An innocent reader would conclude that “logical positivism” is part of the British, and of no other, philosophical tradition. Well, I think almost everybody outside the Anglophone world knows better.

At the same time I am afraid that Fumerton’s article might not just be an expression of remarkable ignorance. It, rather, seems to be an indicator of what “globalization” has in store for philosophy in general and possibly also other parts of the humanities. The wrapping of ideas has changed their content. In

² Its very name was coined by the great Finnish philosopher Eino Kaila (1890-1958), see Kaila 1926. - There are other designations as “Logical Positivism” or “Neopositivism”. Kaila’s “Logical Empiricism”, however, is in my view the best because Logical Empiricism unites two hitherto separated strands of philosophical thinking to a powerful new philosophical instrument: good old empiricism and formal logic.

³ I more or less literally quote this passage from Wolters 2003, 109f.

⁴ In the respective article the verifiability criterion of meaning is also traced back to British empiricism.

the case at hand it is, as my late friend Wesley Salmon once pointed out to me, probably the Anglophone wrapping of Logical Empiricism in Alfred Ayer's *Language, Truth and Logic* (1936). Ayer's book has been for some people in the Anglophone world the only source of information about logical empiricism.⁵

"Globalization" is a complex phenomenon that relates to the global flow of goods, services, ideas and people. In almost all European countries we can observe how former economic strongholds have almost completely dissolved in the course of a few decades, following the capital maximizing logic of the markets. At the same time new forms of production or services develop. There are winners and losers of economic globalization. It seems almost certain that in the near future Europe will be among the losers.

What holds for goods and services holds also for ideas. The winners on the market of philosophical ideas receive global professional recognition and sometimes even fame, but also get more mundane goods as invitations to congresses, lecture tours in foreign countries, and good positioning on the job market. I dare say that being losers on the market of ideas for Europeans is not any more the writing on the wall that may become reality in some distant future; rather, in various fields of learning we are losers already. This bleak analysis holds above all for philosophy, and possibly still less for other fields in the humanities like history.

In order to substantiate my thesis that to some might seem a bit exaggerated and alarmist, we have above all to consider that ideas do not flow around the globe in a quasi Platonic, disembodied form. They come dressed up in languages. We all know that among the around 6500 languages of the world there is a chosen one. To have it, i.e. to have a *lingua franca*, is a good thing I hasten to add. English as the universal means of communication is of irreplaceable help and enormous importance in international exchange in all fields and on all levels. It can hardly be replaced by any other language or means of communication.

As everything in the world, English as *lingua franca* comes at a price, which is, however, almost exclusively paid by non-native English speakers (NoNES⁶).⁷ In the rest of my talk that deals only with *European* non-native English speakers of English the acronym NoNES is restricted to Europeans.⁸ "NES" is an acronym for native English speakers and all those, who work at universities in Anglophone countries, whereas "RoW" refers to the rest of the world outside

⁵ I should, however, add that a reader who follows the links given underneath the entry "logical positivism" is lead among other things to Thomas Uebel's splendid "Vienna Circle". If one has a look at the "Board of Editorial Advisers" of the *Dictionary* one counts 26 Anglophones and 2 non-Anglophones....

⁶ I take this abbreviation from Clavero 2010, 552. I like pronouncing it "nones".

⁷ On further reflection, also monolingual Anglophones pay an intellectual price (perhaps without realizing it), as long as one finds correct Wittgenstein's connection of understanding languages and understanding forms of life.

⁸ Note that for reasons of simplicity also native speakers of English working at European universities outside Britain and Ireland are counted as NoNES.

Europe, where English is not the first language.

The price that NoNES have to pay for the wrapping of their ideas in English is manifold: *First* of all they do not *naturally* have the wrapping paper, i.e. the English language, at their disposal. This means that they have to spend time and money in order to learn English, and then spend even more money, in order to have their work translated or revised by a native speaker.⁹ One of the many scarcities of non-Anglophone European Universities is that they do not offer linguistic services. A laudable exception is the Language Services of the University of Helsinki. There might be others, hopefully. I do not know, however, of any German University that offers anything comparable to “Helsinki” to its faculty, although the average command of English among German academics seems to me clearly inferior to that of their Finnish colleagues. *Second*, even if NoNES are in a position to somehow wrap their ideas into English, such packing looks in most cases rather poor compared to the original. *Third*, this makes it almost certain that NoNES play a rather secondary role on the market of ideas. They are junior partners at best *Fourth*, as it sometimes also happens with material goods, the wrapping has an impact on the content. We know that some plastic containers are not suitable for food and drinks, because some containers emit particles that affect the taste of the food and drinks in question. Applied to ideas this means that English, or any other *lingua franca*, for that matter, might prevent some ideas from being optimally presented.

These four negative linguistic wrapping effects – I will later add three even more important ones – are the smaller, the more formal, and the less culturally embedded a discipline is. It is certainly almost negligible in mathematics and formal logic. A bit less so it might be in physics and related “technical” disciplines¹⁰.

2. Globalized Parochialism

There are, particularly in the U.S., many examples that show a coarse grained perception and sometimes even a considerable ignorance of the rest of

⁹ A NES reading this paper may have noticed well before that I have saved the money for having it edited by a native speaker. I gratefully acknowledge, however, that an RoW with excellent knowledge of English has done very much to render an earlier version more readable. Since then the paper has been spoiled again by further additions.

¹⁰ Mahoney 2000 identifies respective problems in astronomy. On the website of the British Parliament (www.parliament.uk) one finds a paper on peer review in form of “written evidence submitted by the Academy of Social Sciences (PR 26)”. Among the “weaknesses of peer review” (p. 3) one looks in vain for the bias against non-Anglophone publications. It seems remarkable, nonetheless, that at least the non-Anglophone world is taken notice of: “Outside the Anglophone world, peer review is less dominant, although practices are tending to converge to this norm” (p. 4).

the world, connected with a sort of almost natural disinterest. Here as one of an infinity of possible examples an exchange on the HOPOS mailing list: there was some guessing who taught “the first seminar” in the philosophy of science. On March 26, 2011 at 3:15 p.m. Sydney Axinn, professor emeritus of Temple University, what now is beautifully called “Courtesy Professor” at the University of South Florida, wrote the following: “What is reported as >the first ...seminar in the philosophy of science.< was given at the University of Pennsylvania by Edgar A. Singer, Jr. [...] Among Prof. Singer’s students was C. West Churchman, who later became editor of the Philosophy of Science journal. Less noteworthy students included the author of this note.” A quarter of an hour later that day Alan Richardson, an excellent scholar of 19th and 20th centuries philosophy, commented: “It should be noted that the issue that I [...] was attempting to sort through was philosophy of science **in the USA** [bold letters are mine] – so even if we were to agree that Singer’s course was the first **US** course with the title “philosophy of science” this is not to say that there weren’t courses given elsewhere with that name or a direct translation before then. After all, Mach was Professor of the Philosophy of the Inductive Sciences in Vienna from 1895.”

This little exchange seems to be significant for a widespread attitude of self-satisfaction in the Anglophone world, particularly in the US. I mean a habit to spontaneously locate in their part of the world everything worth to be thought and spoken about. Only on further reflection may come to mind that this might not be the case. Such habitually narrow scope is usually called parochialism. In contrast to traditional parochialism, which hardly ever crossed the borders of the respective parish, the new Anglophone variety can claim to be *globalized parochialism*.

To be sure, I do not see any malicious intent here in the sense that people consciously and explicitly might want to exclude the rest of the world. The rest of the world they simply take little notice of. Things would hardly be better if Finnish, French or German or any other language had become *lingua franca*. In my view globalized Anglophone parochialism has its roots in a general human habit to watch and judge things through the lens of one’s own culture¹¹. This universal habit in the case at hand has been reinforced by two more components. *First*, there is in my view no doubt that the Anglophone and in particular the US preponderance in the philosophy of science and in some other fields of philosophy and the humanities seems well deserved. *Second*, and connected with the first, given the general economic and military and in their own view also cultural supremacy of the US, hardly any American thinks that there might be positive developments outside their own realm worth to take notice

¹¹ Note that also NoNES are often – and often rightly – accused of *their* parochial “eurocentrism” by the RoW.

of¹². This seems the more natural since the knowledge of foreign languages is rather limited not only among NES in general but also in particular among NES scholars. For presidential candidates of the Republican Party in the US knowledge of foreign languages raises even the suspicion of lack of patriotism among many voters¹³. Those few scholars who actually know foreign languages hardly ever read and quote works written in those languages. A quick look in any bibliography of articles in scientific journals or in books by NES authors gives statistically very significant proof of this.

I would now like to turn to the question of how Anglophone globalization affects theory.

3. “Globalization”: its Impact on Theory

As hinted to in the last section, the Anglophone preponderance in the philosophy of science and some other fields is well deserved, notwithstanding the globalized parochialism that we find with quite some of its representatives.

When Logical Empiricism fled Nazism in Austria and Germany there began what one might call the “professionalization” of philosophy of science, i.e. its exclusive concentration on more or less conceptual and technical problems. This meant narrowing its focus considerably. In its European beginning Logical empiricism was embedded in a major enlightenment movement directed towards society at large. The foundation of the *Ernst Mach Society* in 1928 and the so called Vienna Circle Manifesto of 1929 suggest that the early Logical Empiricists saw their professional activity in a broader social context, and tried to present their research in public lectures accessible to an interested and educated public.

This approach got completely lost, when Logical Empiricists had to emigrate to the US. In the meantime it does not seem to have regained strength. It occurs to me that this also holds to a certain degree for other Anglophone countries. Here is what the late Michael Dummett, an excellent analytic philosopher at Oxford, and himself in his fight against racism a notable counterexample, testifies for the British case:¹⁴

very few [in Britain] think that there’s any call on them to be involved in any practical sense, and partly it’s a tradition in this country, I must say, and not

¹² In Britain this attitude in 2004 has been elevated to government policy: at age 14 pupils are allowed to drop foreign languages. As was to be expected youngsters drop them in fact on a huge scale, and replace e.g. French by “religious education”. For more information see: <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/education/education-news/the-language-crisis-in-british-schools-2061211.html>

¹³ Cf. McWorther 2012. Suspects are the former Mormon missionaries Huntsman (Chinese) and Romney (French).

¹⁴ See Fara/Salles 2006, 10.

only amongst philosophers. Well, I was very impressed recently, a few years back. I and various other Italian philosophers, and other British ones as I recall it, we all published articles in an Italian daily newspaper on philosophy. Now, that's unthinkable in this country, absolutely unthinkable! [...] In France, and to a lesser extent in Italy, intellectuals generally and philosophers in particular are expected to make remarks on political and social questions.

Dummett points here to a remarkable difference in the role that the humanities play in Europe as compared to the Anglophone world. One of the main tasks of European humanities is to provide cultural orientation for society at large. Let me say a word to philosophy and the Finnish case. The eminent Finnish philosopher Georg Henrik von Wright (1916-2003), a student of Eino Kaila, has not only written much admired books in English. Besides his "professional" work he has published most interesting contributions to general philosophical and cultural questions that are in my view inspired by his clear and rigorous philosophical thinking, but at the same time they address the general public. As Ilkka Niiniluoto pointed out to me von Wright thus became «in the 1980s and 1990s [...] the leading intellectual in Finland and Scandinavian countries»¹⁵. One example of his activities is his denouncing of the Vietnam War in 1967¹⁶. This work, collected in books in Swedish and Finnish, unfortunately, has been only to a small degree translated into English, or any other language a substantial number of people could read. Thus, in a sense, even von Wright himself seems to have internalized the more technical "professionalization" of philosophy and its separation from culture at large that happened to Logical Empiricism in the US.

Another example of embedding philosophy of science in general culture is the Constructivism of the so called Erlangen School in Germany, founded by the mathematician Paul Lorenzen (1915-1994) and the philosopher Wilhelm Kamlah (1905-1976). Erlangen constructivism is a bold program, which attempts a sort of operational foundation of mathematics, physics, philosophy and also politics. Some texts were translated into English¹⁷. To the best of my knowledge they were completely ignored. The same holds for the further development towards the so called "culturalistic" approach that has been put forward by Lorenzen's former student Peter Janich (2006). Here the focus is on the cultural implications and presuppositions that feature prominently in science and philosophy.

A third example is historical epistemology. Historical epistemology goes back to French thinkers like Gaston Bachelard (1884-1962) and George Can-

¹⁵ Personal communication, February 11, 2012.

¹⁶ I take this from a moving memoir (in English) of von Wright's Finnish student, Lars Hertzberg. It can be found via a link in the Finnish Wikipedia entry "Georg Henrik von Wright".

¹⁷ A fine overview in English of the various approaches one finds in Butts/Brown eds. 1989. It does not cover, however, the political dimension.

guilhem (1904-1995) in particular. Thanks to the efforts of Hans Jörg Rheinberger and Anastasios Brenner historical epistemology has gained some influence on a *European* scale. But it would be an exaggeration to say that it has entered the globalized scene of international, i.e. Anglophone philosophy of science. I cannot recall, for example, any article on this topic in recent editions of *Philosophy of Science*.

From these three examples – other people probably could easily add more – we can take the following lesson: the price of globalization and so called professionalization for Europeans would mean to give up the longstanding and in my view very important embedding of philosophy and the humanities in the cultural life of their countries. One may add this as the *Fifth* negative linguistic wrapping effect to those four mentioned earlier. Renouncing the cultural embedding is both a disadvantage for the respective national cultures as well as for the humanities. With the financial crisis progressing tax-paying citizens and their politicians are tempted to ask themselves why they should pay for ivory tower business. It is perhaps no coincidence that philosophy seems most endangered in Britain these days, where at least one department of philosophy was shut down recently.¹⁸ Others might follow or have already followed in the meantime.

Besides this broad cultural approach to philosophy of science that fell victim to the Anglophone globalization, there are also more professional European approaches that were practically ignored by globalized parochialism. To name just three of certainly many more examples:

First the work of the very interesting Italian philosopher of science Giulio Preti (1911-1972), to whom we owe among other things a fascinating pragmatist embedding of philosophy of science. Unfortunately, not a line seems to have been translated into English, and so a necessary condition of being taken notice of is not fulfilled.¹⁹ The example of his student Paolo Parrini shows, however, that being translated is only a necessary, but not also a sufficient condition for excellent philosophical work to surface at the global level.²⁰ Furthermore I would like to mention the Polish philosopher Leszek Nowak (1943-2009), who has launched the contemporary debate on idealization and has greatly contributed to it. He is nonetheless, rarely quoted, although a substantial part of his work is published in English: He just seems to have had the wrong address: University of Poznań²¹. A third example is the theory of truth approximation

¹⁸ I mean philosophy at Keele.

¹⁹ Those, who read Italian may consult among other things the presentation of Preti's work given in Parrini/Scarantino eds. 2004.

²⁰ Cf. e.g. Parrini (1998).

²¹ An excellent overview for the Italian reader both of Polish philosophy of science and of Nowak's work is given in Coniglione 2010. Francesco Coniglione also first pointed out to me Nowak's importance.

that has been developed by Theo Kuipers (2000), Ilkka Niiniluoto (1987) and others. Although there are publications in first rate Anglophone journals and although it is vividly discussed among European philosophers it has not been taken much notice of on the global level. This would have certainly been different if the two philosophers came from Stanford and Princeton instead of Groningen and Helsinki.

These and many possible other examples of genuinely European approaches that did not enter the globalized international scene suggest a *sixth* negative wrapping effect of great importance: The *agenda* of what counts in philosophy is not set in Europe but rather in the Anglophone world, particularly in the US. Everything that does not fit to cultural habits and traditions in those parts of the world has little chance to surface.

A rift even *within* Anglophone philosophy was pointed out to me by James R. Brown (Toronto): «Many [philosophical] topics are perfectly international, but many ethical/political issues are local. Canadian philosophers who work on Canadian issues (e.g. bioethics within a system of socialized medicine) cannot publish in the [American, G.W.] “top” journals, so suffer for it.»²² As Jim Brown says, this development is further intensified by the so called “Philosophical Gourmet Report”, which claims to deliver a ranking that «primarily measures faculty quality and reputation».²³ The top scorers in the “Gourmet Report” practically set the agenda for the rest of the world. And they do not only set the agenda, they are also in a position to enforce it by their strong influence on grants and tenure. Here is what primatologist Carel van Schaik (Zurich), who spent most of his career in the U.S., wrote me about this. Van Schaik certainly thinks of experiences in his own field, but things are probably not entirely different in philosophy:

I think there is one important strategic factor why people behave in this parochial way: grants and tenure. I write for the people whom I know, and sometimes respect, but who will judge me for major decisions, be it acceptance of journal articles, awarding of grants or evaluations of tenure! This great guy in China that nobody has ever heard of will not affect my chances of getting tenure, etc. This problem can also be solved when the evaluation part (grants, articles, tenure) also becomes more fully international. And once everyone is fluent in the lingua franca, this is an achievable goal! And if Europeans (or Asians!) do excellent work, one day the self-appointed dominants and keepers of the flame will have to notice²⁴.

NES not only set the agenda but sometimes also determine the *methods*.

²² I am also grateful to Jim Brown for explaining me the bad influence of the “Gourmet Report”.

²³ See: <http://www.philosophicalgourmet.com/>

²⁴ Carel van Schaik (Zurich), personal communication (March 20, 2012).

Here is an example coming from the political scientist Andreas Bieler (Nottingham)²⁵. Bieler in much of his work follows a method that might be characterized as analytical narrative. This method, as distinguished from the nomological hypothesis/confirmation method, seems to be very suited for large areas of history and the social sciences. When recently he submitted a paper to the journal *International Organization* with an almost exclusively American editorial board he received the following answer:

At IO board meetings in recent years, we have discussed this matter in some depth. We look for articles that state hypotheses drawn from theories of international relations, discuss the literature from which these theories and hypotheses are drawn, propose empirical tests of the hypotheses, and then present findings that advance the relevant theoretical debates. Your piece does not fit this model of an article.

Unfortunately, the Anglophone perspective on philosophy has been more and more internalized even in non-Anglophone Europe: Invited speakers at European conferences include almost always NES, often the majority is NES, and sometimes one looks in vain for at least *one* speaker of the NoNES²⁶. In Anglophone countries, however, *not* having NoNES as invited speakers is rather the rule than the exception. Here is an example from the [Notizie Filosofiche] mailing list (26 March, 2012): For a conference at the “Institute of Philosophy” in London «in collaboration with the University of East Anglia and supported by the Mind Association» on the topic “Philosophical Insights” I count 5 invited speakers from Britain and 4 from North America²⁷. This selection suggests that the organizers do not expect any possible “philosophical insights” coming from NoNES.

It is interesting, not to say depressing, to see how Europeans deepen the fundamental asymmetry by almost slavishly following the newest fashions that are proclaimed in the “leading” journals in the field. The key word “journal” brings me to the concluding section of my talk, which deals with journals, thus talking about the *Seventh* negative linguistic wrapping effect.

4. *Scientific Journals and “Globalized” Humanities*

Let me begin with a truism: In order to be perceived beyond the national scale one has to publish in English. I have got the impression that in the me-

²⁵ Personal communication 3 February, 2012.

²⁶ A telling example of this conference policy is what is described in a circular in English as the “First International Conference of the German Society for Philosophy of Science >Gesellschaft für Wissenschaftsphilosophie (GWP) e.V.<” that is going to take place in March 2013. At this founding event of a *German Society for Philosophy of Science* that avoids the word “German” in its very name, one finds seven “keynote speakers”: 4 NES, 1 Greek, and, after all, 2 Germans.

²⁷ See: philosophy.sas.ac.uk/d/f/Philosophical_Insights_21230612.pdf

antime this also is necessary for being taken notice of at home. The *European Science Foundation* has developed the so called *European Reference Index for the Humanities* (ERIH), which has appeared in two editions, the second in 2011.²⁸ ERIH files journals in three classes: (1) National; (2) International 1; (3) International 2.

“INT1” is defined as endowed «with high visibility and influence among researchers in the various research domains in different countries, regularly cited all over the world». “INT2”, in turn, has only «significant visibility and influence» and it lacks being «cited all over the world».

I am not going to criticize here the enterprise “Reference Index” as such. I would rather like to have a look at the criteria, which led the commission: «Any journal accepted in the ERIH list has to meet stringent benchmark standards: peer review of submissions, an active international editorial board [...], openness to new authors [...]»

I would like to concentrate on peer review and the «active international board» of the leading journals in philosophy. As far as peer review is concerned, there is a vivid international discussion also in many other disciplines. It has led to the result that papers written by NoNES coming from institutions outside the NES world have a significantly lesser chance to be accepted. The reason for this is simple: the editors and peer reviewers are mostly NES, and mostly American.

I have done some empirical research with three journals in the course of 20 years and have checked editorial boards and reviewers for *Philosophy of Science*, *The British Journal for Philosophy of Science*, and *Biology and Philosophy* in the respective editions of 1990, 2000 and 2010. Although this does not warrant a quantitatively exact result, the figures I have found seem representative and are sobering. Although all three journals are ranked INT1 in the ERIH-Index, the editorial boards of *Philosophy of Science* and *Biology and Philosophy* show no significant changes in their overwhelmingly NES composition during the last twenty years. The editorial board of *Philosophy of Science* consisted in 1990 of 40 people, among them two NoNES; in 2000 we find 55 people, among them 4 NoNES and 1 RoW, while in 2010 of 44 members 2 are NoNES. The number of NoNES referees is also always well below ten percent. In 2010, for example we find 182 referees, among them 13 NoNES. Similar things as for *Philosophy of Science* apply to *Biology and Philosophy*, while at the *British Journal*

²⁸ Cf. <http://www.esf.org/research-areas/humanities/erih-european-reference-index-for-the-humanities/erih-foreword.html>. Here one finds links to the various lists. It is also explicitly stated (p.2) that the «difference between the categories [...] is not of quality but of kind». - This is, of course, naïve nonsense because a publication in INT1 is judged better by everybody as one in INT2. And because publications in English count more, NAT papers can be simply forgotten. Several people from various countries told me that this has already become the procedure of hiring committees in their respective countries.

for *Philosophy of Science* all members of the editorial board have been NES so far, while perhaps 17 of the 252 reviewers of the year 2010 have been NoNES²⁹.

I think it justified to say that NoNES and even more RoW are marginalized in these three journals, ranked “INT1” in the ERIH-Index. I cannot detect much of «international editorial boards». Consequently there is a *structural unfairness* in these journals to aspiring non-Anglophone contributors, and certainly in other journals that I did not check³⁰. An exception is the Germany based *Erkenntnis*, whose editors have been Germans so far. The board has consisted predominantly of NoNES. But, for what reason ever, *Erkenntnis* is ranked INT1 in the “Philosophy of Science”-section of the ERIH-Index, while it is only INT2 in “Philosophy”³¹.

The ERIH-Index for history contains around 1000 journals. I checked some 30 in the INT1 category. The picture is somewhat different from philosophy. In history the ERIH-guidelines for INT1 seem to be suspended not only for English language journals but also for others, French or German, for example. But one observation made in philosophy also seems to hold for history. *All* historical journals published in Britain or the US have predominantly or exclusively NES editorial boards, while *only a few* journals published in Europe have exclusively monolingual boards. Here are two nice examples of history journals, published by Oxford University Press, *French History*, and *German History*. One would expect some French or German board members. This is not the case. On the editorial board of *French History* one finds 18 NES, and one French historian. There is not much difference when we look at the journal *German History*.

5. What might be done?

The admitted Anglophone superiority in the humanities does in my view not justify the degree of actual dominance, nor does it allow that the agenda is almost exclusively set by NES. How might the NoNES change this situation,

²⁹ There is a certain uncertainty in these figures. Not all referees are known to me. I have then categorized those with a clearly English name as NES. The other names unknown to me I have checked on the internet. This little uncertainty does, however, not influence the general result.

³⁰ Van Parijs 2002 and 2007 discusses the unfairness question. I thank Werner Callebaut of the *Konrad Lorenz Institute for Evolution and Cognition Research* for directing my attention to the articles of van Parijs and Clavero.

³¹ In the last 20 years the percentage of NES on the editorial board of *Erkenntnis* oscillates between ca. 25 and 45 percent. One might speculate, whether the downgrading of *Erkenntnis* to INT2 in the “philosophy”-section of the ERIH-Index has possibly to do with the fact that there is no majority of NES on the board. So what the ERIH authors seem to interpret as «active international editorial board», i.e. predominantly NES, might be missing in the case of *Erkenntnis*...

which I regard as undeserved and unsatisfactory? Let me give you some suggestions:

(1) We ought to try to learn English as early and as well as possible. This is not only a question of personal will and determination but also of public structures, particularly schools. The most important example of a counterproductive public structure is dubbing. Although I know that people prefer dubbed movies and tv series to originals with subtitles I regard it as a great stupidity that in major European countries like France, Germany, Italy and Spain films and tv series are dubbed because the costs of dubbing are easily repaid. Whoever had the opportunity to live for a while in a non-dubbing country can testify what I have experienced in recent years in Holland and Finland, namely that almost all younger people, from the supermarket cashier to the student of philosophy speak pretty good English. So my recommendation is: ban dubbing!³² Nobody will doubt that only people with an excellent command of English are in a position to submit articles to Anglophone journals. In addition, in discussions most of us give a rather clumsy impression compared to our NES friends. This is no wonder because we have to struggle not only with questions and problems but also with the language, in which they have to be answered.

(2) We should be aware that it is not sufficient to only *produce* great thoughts; one also has to *sell* them. Apart from linguistic asymmetry NoNES are on the whole rather bad vendors. In other words, compared particularly to their American colleagues, Europeans in a statistically very significant way are just lousy presenters of their work. Primatologist Carel van Schaik observed the following:

I have recently visited some philosophical meetings in Europe, and I noted that many European philosophers present their work in a most unattractive way. If at a busy meeting with numerous presentations, one has to work very hard to figure out what the speaker is trying to say, one simply gives up and instead focuses on the talks that are easy to follow! So, another response [to my paper, G.W.] would be to make sure continentals produce better presentations, and so have more impact!³³

(3) My third proposal regards the university system. Independent teaching and research in most European countries starts after many years, sometimes decades, of serving – in some cases even slaving – as assistants or whatever. This is most unproductive because the best work is usually done by people under 50. Professors should not aim at creating intellectual clones of themselves but rather independent, critical spirits, as is the rule in the Anglophone system, and a precondition for scientific creativity. The structural prerequisite for this is,

³² Cf. Van Parijs 2007, 226ff.

³³ Carel van Schaik (Zurich), personal communication (March 20, 2012).

however, the introduction of the tenure track system as it has been in use in the US for a long time. Given the internal corruption, nepotism and clientelism in the universities of some European countries it should be excluded that somebody starts a tenure track carrier in the university, where he/she received his/her PhD. There should be an open job market as in the US.

(4) Compared to American top universities European universities are grossly underfinanced. Take Harvard, a university with 21.225 students³⁴. The “total operating expenses” as documented in the “Harvard University Financial Report Fiscal Year 2010” (p. 18) are \$ 3,729,582,000³⁵. This equals (as of March 31, 2012) € 2.794.583.251. The budget 2011 for the 9 universities³⁶ and several other academic institutions in the German *Land* Baden-Württemberg is about 150 million Euros smaller: € 2.636.302.000. The number of students in Baden-Württemberg was, however, as of November 2010 at 294.362. This means that Baden-Württemberg spends less than 9.000 Euros/student compared to 131.664 at Harvard. I am afraid that the figures in other European countries (“Oxbridge” possibly excluded) are not decisively better. Certainly, not all American Universities are as rich as Harvard, but it seems clear that the operating expenses of the top institutions exceed by far everything what we might find in Europe. Given this financial imbalance compared to U.S. top institutions it is astonishing what poor European universities, in fact, still accomplish.

(5) Publishing in English is only a necessary condition for crossing the global perception threshold. Active networking has to be added. These two necessary conditions are, however, not jointly sufficient. Disappointments are unavoidable. For those feeling disappointed it might serve as a consolation that also in pre-globalization times scientific quality did not always suffice to be perceived and acknowledged, that – in other words – there have always been unrecognized geniuses... It seems to me that there is no separate path to avoid publishing in English. Ongoing resistance in major European countries like France and Germany is in my view counterproductive and doomed to fail.³⁷

³⁴ Cf. the English Wikipedia entry “Harvard University”.

³⁵ Available at: http://www.google.de/url?sa=t&crct=j&q=operating%20budget%20harvard%20university&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CC4QFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fcdn.wds.harvard.edu%2Ffad%2F2010_full_fin_report.pdf&ei=cbp1T53hHdGOswbA3ODDAw&usq=AFQjCNFo3hpftBp2vcsPqosigtR3-hPiYA&cad=rja

³⁶ Among them are large and old institutions with costly medical schools like Freiburg, Heidelberg and Tübingen.

³⁷ According to a letter in the HOPOS mailing list (January 13, 2012) there is being launched a new bilingual (articles in French and English) journal *Lato Sensu - Revue de la Société de philosophie des sciences*. I very much doubt that articles written in French in this journal will be read by NES. I just checked the first 2012 issue of *Philosophy of Science*. Of the many references in 9 articles *not one* relates to a publication in a language other than English. I think this finding is fairly representative, and I am afraid that it will hold *lato sensu* also for publications in *Lato Sensu*. – Apart from this it is interesting to note that in the name of the French society the word “French” is missing, as *mutatis mutandis* in their German counterpart.

(6) We NoNES should stay away as much as we can from seeing the world of the humanities through the lenses of globalized parochialism. There are interesting and sometimes fascinating developments in our countries that do not surface globally. To notice them presupposes attentiveness to what is going on in other NoNES countries instead of staring like a rabbit caught in the headlights at the newest revelations arriving from the world of globalized parochialism. Here research networks on a European level can open our eyes for what our NoNES friends have achieved and are achieving. Therefore projects on a European level are very much desirable. If only the bureaucratic procedures with the *European Science Foundation*, and probably other European institutions as well, were not as tiresome, unproductive and nerve-wracking as they are!

REFERENCES

- Butts, Robert E., James Robert Brown, eds. 1989. *Constructivism and Science: Essays in Recent German Philosophy*. Dordrecht: Kluwer
- Clavero, Miguel. 2010. "Awkward wording. Rephrase": linguistic injustice in ecological journals. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 25: 552-553
- Coniglione, Francesco. 2010. *Realtà e astrazione. Scuola Polacca ed epistemologia post-positivista*. Rome: Bonanno
- Fara, Rudolf, Maurice Salles. 2006. "An interview with Michael Dummett: from analytical philosophy to voting analysis and beyond", London: LSE Research Online. Available at <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/archive/00000552>
- Fumerton, Richard A. 1999. "Logical Positivism". In *The Cambridge Dictionary of Philosophy*, ed. Robert Audi, 514-516, 2nd edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Galavotti, Maria Carla, Elisabeth Nemeth, Friedrich Stadler, eds. *Philosophy of Science in Europe – European Philosophy of Science and the Viennese Heritage*, Dordrecht: Springer (Vienna Circle Institute Yearbook) (forthcoming)
- Janich, Peter. 2006. *Kultur und Methode: Philosophie in einer wissenschaftlich geprägten Welt*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp
- Kaila, Eino. 1926. *Die Prinzipien der Wahrscheinlichkeitslogik*. Turku: Turun Suomalainen Yliopisto
- Kuipers, Theo. 2000. *From Instrumentalism to Constructive Realism: on Some Relations between Confirmation, Empirical Progress, and Truth Approximation*. Dordrecht: Kluwer
- McWorther, J. 2012. "When Does Speaking a Foreign Language Get a Candidate in Trouble?" In *The New Republic*, January 23
- Mahoney, T. J. 2001. "The Problems of English as a Foreign Language in Professional Astronomy". In *Organizations and Strategies in Astronomy*, ed. A. Heck,

- 185-192. Dordrecht: Kluwer
- Niiniluoto, Ilkka. 1987. *Truthlikeness*. Dordrecht: Reidel
- Parrini, Paolo (1998): *Knowledge and Reality: An Essay in Positive Philosophy*, Dordrecht (Kluwer)
- Parrini, Paolo, Luca Maria Scarantino, eds. 2004. *Il pensiero filosofico di Giulio Preti*. Milano: Guerini
- Uebel, Thomas. 2011. "Name ist Schall und Rauch? On Naming a Revolutionary Philosophy". In *Philosophy of Science in Europe – European Philosophy of Science and the Viennese Heritage*. Maria Carla Galavotti, Elisabeth Nemeth, and Friedrich Stadler eds. Dordrecht: Springer (Vienna Circle Institute Yearbook) (forthcoming)
- Van Parijs, Philippe. 2002. "Linguistic Justice". *Politics Philosophy Economics* 1: 59-74
- Van Parijs, Philippe. 2007. "Europe's Linguistic Challenge". In *The Language Question in Europe and Diverse Societies*, eds. Dario Castiglione, Chris Longman, 215—251. Oxford: Hart
- Wolters, Gereon. 2003. "Carl Gustav Hempel - Pragmatic Empiricist". In *Analytical and Continental Aspects of Logical Empiricism*, eds. Paolo Parrini, Merrilee H. Salmon, and Wesley C. Salmon, 109-122. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press