

# REMEMBERING PETER HARE







Peter in Potsdam  
*Summer 2004*

**REMEMBERING PETER HARE**  
(1935-2008)

Prepared by the Members of the  
Society for the Advancement of American Philosophy

April 2009



*To Susan Howe —*

*The unexpected death of Peter H. Hare in January 2008 came as a great shock to the members of the Society for the Advancement of American Philosophy. Many of us had listened to his discussion of philosophy and life at the Baltimore meeting of the American Philosophical Association just a few days before.*

*We decided to share with you a sense of our loss — partial as it no doubt is compared to yours — to try to indicate what he meant to us and to our Society.*

*We hope that these remembrances bring you comfort in knowing that Peter's life had such a positive impact on so many of his philosophical colleagues.*

*James Campbell*

*President*

*Society for the Advancement of American Philosophy*

*April 2009*



## Contributors

1. <i>Doug Anderson</i>	-----	02
2. <i>John Anton</i>	-----	03
3. <i>Joseph Betz</i>	-----	04
4. <i>James Campbell</i>	-----	08
5. <i>John Corcoran</i>	-----	09
6. <i>Donald Dryden</i>	-----	17
7. <i>Richard E. Hart</i>	-----	19
8. <i>Larry A. Hickman</i>	-----	21
9. <i>Nathan Houser</i>	-----	22
10. <i>Frederic R. Kellogg</i>	-----	24
11. <i>Colin Koopman</i>	-----	25
12. <i>Chad Lykins</i>	-----	27
13. <i>Edward H. Madden</i>	-----	27
14. <i>Armen Marsoobian</i>	-----	31
15. <i>John J. McDermott</i>	-----	32
16. <i>Bill Myers</i>	-----	34
17. <i>David L. O'Hara</i>	-----	35
18. <i>Frank Oppenheim, S.J.</i>	-----	36
19. <i>Joseph T. Palencik</i>	-----	37
20. <i>John Ryder</i>	-----	39
21. <i>John R. Shook</i>	-----	40
22. <i>Beth J. Singer</i>	-----	43
22. <i>John J. Stuhr</i>	-----	44
23. <i>Griffin Trotter</i>	-----	45
24. <i>Kathleen Wallace</i>	-----	46

# 1

## Peter Hare

*by Doug Anderson*

Peter Hare was initially a name to me—a name that ran the most important journal of the day in American philosophy. Then Peter became a correspondent, telling me how to tweak my essays for publication in his journal. Later, he became a face—a smiling benevolent face—at professional meetings where I didn't have the courage to go up to him and introduce myself. Finally, one year at one of those professional meetings, he read my name tag and introduced himself and we talked casually for some time about Peirce and American philosophy.

In the ensuing years we crossed paths routinely and I came to know Peter as an encourager of young thinkers, as a champion of all kinds of American philosophy, and as a thinker who had his own take on what philosophy was about. My last two encounters with Peter were very special. We met first three years ago at Ivo Ibrri's pragmatism meeting in São Paulo, Brazil. Peter was writing on philosophy and poetry and, given my interests in Emerson and the arts, we struck up several conversations on philosophical/poetic themes in our days there. It was nice just to hear Peter's passion for philosophy and poetry! We also had several long discussions on William James finding that we shared a genuine interest in the importance of James's work.

The last time I saw Peter was at the Eastern APA meeting in Baltimore where he had graciously agreed to comment on the work on John McDermott for a session I had put together. In reflecting on McDermott's work, Peter recreated the drama of his own entry into the world of philosophy. It was a fascinating story—one I had not heard Peter tell before. After the session, I asked if he might want to consider writing a book that would bring together his experiences as philosopher and editor with some of his technical philosophical work. He seemed intrigued by the idea and I left hoping that such a text might be in the offing. Soon after, Peter died.

His philosophical spirit and his passion for philosophy, however, have not died. These live on in his students and their work, and in those of us in American philosophy who studied and worked under his influence. I am still hopeful for a book on Peter's thought; unfortunately, it will miss the experiential touch of his editorial hand. American philosophy will miss Peter Hare.



# 2

## Letter to Richard Hull

*by John Anton*

January 12, 2008

Dear Richard,

Thank you so much for forwarding to me the obituaries for Peter Hare. His leaving us so suddenly saddened me deeply. It was only recently that I had the opportunity to see him again after so many years. I was invited to present a paper at the Naturalism conference the Center for Inquiry had organized this past October. Peter chaired our session and introduced each speaker in his extremely laconic way. "Next will speak such and such on such and such." No titles no c.v.! He was just eager to get us to the podium and hear us deliver our truths. Being one of the speakers at this conference was also a reunion.

Later that afternoon, Peter, Jim Gouinlock, Nathan Buff and I had dinner together. Peter was charming and anecdotal. We went back to the years when I was professor at Buffalo, and reminded him of his visit for the interview and his subsequent acceptance of the position. We hired him while he was still working on his dissertation, which he completed within a year. He was a fellow Columbian, a generation later than my student years at Columbia. He was closer to Professor Justus Buchler, while I was continuing the tradition Professor Randall has instituted. As I recall, Peter was a fierce Peircean. We were both caught in the snares of American naturalism that had already established the framework to capture the ideas common Aristotle, Peirce and Dewey.

Peter joined the Department during the difficult period of the student unrest on our Buffalo campus. He was quick to see its relevance to the critical moment America was facing in that transition period. I was a bit slower to get the message despite the fact that I had fought behind the enemy lines during the Second World War and knew the social pains of the decades that followed. But, as you recall, we had a common concern: we did not want our students and junior colleagues to get hurt by the bitter counter-attacks the ultra-conservatives were staging. Anyway, let me not repeat events you are familiar with since you were also a junior appointment to our department.

Then I left Buffalo to accept the chairmanship of the Department of Philosophy at Emory University. The rest is history. Occasionally I would see Peter at various professional meetings and hold brief conversations on the happenings at the Buffalo campus. All along I kept an active interest in the Society for the Advancement of American Philosophy since I was one of its founding members. As things turned out, Peter became one of its devoted supporters. Of course, we honored him, just as we honored Jim Gouinlock.

The years went by and Peter in his own special way did more than any other I know to keep the interest in promoting American Naturalism and the Peircean tradition alive. Now Peter left us, but his legacy remains. That is more than one can ask from a genuine scholar and educator.

Yours, as ever,

John P. Anton

Distinguished Professor of Greek Philosophy and Culture  
Department of Philosophy  
University of South Florida  
Tampa, Florida 33620



# 3

## Peter Hare. Remembered With Great Appreciation

by Joseph Betz

I was a member of the group, though only at the fringe and not at the center, which established the Society for the Advancement of American Philosophy in the late 1960's and early 1970's. My doctoral dissertation on the social self gave pride of place to G.H. Mead and John Dewey. I was eager to find a professional society whose members were reading and writing on these two American greats. SAAP was clearly that society. I attended annual meetings and soon was submitting papers for the program.

"George Herbert Mead on Human Rights" was such a paper, and it was accepted for the program and read. Since I had also worked on Peirce in graduate school and was one of the original subscribers to the *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society*, I was aware that Peter Hare was on its editorial staff. Peter attended my SAAP session and, to my surprise and delight, approached me after it to solicit my paper for publication in the *Transactions*. This was a lesson and a revelation to me of the enormous importance of Peter Hare in the creation of SAAP, the establishment of the *Transactions* as its key organ, and of his kindness in the nurturing, encouraging and guiding of young scholars in our field. I would guess that there are dozens of us in SAAP with this similar experience of Peter's help. His bold kindness in bringing young Russian philosophers to the U.S. during the cold war was also remarkable.

Considering the "publish or perish" norm for young scholars, and the weak regard for studies of the classical American philosophers among most philosophy journal editors in the late 1960's, Peter was surely a cause of the achievement of tenure for many of those in my generation of American scholars. My belief is that when Peter advanced from consulting editor of the *Transactions* and merely advising editor Richard Robin, to become co-editor with him, the meaning of this advance was that the *Transactions* became as much about the other classical American philosophers as it was about Peirce. It seems probable to me that Peter was to thank for this and that it was a development of enormous support to SAAP and us Americanists.

Peter found a specialty for me as a book reviewer which kept me true to my academic roots. Peter knew that I had taken about five graduate courses with Chicago's Richard McKeon, who, to Peter and I, was a brilliant and original but unappreciated American philosopher. So Peter would look for newly published books on McKeon and be sure that they were reviewed in the *Transactions*, usually by me. For this chance for me and for this deserved and rare attention to McKeon, I thank Peter.

It was a continuing compliment to me that Peter always found me out for friendly chat at SAAP meetings. At one, he invited me back to a party in his wife's Washington apartment.

He always paid attention to what I was doing, often shared a breakfast or other meal with me at conference hotels, and made observations to me of what he thought should be happening in the field of American philosophy. I took one of these observations as an invitation to carefully study and write on the work of Hannah Arendt. I had heard her lecture when I was at the University of Chicago and had always intended to learn more about her thought. Peter's position was that she was now a world-renowned philosopher, was now an American and was much sought after to teach and lecture here in America, but was not much noticed by American philosophers in SAAP. When I had read her in depth, I loved her work, and wrote the sort of article on her which Peter was looking for and quickly published, "An Introduction to the Thought of Hannah Arendt." My background biography in the article claimed that she had had an affair with her teacher, Martin Heidegger, and this was challenged by a pre-publication reviewer. Peter notified me of the challenge. I substantiated the claim. Peter stood by me. It was only later that this affair became widely known.

Incidentally, my daughter, Margaret Betz, wrote her doctoral dissertation in philosophy at Temple University on Hannah Arendt, since published as a book. Considering that she probably first heard of Arendt from me, Peter was not only the father of my article on Arendt, but was also the grandfather of her book on Arendt. My gratitude to him thus grew to become my whole family's gratitude to him.

Speaking of gratitude to him, there is still more thanks that I give him. He phoned me in the 1990's to ask me if I would accept nomination to be elected President of SAAP. I was a bit shocked. I have published no books, I told him, there are more accomplished and better-known scholars in our organization than I. But I did not dissuade him. He seemed to value my faithfulness to SAAP, my work on hosting its meetings and on arranging programs for it, and my work on its committees, as more than any value that might have been in my unwritten books. So I accepted and became President, greatly honored to have been nominated by Peter's committee, and then elected. Having myself shared in the nominating of two of SAAP's deserving Presidents, Darnell Rucker and Herman Saatkamp, and having always been proud of the esteemed stature of all of SAAP's Presidents, I felt myself elevated by Peter to the company of the greats.

My Presidency of SAAP led to the last great favor for which I owe Peter gratitude. Sometime in the 1980's I had begun to pay attention to what the United States government was doing in Nicaragua and El Salvador. I was appalled to learn that my native land was destroying democracy and Christian decency (of the liberation theology kind) there. It had changed my scholarly focus, for my previous regularity in teaching Villanova's course on American Philosophy became my regularity in teaching its course in the Ethics of War. I was and am very critical of our government and its foreign policy in this course. Still, I kept looking for the connections between this new interest and my old interest. One result was my *Transactions* article, "John Dewey and Paulo Friere." However, as I was preparing my Presidential Address for our Toronto meeting as my term was ending, I realized that the talk I was going to give, "Sandinista Nicaragua as a Deweyan Social Experiment," was so full of my anger at the Reagan administration that, in spite of its Deweyan inspiration and content, it was far from standard material for any philosophical journal. Yet, once again, Peter shocked and gratified me by asking my permission and publishing it in the *Transactions*.

About five years ago, Peter had some business in Philadelphia, and phoned to invite my wife and I to be his dinner guests at a downtown restaurant. We had a lovely time with him, in part because my wife and I are charmed by colonial Philadelphia and its history, and Peter was connected to it by his Hare ancestors. I had pointed out to him that the Ben Franklin-founded American Philosophical Society (when we were both there to hear Jim Campbell on Franklin) had an exhibit on the colonial Hare's. In fact, the day after our shared dinner in the restaurant, Peter was to make a dutiful visit to Hare relatives still in the Philadelphia area. Anyway, at that dinner, the last time that I saw him, Peter mentioned that, my Presidential Address in print, some had been outraged by my non-academic use of Dewey, the polemic tone of my essay, and his foolishness for publishing it. But I loved his unapologetic attitude based on the principle that I had admired when I had heard it from him long before. It was that his choice of essays to publish had always included those that claimed or showed some difference to us here and now, indicated to us, or even demanded of us, by the works of our great classical American philosophers. How true he was to James's dictum, every difference makes a difference!

Thank you for your kind attentions to me, for your enormous support to young scholars, for your most effective defense of American philosophy, and may you rest in peace, Peter.

*Villanova University*



# 4

## For Peter H. Hare

*by James Campbell*

It is with profound sadness that the members of the Society for the Advancement of American Philosophy recognize the death of Peter H. Hare.

Peter was a long-time member of our Society, and his dedicated efforts on behalf of its ongoing development were recognized by all. Whether by serving on various committees, or as President (1988–1990), or by offering monetary subventions, or by encouraging young scholars in countless corridors at numberless meetings, Peter was always a model servant of the aims of SAAP. In an attempt to partially recognize Peter's many contributions, he was awarded the Society's *Herbert Wallace Schneider Award* "for distinguished contributions to the understanding and development of American Philosophy" in 1996.

Peter's contributions to the understanding and development of American philosophy are also to be found in his work for the *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society*, the premier journal of the history of American philosophy. Peter's name has appeared on the masthead of the *Transactions* since 1974, and his tireless efforts on its behalf are well known to all its readers and contributors.

When Peter was still a boy, the elderly James Hayden Tufts wrote the following words, words that might be seen as offering an interpretation of Peter's life: "the individual's span at best is short. His working years are soon counted. He can accomplish little alone. But man has learned to build institutions. Through these he gives cumulative strength and enduring life to aims and ideals of generations and ages."

Peter was a builder of institutions. Two I have mentioned. The Buffalo Philosophy Department is another. There are, of course, more. In each of these cases, Peter helped to give 'cumulative strength and enduring life' to institutions that will continue to help spread the 'aims and ideals' to which he dedicated his life.

Many members of SAAP spoke about his death at our recent meeting in Michigan. I am sure that we will continue to speak of him, and his many contributions, at our future meetings.

*President, SAAP*



# 5

## Remembering My Life With Peter Hare

*by John Corcoran*

Peter H. Hare, Distinguished Professor Emeritus of Philosophy at the University of Buffalo (SUNY at Buffalo), died peacefully in his sleep on Thursday, January 3, 2008. I would like to share my memories of my life with him. Others have eulogized him, enumerated his virtues and accomplishments, and written his obituaries. I am revisiting my personal relationship with him. These memories are as much about me as about him.

### **Our Last Evening Together**

Although Peter and I had a frequent email correspondence up until a week or so before he died, our last face-to-face meeting took place almost two months earlier in Buffalo on November 12, 2007. It was the last of several raucous evenings the two of us shared over the more than 35 years of our friendship. It started with drinks in my dimly lit second floor study looking westward over a lovely Buffalo snowscape as the sunset faded. Peter had enjoyed that view many times before but never in the winter at sunset. He was in a wonderful mood. He roared with delight as I gave a dramatic reading of a humorous logic piece I had just finished writing. In return he gave me his latest insights into his evolving interpretation of one of Gertrude Stein's poems, which he saw as extolling the aesthetics of symbolic logic. As I had done more than once before, I again urged him to get it into print before he got scooped.

We were having so much fun that I forgot to show him what I had invited him to see, my new glass polyhedra. In the summer I had proved the existence of a previously unknown three-dimensional geometrical figure, the subregular tetrahedron. I had commissioned a local glass maker to construct two of them, mirror images that are congruent but do not coincide. After we were bundled up ready to leave the house, I remembered to show them to him. Peter loved them. His first impulse was regard to them as abstract sculptures. We did not have time to discuss them or even to review the mathematical definitions. If he had had more time to sit and study them, he would have had a score of questions. And he would have told me what Peirce said about solid geometry and what Peirce would have said about my discovery. The next day it annoyed me to realize that I had this missed opportunity, but I thought I would get another chance. It hurts much more now to remember and to realize that I never will.

When the sky had lost its color, we went out into the windy, freezing cold night for dinner at a nearby quiet Thai restaurant. We discussed his recent travels to Romania and his plans for future travel. We also discussed his love of sculpture, his education, his father, department news, my logic course, and the Buffalo Logic Colloquium, which had been dear to him for many years. I don't ever remember him in a better mood or in a better state of health.

He died in his sleep— a pulmonary embolism. Many years ago he told me in casual conversation that there was a history of heart problems in his family and that he did not expect to live past 60. He made it to 72.

## Overview

Peter and I were very close over the years. He appointed me Associate Chair and Director of Graduate Studies in his first administration 1971–75, in my second year at UB when I was an untenured associate professor. Without his unstinting support, my tenure and promotion to professor would have been delayed and my assignments to positions in college, university, and SUNY-wide governance would not have occurred. In those days such positions carried prestige and automatic salary increases which remained even after their terms expired. I have been clear about my debt to Peter for years and I am glad to say that I expressed my gratitude many times while he was alive. In 1995 I published a logic paper with the following epigraph: *Dedication: to Peter H. Hare for a quarter century of leadership, encouragement, and support of "The Buffalo School of Logic", with affection and admiration.* A year earlier there had been a reference in the *Journal of Symbolic Logic* to "The Buffalo School of Logic". Peter was so thrilled that his Department was getting some recognition that he had hundreds of pins made. It was a three-inch white circle inscribed with blue italic script lettering "*The Buffalo School of Logic*". He got everyone he saw to wear one. I still have mine. Peter never missed an opportunity to make the Department feel good about itself.

We were on the same wavelength in regard to many issues. Like me, he was a devoted feminist, civil rights advocate, civil liberties advocate, peace activist, environmentalist, and philosophical pluralist. He was deeply offended by partiality, bigotry, old-boyism, and injustice, even though his intense personal loyalties and his zeal for a righteous cause sometimes led him to do some fudging and corner-cutting that could look like unfairness to those on the losing side. I was always on the winning side. In a few cases, people were offended and things back-fired.

As far as class differences are concerned, on the surface we could not have been more different. He was born into a wealthy and accomplished Protestant New York family with a distinguished history tracing back beyond the Revolutionary War. His mother is a direct descendant of Commodore Matthew Perry. An etching of the American fleet Perry commanded hung in Peter's Buffalo home. His father, a modernist architect, was a member of an aristocratic New York men's club, the Century Club. Peter went to boarding schools, to an exclusive prep school, and to an Ivy League college and graduate school. In my family, it was pretty much the opposite. All eight siblings in my lower economic-class Catholic family went to public or tuition-free parochial schools. We lived in a semi-rural three-bedroom, one-bath house: four girls in one bedroom, four boys in one, and the parents in the third. My twin brother and I were the first two persons in the history of the family to receive college degrees; we both went on to the PhD: he from MIT, I from Johns Hopkins.

Over the years Peter made many sometimes overtly proud references to his privileged past, but I never gave him the slightest clue about my underprivileged one. He never pressed me

about this. When he seemed to be interested in my background I would brag about my advanced science-mathematics high-school (the Baltimore Polytechnic Institute) and about my two brothers who graduated from the US Naval Academy in Annapolis. Commodore Perry had taken special interest in the Naval Academy and Peter's family history included some graduates of the US Military Academy at West Point.

The previous paragraphs reflect the impression that Peter allowed people to form and that he seemed to encourage without actually stating. After he died I found out from his widow, the celebrated poet Susan Howe, that the reality was somewhat different. The fact is that his father did not pursue an architectural career for long. He became an eccentric modernist. Despite some impressive commissions, including the well-known Theatre Complex at the University of Wisconsin and US consulates in Latin America, he could not sustain his profession. After his business failed, he turned to a cultish philosophical group in England and then ran through the family money, including his inheritance. Peter went to Groton and Yale on scholarships, and on fellowships at Columbia. Members of his family had been at Groton and Yale in better times. It was an embarrassment to him to be on financial aid. He had almost no help from his family during those years. Peter worked jobs at all these places to pay for room and board. So Peter's educational years were more like mine than I ever would have imagined.

Although he was not a logician, he knew my work in history and philosophy of logic. He discussed my philosophy of logic with me, and he encouraged me in it. His knowledge of symbolic logic was that of the typical philosophy PhD. He knew *of* my mathematical work. He respected it without really seeing where it fit in and without understanding any details. As many of you know, philosophy, history, linguistics, and mathematics are all equally important parts of my intellectual work. Although he had a feeling that all four were essential to my perspective, Peter only knew the first two parts.

But he enthusiastically supported all of my projects: the Ancient Logic conference, the Tarski conference, the Church Symposium, the Buffalo Logic Colloquium, the Buffalo Logic Dictionary Project, etc. In the 25 years before his retirement Peter attended almost all of my numerous colloquium presentations as well as many meetings of the Buffalo Logic Colloquium, even when the speaker was not one of our faculty members. He would regularly attend the always lively, sometimes rowdy, beer-fueled dinners held afterward in an inexpensive working-class restaurant near campus, where tradition was for the faculty members to divide the modest bill equally and for the graduate students to pay nothing.

I owe him more than I can say. I will miss his enthusiastic and imaginative support. I will miss the attention he paid to my ideas, his thoughtful and objective criticisms, and his enthusiastic encouragement. And I will miss his warm friendship. Most of all, I will miss our times together. He was fun to be around. When Peter was present there was never a lull in conversation.

## **Our First Meeting**

I met him in the winter of 1968-69 on a cold, damp, gray day. I gave a talk “Conceptual Structure of Classical Logic” at the interim campus of UB, the University of Buffalo. The old campus was overcrowded and the new campus was being built. I was in the last year of a four year appointment as Assistant Professor of Linguistics at the University of Pennsylvania. As a candidate for an untenured associate professorship at UB, I was interviewed by the Chair and the Associate Chair before the talk. The Chair was William Parry, a distinguished logician who was nationally known for having stood up to Senator McCarthy and HUAC; the Associate Chair was Peter Hare. Peter was a tenured associate professor and Director of Graduate Studies.

I remember the talk, the lively discussion that followed, and many other things. I have vivid memories of many of the people at the talk and the dinner that followed – Charles Pailthorp, Newton Garver, Mary Varney, Thomas Perry, Richard Hull, Kenneth Barber, Jesse Kalin and the logicians Nicolas Goodman, Robert Martin, John Pollock, Lynn Rose, Charles Lambros, William Parry, and John Kearns. The dinner was attended largely, perhaps exclusively, by the many untenured assistant professors, instructors, and graduate students. There I learned that the large 36 member Philosophy Department had a two-tier social structure. At the top were the full professors and tenured associate professors. At the bottom were the rest. The top group, to which Peter belonged, included such well-known figures as Marvin Farber, Rollo Handy, Edward Madden, Paul Kurtz, and John Anton.

But aside from his warmth and to me exalted status, I do not remember much about Peter on that visit. I started teaching at UB in fall 1970 and I got to know Peter during that year. He looked the part of the established East-coast academic: tweed sport coat, button-down shirt, bow tie, and long sideburns known as mutton chops. My style was more Bohemian: jeans, turtlenecks, thick red beard, long flowing red hair despite some thinning on the top. My winter hat was a wool US Navy watch cap that Peter found amusing. He often referred to it as a toque, using a word I had never before heard – in that sense. He was the post-preppie, I the post-hippie.

I remember looking at his CV and being impressed with the quantity of his publications in prestigious journals. He had published over 20 articles to my three. I looked up to him for his status and achievements. If someone had told me that he was less than two years older than I, I would not have believed it.

## **The Years of the Hare-Corcoran Administration**

In 1971 Peter became Chair of the UB Philosophy Department. I was surprised and flattered when he appointed me Associate Chair and Director of Graduate Studies, a post in which I served him for the rest of his first four-year term. I inferred that he would never have appointed me if he were not certain I'd get tenure. In two years I went from being unemployed to being virtually guaranteed tenure at one of the best philosophy departments. It was to this period that my most vivid memories of Peter date. He became a kind of mentor. From then

until the time of his death, without ever saying so even to myself, I regarded him in some vague way as my superior, somewhat like an older brother or an uncle. I sought his advice often. It was only after he died that I came to realize how strongly I valued his opinions and wanted his approval.

In 1973 the Chairs and Associate Chairs of the four SUNY graduate philosophy departments (Albany, Binghamton, Buffalo, and Stony Brook) were to meet for a weekend in Albany to discuss ways of increasing cooperation and communication. I suggested to Peter that we propose broadening the agenda to include presentations of recent research results achieved in the four departments. I volunteered to present my recent interpretation of Aristotle's *Prior Analytics* as a natural deduction system. After Peter forwarded my proposal to the other three departments and to SUNY Central Administration, it was immediately and unanimously accepted, but it was modified so that there would be only one full-length lecture and then four 15-minute presentations by each of the four chairs summarizing the directions of research in their respective departments. I was invited to give the full-length presentation. Peter was proud to show off his department's achievements.

It must have been on a short winter day that the conference started. I remember the four or five hour drive partly in the dark with Peter at the wheel of an official car bearing the insignia the State of New York. We had a lively conversation and the time seemed short. We made a rest stop at a Howard Johnson on the Thruway and decided to get a snack because it would be some hours before we would be able to have dinner. I remember deciding to have a bowl of chili, still my favorite snack, even before getting out of the car. I insisted that Peter order first. I was amazed and delighted that he ordered a bowl of chili.

### **Philosophical Exchanges**

Over the years Peter and I had many lively and informative philosophical exchanges. American philosophy had been on my back burner for years before arriving at UB. As a graduate student, I had studied Peirce, James, and Whitehead with Victor Lowe at Hopkins; as a Visiting Associate Professor, I sat in on Abraham Kaplan's American Philosophy seminar at Michigan in 1969-1970. And of course, as a logician, I had studied Quine and Lewis intensely. Quine is my doctor grandfather; Lewis my doctor great grandfather.

From the beginning I disapproved of the tone of American Philosophy. The more I learned about it, the better I was able to articulate what I found distasteful about it. Nevertheless, I am still fascinated with American Philosophy and I respect its problems, intricacies, and attractions. Frankly, pragmatism and American-style naturalism are not agreeable to my temperament. Cognitivism and realism suit me better. The key difference between cognitivism and pragmatism, though Peter would always object to my putting it this way, is that for the cognitivist the end of inquiry is knowledge of truth, but for the pragmatist the end of inquiry is belief. For the pragmatist not only is there no such thing as knowledge in the traditional strict sense, but there is no such thing as truth either – in the sense of correspondence with reality.

I can go along with American-style naturalism's support of humanism and its opposition to the supernatural. But, like Peter, I am intellectually repulsed by its scientific tendencies and its recent shrill disrespect of religion. Even though neither Peter nor I have religious beliefs in any traditional sense, we both felt strongly the pluralistic impulse to respect all sincere belief as long as it left room for non-believers. I playfully told Peter that I am a naturalist – adding that, after all, to a Platonist, abstract objects are as much part of the natural world as concrete objects. On several occasions he tried to get me to admit that the pursuit of truth is not a privileged value, that it is a Jamesian choice just like the pursuit of justice, or pleasure, or power. Once I said to him: “OK, Peter, I have faith in reason, but I can't remember *choosing* to believe in reason.” In all of our exchanges, sharp differences came to light, but no sharp word ever passed between us – it wasn't Peter's way. I could have handled a certain amount of heat in exchanges without being disturbed, but I was always on my best dialectical behavior with Peter. He was the best conversationalist I ever knew: always intense, always focused, but always respectful and polite. He had a beneficial effect on everyone he conversed with.

As many of you know, I solicit comments and criticisms on my drafts before submitting them for publication. I think that learning is a social process carried out by a community of scholars. Peter and I agreed on this. He thought he got it from Peirce. I got it from study groups with my brilliant high-school friends at the Baltimore Polytechnic Institute. Later I realized that Plato thought so too, as evidenced by the dialogue form he chose for his writings. Over the years Peter remarked several times that I had taken this belief more seriously and with more energy than anyone he knew. He was afraid that someone might steal my ideas before I got them into print. I told him that I was more afraid of missing the opportunity to be corrected and thus going into print with a flawed work. Besides, I get deep satisfaction from engaging in dialogue.

Once I started using email, I would send Peter drafts of everything historical or philosophical I wrote, and he would critique it as a rigorous and meticulous but sympathetic editor and as a promoter of American Philosophy. He would always make sure that my treatment of American philosophers and logicians put them in the best light consistent with the textual evidence. In late fall 2003 before I left Buffalo to spend the winter in Florida, Peter put in my department mailbox a huge package that turned out to be the typescript of Murray Murphey's then forthcoming intellectual biography of C. I. Lewis. Peter wanted me to write an article about Murphey's treatment of Lewis's logic for a special issue of the *Transactions*. I started working on it as soon as I got to Florida. When Peter got the first draft by email, he replied in a day or so with a list of detailed criticisms and suggestions ending with something to the effect that the draft was too much Corcoran and too little Lewis and Murphey. It took several drafts before I had something he was happy with. He never said a word about the order of the articles. I was gratified when I saw that he made mine the lead article making it the first in the 2006 volume. It appeared as “C. I. Lewis: History and Philosophy of Logic”, *Transactions of the C. S. Peirce Society*. 42 (2006) 1-9.

After the Lewis piece was finished, he read and commented on draft after draft of the nine articles commissioned by John Lachs and Robert Talisse for the 2007 Routledge *Encyclopedia of American Philosophy*. Not only did Peter critique my drafts but he also dug up passages

that I needed to cite and gave me names and email addresses of several scholars who could help. Although I have had a nice relationship with John Lachs for many years, I suspect that Peter had some involvement in my being offered the nine commissions. I am not thought of as a specialist in “American Philosophy” and, before the *Transactions* paper, I had never been invited to participate in an “American Philosophy” project. Without Peter none of those 10 articles would exist. And even if similar opportunities were to present themselves in the future, without Peter I could never complete them with as much accuracy or fairness.

Although we discussed the *Encyclopedia of American Philosophy* in scores if not hundreds of emails, Peter never mentioned the honor that the editors had accorded him: he was chosen among a dozen or so famous philosophers to contribute an autobiographical article on his own philosophical development. Peter’s bragging was mostly about the achievements of his colleague and students.

Peter made no secret of the fact that he enjoyed reading my philosophical work. He told me this many times – in fact the last time I saw him he went into some detail about his enjoyment of the writing itself, each sentence he would savor. To my knowledge there have been only four other people who enjoyed my philosophical prose as much. Of the five, three are dead. In every case, I felt diminished as a person by the death. It was as if part of me had died.

### **Dinners in the Garden**

In early August 1995 when I was away from Buffalo, Peter’s first wife Prof. Daphne Hare, a physician, died after a long struggle with melanoma. My wife Lynn and I had been guests of the Hares. Although they had been to parties at our house on Burbank Terrace in the small Buffalo neighborhood known as TINYTOWN, they had never been dinner guests of ours – in spite of our best intentions. After Daphne died we invited Peter for drinks and dinner in our garden. He had not seen Lynn’s two-story high, flowering trumpet vine bedecked with hundreds of deep orange-red “trumpets” and regularly visited by a pair of Baltimore orioles. As luck would have it, the trumpet vine was one of Peter’s favorite plants, as it is of mine. In fact, Peter had been trying to grow one himself, but he had not achieved the success that Lynn had. From then on, Peter would recall from time to time the delightful evening outdoors dining with a view of the trumpet vine. We repeated the event four or five more times before his death. His last dinner in the garden was early fall 2006 when he was accompanied by his wonderful new wife, the poet Susan Howe. Lynn and I were cheered to see how happy Peter and Susan were that evening and how complementary their personalities were. They seemed on track for a long and happy life together.

### **Afterword**

There is more information about me and less about Peter in this remembrance than I would like. I can imagine Peter reading it over and saying; “John, it’s a nice first draft, but there is too much Corcoran and not enough Hare”. I considered making deletions and additions but finally concluded that memories are less misleading if the person doing the remembering is better known. Forgive me if I am wrong.

## Acknowledgements

For criticisms and suggestions I would like thank Robert Barnes, Millard Beatty, Stephen Brown, Joseph Corcoran, Lynn Corcoran, William Corcoran, Margaret Corcoran Glenn, Carol Gould, Forest Hansen, Roger Hurlbert, Carolyn Korsmeyer, Timothy Madigan, Daniel Merrill, Irvin Miller, Joaquin Miller, Mary Corcoran Morton, Mary Mulhern, José Miguel Sagiillo, and Judith Wagner. Special thanks to four special people. Forest Hansen, my dear friend for over fifty years, has continued to be my grammatical and editorial conscience. Stephen Brown and Lynn Corcoran revealed things about my relationship with Peter that I might never have noticed. I am also deeply grateful to Susan Howe for crucial information and for her enthusiastic encouragement.

*University of Buffalo*



# 6

## Peter Hare: An Appreciation

*by Donald Dryden*

I first met Peter Hare in the spring of 1995, at an APA panel commemorating the 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the birth of the American philosopher Susanne Langer. Although I was then 50 years old and had been a serious student of Langer's writings for more than 30 years, I was only in my first year of a doctoral program in philosophy at Duke University, having been discouraged much earlier from entering a career in philosophy because of the widespread neglect of classical American philosophy in general, and of Langer's work in particular.

But by the 1990s, changes were underway in American philosophy, and the time seemed right for me to return to the study of Langer's work. I had missed the announcement of the Langer panel, however, and had only found out about it a couple of months before the Central Division APA meetings were to be held in Chicago. Hoping there might still be some way for me to contribute to the panel, I immediately contacted John McDermott, who was listed as the chair of the session. He referred me in turn to Jim Campbell, who was organizing the session. Jim explained that the panel was still in need of a commentator, and I gladly accepted his invitation to contribute in that role.

One of the three presenters on the panel, Richard Liddy, was a Roman Catholic philosopher whose contribution took Langer to task for what he saw as the irremediable shortcomings of her naturalistic perspective on the nature and evolution of human mentality. I, on the other hand, had been strongly attracted to Langer's work in large part because of what I saw as its rich and creative use of the resources of the naturalistic tradition as these had been developed much earlier in the work of William James.

The commentary I delivered was therefore a long critique of what I took to be Liddy's impoverished understanding of naturalism; and I indicated some of the contemporaneous developments in philosophy, as well as in the biological and psychological sciences, that were contributing to the revival and enrichment of a wide-ranging naturalistic understanding of the problems of life and mind.

At the conclusion of the panel, a man came up to me and introduced himself as Peter Hare. Peter explained that, as editor of the *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society*, he was interested in publishing an article that would locate Langer within the tradition of American philosophic naturalism, a strand of classical American philosophy that had been the subject of a recent anthology edited by John Ryder; and he asked me if I would like to send him a manuscript. Peter, I later learned, was always prospecting for articles and encouraging people to contribute to a number of areas in the history of American philosophy that he thought were in need of scholarly attention.

The article I wrote for Peter, “Susanne K. Langer and American Philosophic Naturalism in the Twentieth Century,” was awarded the Greenlee prize by the Society for the Advancement of American Philosophy in 1997 and was published in the *Transactions* later that year.

I will always be grateful to Peter for encouraging me in my first publication, but more generally for supporting me in my belief that Langer—at the time a largely neglected figure in American philosophy—was nonetheless worthy of serious scholarship. I have gone on to make several more presentations on Langer at SAAP meetings, have published a number of articles, and have found further support for the pursuit of Langer scholarship from other members of SAAP—including Tom Alexander, Jim Campbell, Vincent Colapietro, Richard Hart, and Bob Innis—all of whom I met as a result of work that might have been postponed indefinitely, pushed aside by the demands that graduate school made on a 50-year-old beginning philosophy student, had it not been for the support Peter first extended to me in 1997.

*Duke University*



# 7

Peter H. Hare

by Richard E. Hart

I had the good fortune of knowing Peter Hare for thirty plus years. When I was a new SAAP member in the late 1970's, trying desperately to get my career in philosophy off the ground, Peter was already (or so it seemed) an established, elder statesman of SAAP. A closer look at the calendar reveals that he was not an "elder" at that time. So why did it seem that way to me?

For me, Peter was always the very mark and essence of SAAP. He solicited and edited people's work, readily shared his expertise and speculative ideas, did untold administrative labor for SAAP and the philosophy profession more broadly, and always labored tirelessly to support and encourage younger scholars breaking into American philosophy. Initially, I saw him as a "Peirce guy" (simply because of his editorship of the *Transactions*), but over the years I came to understand and really appreciate his passion for and knowledge of the history of American philosophy. He knew well the work of my teacher and his, Justus Buchler. In this I felt a kinship with him. But over the years I, also, shared his interest in the interface between literature and philosophy, particularly poetry. Given my own near obsession with this interface – in my teaching, research and writing – I had many rich discussions with Peter. I loved his passion for literary art, and his exquisitely developed powers of interpretation. I have more than once in recent years felt that Peter may have been the only person in SAAP who really understood and appreciated what I have tried over the years to do with literature and philosophy.

Perhaps the most important thing, however, was what a fine and loyal friend Peter was. After knowing him for several years, it came to light that the town I live in on Long Island was Peter's boyhood home. In fact, when I look off my deck at the back of the house, I can see what remains of the house he grew up in. This was an amazing coincidence, one that we reveled in. He came to visit on Long Island some years ago, and we spent a day going around on the North Shore, with him showing me places and providing experiences that revealed whole new dimensions of the town I have resided in for over thirty years. I will always cherish that private, personal time with Peter. What a fine companion and tour guide.

The last book review I wrote was solicited by Peter, and appeared in the final issue of *Transactions* that he edited. Also, his last talk at a professional meeting was as part of a panel discussing two new books by or about John J. McDermott. One of the books is a collection of essays on various aspects of McDermott's philosophy edited by James Campbell and me. Of the nine essays in the volume, Peter did me the honor of singling out my chapter on McDermott's aesthetics for extended commentary. Of course, typical of Peter, prior to the meeting

he sent me a draft of what he was going to say, expressing his hope that I would approve of his treatment of my chapter.

Peter Hare can never be duplicated. Not even close. He was a servant of the academic world, a gentleman and a joy to be with. I am deeply honored to have known him. His memory will live in my heart forever.

*Bloomfield College*



# 8

## Peter Hare: Ambassador for American Philosophy

*by Larry A. Hickman*

When attending conferences and workshops abroad, it was always a plus to learn that Peter Hare would be one of the participants. It was a delight to observe the easy manner with which he engaged his non-American colleagues. He never failed to exhibit an eager interest in local customs and cultures, and he always had helpful questions or comments for every paper – especially for the presentations of the most junior among the conferees. I can recall one conference during which the program was running late and the last presenter was a graduate student. The audience drifted out, one by one, probably to go to lunch, leaving the poor student to wonder, no doubt, whether there would be anyone left to hear his final remarks. Peter remained until the last sentence, and then engaged the student with numerous helpful suggestions about how to improve his paper.

Although it is not widely known, Peter was also very helpful when it came to raising funds to help foreign students attend conferences in the United States. The funds, it turned out, usually came out of his own pocket. On one occasion, for example, he provided the funds that enabled two students from China to attend a Summer Institute in American Philosophy.

Peter was a great traveler. The rigors of long flights and spartan accommodations seemed to him matters of little concern when weighed against the prospects of lively discussions about American philosophy in places like Poland, Brazil, and Russia. Peter was a great and generous ambassador for American philosophy. If American philosophy had been a country, he could have been its Secretary of State. He will be missed.

Respectfully submitted,

Larry A. Hickman

*Center for Dewey Studies and Department of Philosophy  
Southern Illinois University Carbondale*



# 9

## Tribute to Peter Hare

by *Nathan Houser*

I'm sure we all have our private ideas about what Peter would have appreciated in honoring his memory. Assuming Peter's style, I'll be brief and efficient with my tribute to our friend and colleague, a man of genuine greatness.

In my dealings with Peter over many years, I became well acquainted with his many superlative qualities and abilities, his astonishing good sense, and his truly American “can-do” spirit. But more than anyone else with whom I have worked, Peter knew how to nurture and promote ideas by attending to systems and institutions, and by cultivating talent. He had long-range vision, aimed both toward the past and the future, and he knew how to shape the future by wise yet calculated moves of the present. Peter was a master strategist. His strategic moves sometimes took the form of a letter to a dean or a university president in support of a new center or project; or a letter of reference for someone seeking a new position or going up for tenure—Peter always knew just what to say. They sometimes took the form of a well-placed telephone call or an email suggesting a capable and well-deserving person for a special appointment or honor, or a timely interjection at a business meeting that would set things going in a new direction. They sometimes took the form of a request to organize a session at a professional meeting (often the APA or the Society for the Advancement of American Philosophy) or an invitation to write a paper for the *Transactions* on a topic that Peter believed needed attention. Not infrequently, the strategic move Peter thought necessary involved a personal appearance on some distant shore or a well-timed financial contribution. When I think of Peter, I often recall the wise if sometimes unwelcome counsel of Horace Kallen that if ideas are to thrive, if philosophic traditions are to continue, they have to be promoted by dedicated and capable adherents. Peter was not put off by the thought that one's chosen philosophy or philosophical method requires promotion—he understood this well and was a master of it.

But Peter was by no means narrow or partisan; he was delighted with brilliance and fine thinking wherever he found it and, in this sense, was no respecter of philosophic traditions. Not long ago, when recommending a person out of the mainstream for a top honor, Peter wrote the following to the other members of the selection committee: “It seems to me that our committee should take special care to recognize great distinction in [the] minority—lest we slide into a tyranny of the majority.” That was typical Peter.

About three years ago a colleague of mine spent a few days with Peter in São Paulo and told me that Peter was developing a philosophical approach called flexibilism. Flexibilism, Peter said, was no ordinary pluralism, yet I'm sure it is a philosophy that reflects Peter's com-

mitment to being a member of a vast community of thought that outstrips any narrow or partisan point of view.

I am aware that Peter was not always optimistic about the outcome of his causes or, for that matter, of civilization itself. Yet, as we all know, Peter was no quitter—he never gave up. He knew that it was in the realm of action-guiding ideas that our future will be determined and he cast his lot with the ideals of the naturalist pragmatists; it is this American tradition of thought, kept alive and up-to-date, that Peter believed offered the best hope for the future. He did more than anyone else to bring these ideas into vital participation with contemporary thought. The world is a better place because of Peter and whatever our chances for the future, he raised the odds.

I'm honored to have known Peter. May his memory and his influence long endure.

*These remarks were originally given on 29 March 2008 at Peter Hare's memorial service in Buffalo.*



# 10

Peter H. Hare

*by Frederic R. Kellogg*

30 January 2009

Peter H. Hare exemplifies a spirit that I encountered at SAAP when I first started attending meetings in 1985. It was creative, energetic, collegial, and welcoming, and Peter especially stood out among the regular members for his interest in the Society's purpose--advancing American philosophy, not just expounding it. Many are not aware of the influence he had in bringing pragmatism to other countries, including Russia, Poland, and Brazil.

His influence on my own work was encouraging, continuous, and profound. He saw merit in my work that others did not, and convinced me to pursue lines of work that I myself have doubted, but that eventually led me to successful results. Peter is principally responsible for three major research and teaching visits to foreign countries, and several papers, all of which I now recognize as having been major building blocks in my career.

Through his own work as well as his collegiality, Peter set an example which I have tried to follow, and which in the character of its members continues to make SAAP one of the best, and perhaps the best, philosophical organization in the country.

*Research Professor  
Universidade Federal de Pernambuco, Brazil*



# 11

## Letter to Susan Howe

by *Colin Koopman*

February 12 and 13, 2009

Dear Susan Howe,

You may not recall, though I certainly do, when I first met you and Peter. It was in Buffalo in a session of graduate seminar on James and Melville which you were offering in the English Department at UB. I was at the time writing a dissertation on pragmatism up the road at McMaster University and a dear friend or two, both students of yours (Jessica and Thom), encouraged me to attend your seminar. Since that time, I have never left Melville nor James, though James I had already spent much time with by then, and Melville not nearly enough. One word which I have ever since carried with me from that Buffalo winter day is hope: as in Hope Atherton and “Hope for the artist in America & etc”. (I used the latter, as you may recall, as an epigram for an essay of mine entitled “Pragmatism as a Philosophy of Hope”.) Now I have almost a whole book of things I want to say about hope for the philosopher in America. James is at the very center of all of this. So is Melville though I have not yet found a way of expressing my debts to him adequately. I would still very much like to find the way to say something interesting about Ishmael, Pierre, experiment, hope, and America. We all carry such hidden wishes with us as we dive through the stacks, like your library cormorants.

One reason for my attending your seminar session was that I had recognized Peter’s name in connection with his work on pragmatism. During the session I was immediately taken with Peter’s knowledge as well as his generosity. I introduced myself to him at the end of the afternoon and he provided me with a great many useful leads and ideas which he thought would be helpful for my work. I continued to run into Peter here and there over the years: in Buffalo, at meetings of the Society for the Advancement of American Philosophy, and at other conferences. He was always generous with his time and conversation. He was always also full of great hope. He seemed to me one of those rare persons filled with a natural confidence that can readily inspire hope in another.

As my work on pragmatism, James, America, etc. improved I worked up enough confidence in one of my papers to send it to Peter for possible publication in the *Peirce Transactions* journal. Peter’s advice and recommendations, and his own suggestions about what I might do to better meet the worries expressed by his readers reviewing the essay, enormously improved the piece. His generous email exchanges during and after my revisions also enormously improved my thinking on many other matters of related concern. All this led to my finding a way to articulate some of my centermost hopes for pragmatism, America, James, Dewey, and Rorty. In connection with the last of these names in particular I was impressed by Peter’s

great philosophical curiosity—it was clear that, like me, Peter found it very important indeed to take Rorty’s work very seriously (now this may seem like a minor point of technical jargon, which indeed it is, but it serves well to know that Rorty’s name is downright scandalous in some circles of philosophy and perhaps moreso in pragmatist circles than any other). I found his honest curiosity quite bracing at just the right time in my philosophical development. It led to my being able to fully commit myself to book on pragmatism. I would like to send you a copy of this book when it comes out later this year, if only because the book would not be what it is without Peter’s advice and encouragement. It was he who first set me straight by telling me that he thought my work good enough to publish as a book. If the rest of the manuscript is as good as this, he told me (at least this is how I now remember it), then you should send it out for review now. I did. I then waited. Finally the book was accepted. Soon I will have something to be very proud of.

My last conversation with Peter was in late December of 2007 in Baltimore at the American Philosophical Association. I found my way through the festival of sharks to the much more welcoming annual APA party hosted by SAAP. Peter there indulged me in a long conversation about pragmatism, James, Rorty, my work, and the future of this philosophical tradition. He again offered me very kind words and inspiring thoughts. As he walked away I found myself truly content – and please understand how rare this is at a professional convention as ethically absurd as the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association. Peter’s generosity and friendship in such places was always a welcome, and almost instant, relief. I am sure I am not the only young philosopher who felt these steady assurances.

I was saddened to receive news, only a few short days later, of Peter’s passing. His spirit in Baltimore was overflowing with warm vitality. What a shock this was. The early months of that year were a very long and hard Winter for me. I did not come out of it the same person as I went into it. It produced questions in me which I still have not been able to satisfactorily answer. There were many causes of these cold transformations. The loss of Peter’s ongoing generosity to me and service to the wider community of scholars was just one of these causes. And it was indeed a real loss, and a still-felt loss, as you well know, for a great many of us.

With My Warmest Regards,

Colin Koopman  
*San Francisco, California*



# 12

Peter Hare

*by Chad Lykins*

March 2009

I was fortunate enough to sit next to Professor Hare at a Dinner at Bosco's in Nashville, Tennessee. It was my second year of graduate school and something of a period of crisis. I had written a paper offering a qualified defense of Richard Rorty for a seminar I was taking with a professor who was (and is) deeply disdainful of him. I had felt that the paper was one of my better attempts. The professor disagreed — so much so that he refused to grade it. He wouldn't even fail it. Instead, he told me to go back and read a couple of articles that he approved of (for no other reasons than that they were commensurate with his own position). The message was that unless I changed my position, he would not accept the paper.

I confided this story to Professor Hare over dinner. He listened to my position, asked questions, and confirmed my suspicion that my paper was judged unfairly. The sense of validation restored confidence in my own judgment. A senior scholar, the editor of our flagship journal, took me seriously, even at the peril of disagreeing with my professor, himself a well-known and respected scholar. The encouragement he gave me that night meant more than he could have possibly known.

*Vanderbilt University*





Peter in Poland  
1999

# 13

## 1996 Herbert W. Schneider Award Citation: Peter H. Hare

*by Edward H. Madden*

March 1996

It seems appropriate at this time to honor and thank Peter H. Hare for all that he has done for the advancement of American Philosophy – in his fine publications, and papers read at conferences and colloquia, as president of the Society for the Advancement of American Philosophy and of the Charles S. Peirce Society, and in his many editorial labors, most notably as longtime co-editor of the *Transactions of the C. S. Peirce Society: A Quarterly Journal in American Philosophy* which he, with the never failing help of Richard Robin, took over as an in-house publication and built into one of the major philosophical journals of our time. Through all of these activities he certainly has earned the Herbert Schneider Award of 1996.

Professor Hare's publications in American philosophy span a wide range of topics, including numerous clarifying articles on James's will-to-believe doctrine and a splendid Introduction to the Harvard Edition of James's *Some Problems of Philosophy*. His scholarship has range as well as depth. He has also written substantial articles (or sections of books) on Whitehead, Royce, Tillich, Hartshorne, Ducasse, Mead, Sheldon, Buchler, Dewey and Dickinson Miller. And he has written numerous valuable articles for recent and current Dictionaries, Encyclopedias, and Companions of Philosophy, pieces generally dealing with figures in American philosophy. Peter has written a good deal on American naturalism and several entries for the *Encyclopedia of Unbelief*; but it is clear that he has not entirely escaped his Puritan heritage: for him, laziness is the Unpardonable Sin.

Peter's editorial work has been far-reaching in its influence. In addition to the *Transactions* he is the editor of a series of books entitled *Frontiers of Philosophy*, one of which includes a symposium on William James. And he has edited individual books as well and was a long-term member of the Editorial Board of the *American Philosophical Quarterly*. His editorial significance lies in the fact that he has made every effort to see that all aspects of American Philosophy are given a hearing. I can think of no dimension of American Philosophy that has not been included some time or other in the *Transactions*, many written as a result of his encouraging authors to write on diverse subjects. His openness, his desire to have all sides heard, is more than an ideological commitment to pluralism but also reflects his heart-felt commitment to all democratic principles.

We all know, of course, that Peter is past president of our Society. That honor came as the result of many years of labor on every conceivable committee of the Society and his participation in organizing annual and sectional meetings, including the excellent international meeting in Buffalo, where the interest of foreign scholars in American philosophy was cheer-

ingly evident. From the day he received his Ph.D. from Columbia University he has worked tirelessly and effectively for the recognition of American philosophy.

In still another way Peter has promoted American Philosophy from his home base at SUNY at Buffalo. In the near future he will have chaired more Ph.D. committees than any other person in the history of the department, the majority of students writing their dissertations in American philosophy and who, in turn, carry on this interest in their own teaching careers. But even more impressive is the fact that he has been a member of 56 dissertation committees at Buffalo. He has sunk many baskets himself but, to his credit, he also has had an overwhelming number of assists. Peter has always been helpful to young philosophers beyond measure, whether they be friends or bare acquaintances, whether they be Buffalo students or young people he met at a convention. Helping others is not a prominent feature of our world and deserves to be honored when it assumes a large role in a scholar's life.

With his advancement of American philosophy in numerous and diverse ways no one can deny that Peter Hare richly deserves the high honor bestowed on him today by this Society, the Herbert W. Schneider Award. This award, which recognizes one's contributions and dedication to American philosophy, also has a significant moral overtone. Like most areas of life nowadays, academia is not known for its benevolence, so it is reviving and refreshing to be present when a most kindly and benevolent Peter Hare is honored – by an official award, yes, and one accompanied by overwhelming affection from the members of this Society.

*Professor Emeritus*  
*SUNY at Buffalo*



# 14

## Tribute for Peter Hare

*by Armen Marsoobian*

Peter Hare was a voice of reason in a profession, which, while ostensibly about reason, often succumbed, to preconceptions about what should count as a discourse about reason. He was fair and open minded about alternative perspectives within the discipline of philosophy. His openness to alternative voices extended well beyond the boundaries of the American and Anglo-American traditions. His fruitful contacts with philosophers from around the world have strengthened the international scope of the American philosophical tradition. As a fellow editor of a philosophy journal, I could always count on his sound advice on editorial matters and projects. He did much over the years to sustain the breadth and excellence of the *Transactions of C. S. Peirce Society*. I am sure his guiding editorial hand will be sorely missed. On a personal note, Peter had in recent years become my neighbor in Guilford, Connecticut. While our neighborly get-togethers hadn't been many, I had hoped that we'd have more opportunities in the years ahead. I will cherish the memory of sailing with Peter on Long Island Sound a couple of summers ago. Sailing on the Sound was a passion of Peter's that dated back to his youth growing up on Long Island. I am glad that I was able to share that one moment of passion with him on that lazy summer afternoon. I will miss him.



# 15

## Peter Hare—Eulogy

by John J. McDermott

Jealousy is the besetting sin of the academy, the university and the intellectual life. My friend of some forty years, Peter Hare, was singularly free of jealousy. To the contrary, magnanimity was his cardinal virtue. Peter Hare was gracious and affectionate. He showered us with generosity of spirit, of person, as directed to each of us with regard to our work, however halting that may have been and still is. I know of no one in my province of activity who has been so solicitous of the physical and medical well-being of his aged colleagues as has Peter Hare. Strikingly, this deep concern has been matched by his equivalent response to the needs of his very young colleagues, locally, nationally and internationally. His brilliant editorship of the *Transactions* has been characterized by an original and seamless blending of work by senior scholars and by those just beginning to publish. Further, he had an unerring ability to locate rich intellectual activity unknown to the traditional vetting network. Given the history of American philosophy in the national philosophical culture of approbation, that the *Transactions* is widely regarded as a mainstream journal can only be greeted with congratulatory astonishment.

By unhappy happenstance, I was the recipient of a manuscript from Peter Hare requesting a review for the *Transactions*. In an accompanying note to me he waxed excitedly about family plans for New Years Day. Within an hour I had a telephone call from Tom Alexander that Peter Hare had died in his sleep. The contrast was startling, as were the flood of recent memories from our time together in Baltimore. We shared visits to several sessions, a long, engaging lunch with the William James Society and a richly rollicking conversation at the SAAP reception.

Most telling of these memories, however, was Peter's presentation at my author-critic session. At this meeting one year ago in South Carolina, Peter Hare told a large dinner group that he had decided to emulate McDermott in telling stories as central to his person and philosophy. He did this in his paper at the Harvard conference. In Baltimore, he opened his remarks with a telling of the trumpet vine story bequeathed to him by his grandmother. It tells of the search for nectar and the importance of reaching up, reaching out and being surprised at the existence of nectar in unlikely places. This is a lovely story, and I ascertain that it occurs in what most likely was his last piece of written work. Notable as well is the fact that this essay was mostly autobiographical, for example, acknowledging his long-standing personal and philosophical affection for existentialism. Yet, he writes that never did he experience a sensibility of ontological disconnection, a theme front and center in the work of McDermott.

So however we cast this situation, disconnection from the beguiling, enthusiastic and wise personal presence of Peter Hare is our lot. We miss him, and I hope, fervently, that we never

forget his admonition to take care of those who are struggling to begin. And that transaction is exactly our task if we seek to honor his memory, as certainly we should.

*Society for the Advancement of American Philosophy*  
*March 15, 2008*



# 16

## In Honor of Peter Hare

by *Bill Myers*

I joined SAAP in 1996. The 1997 meeting was the first time I met Peter Hare. I noticed very quickly that he was a significant person to our group, but at that time, I had no idea how significant. My first rejection letter came from Peter, though it was accompanied by thoughtful, critical comments. My first real acceptance letter came from Peter, and there was a celebration that followed. When I was first starting my career, Peter was one who was always there to encourage, to goad, and, when necessary, to chastise. He encouraged me to write new pieces, to rewrite old pieces, and to expand my world. For that, I will always be grateful.

Since I was elected treasurer of SAAP, my relationship with Peter moved to a different level. At the APA that year in DC, he and I shared a single malt scotch and spent some time talking about where SAAP is and where it should be going. At that time, he mentioned that he wanted to be sure that his bequest to SAAP was used wisely, and we began to discuss a broader use of our endowment funds, given that Peter played a role in the original setup of that fund. At the meeting in South Carolina, we visited again and began to dream up the first SAAP grant program, with a promise to continue the conversations at the APA in Baltimore. On the first night of that meeting, Peter and I got together in my room, shared a nice beverage, and he shared with me his vision of where SAAP is and where he thought it needed to go. Again, he mentioned that he really wanted his bequest to SAAP to be used in appropriate ways, and we discussed those ways extensively. Our conversation continued over a wonderful seafood dinner, and on to after dinner drinks. Much was discussed.

I had no idea that Peter's bequest would come so quickly. Just a few days later, Peter died. I will never forget that evening, and the conversations that Peter and I had still live in my mind. As we all know, upon his death, Peter left us a substantial endowment fund, exactly the same fund that he was so concerned about. Peter left us with a charge to use his funds to promote pluralism, to break boundaries, and to have international concerns. And, indeed, these are the explicit goals of our grant program. I believe Peter would be pleased.

Godspeed, Peter.

*Birmingham-Southern College*



# 17

## On Peter Hare

*by David L. O'Hara*

I only met Peter once, but his career made a great difference in mine. It was when SAAP met in Birmingham a few years ago, and I was giving my first paper at a big conference. During the banquet, Peter called me over to his table to let me know he had read my paper, and that he thought it was a good one. This may seem like a small thing, but for this young philosopher it was a real shot in the arm to be noticed by Peter. It's that sort of gesture, repeated a thousand times, that makes SAAP the warm community that it is. A philosopher of his stature could have easily afforded to ignore me and my work, or to read it and to say nothing. That he read it and took the time to talk to me about it is a memory I will cherish for many years; and it's a gesture that I intend, remembering Peter, to pass on to others as often as I can.

*Augustana College*



# 18

## On Peter Hare

by *Frank Oppenheim, S.J.*

My interactions with Peter and memories of him go back at least two decades. On the chance mention of “Francis Bowen” (chair of Harvard Philosophy Department in the early 1880s) and my reply that Josiah Royce had penned a long yet unpublished review of Bowen, Peter Hare stimulated me to research that review. It led to the discovery that the so-called review had functioned, yes, as in lesser part as a review of Bowen history of modern philosophy, but for the most part, as an early drafting of much of Royce’s dissertation at the Hopkins.

On another occasion Peter was kindly but judicious enough to decline an MS I sent him because it didn’t come up to the standards of *Transactions*.

Peter was indeed a humanist, in the best sense of that term. Refined, erudite, open to vastly different temperaments and world-views, eager to help, and a true “animator” of our advancement of American Philosophy.



# 19

## A Remembrance of Peter Hare

*by Joseph T. Palencik*

My fondness for Peter developed during my time as a graduate student at The University at Buffalo. Peter was an emeritus professor at the time, but he was still active in the Department's affairs and was always willing to work with interested students. In the course of our relationship he introduced me to pragmatism and philosophical naturalism, as well as many of his influences which included Joseph Blau, Brand Blanshard, Paul Weiss, and Justus Buchler.

Peter and I worked together on many projects. We often talked about issues in contemporary epistemology and the philosophy of mind, but beyond that he was a crucial influence in developing my voice as an author. We collaborated together on a 2006 conference on the future of American philosophy held in Buffalo, NY. More significantly, Peter taught me volumes when I join *The Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society* as assistant editor.

I will always remember Peter's generosity with his time and energy. Like most of us, he was always juggling numerous responsibilities, however he would never turn down my requests to have him help on something going on. I was frequently amazed at the way others saw him. Despite his simple and affable nature, I was often taken aside by many of his long-time friends to make sure that I appreciated the deeply moral man I was working with. Peter was always too modest to enumerate the many ways he was active in support of people in philosophy. Many details, including his financial support of the *Transactions*, only became known after his passing.

As a scholar, I believe his development was quite fascinating. Peter's pluralistic tendencies can be found in his earliest writings, yet it is clear that his diverse ideas achieved unity only late in life. He was a talented essayist and insightful social critic, however given the steady progress of his thinking I suspect that his best work was yet to come. Many of his late essays reveal a far-reaching vision that brings together a wide range of human values.

One of Peter's most significant contributions came from his efforts to internationalize American philosophy. He knew a staggering array of foreign scholars, many of whom found a home in American philosophy thanks to Peter. In many ways he served as an ambassador for pragmatist thought, and it was the foreign philosophers he met who seemed to appreciate this the most. They, like many of us, were charmed by Peter's wit and ability to bring people together. I think he was most proud of this. Today American philosophy has a significant presence across the world. Dedicated scholars from Poland to Brazil to Japan work in pragmatism and naturalism. It was only a few days ago that I met one of them: a woman who

was so thankful for everything Peter had done to establish her career. American philosophy continues to grow without regard to the borders that demarcate its birth. Peter helped make this possible.



# 20

## In Memory of Peter Hare

by John Ryder

I first met Peter on a plane flying from New York City to Houston, Texas for the 1980 conference of the Society for the Advancement of American Philosophy. A paper of mine was on the program; in fact it was the first national conference at which I would present a paper. If I were not so terrified of flying in those days I would have had time to be terrified of the coming experience of standing in front of a room of philosophers who would actually be listening to what I had to say. Worse yet, the commentator on the paper was to be one Peter Hare, a distinguished philosopher from the University at Buffalo and editor of the *Transactions of the C.S. Peirce Society*, the primary professional journal in the field of the history of American philosophy. What had I done to myself?

Peter introduced himself somewhere over the eastern part of the country. Instead of expressing his upcoming delight in being able to eat me alive in public, in which so many philosophers did and still do take such pleasure, he began to talk about how interesting he found the paper. And in a way that I would learn was characteristic of Peter, he began to consider more extended possibilities of the theme and my analysis of it — had I thought about a connection with Whitehead? Doesn't my analysis of the topic leave a great deal of room for points of contact with other thinkers and traditions? — and so on in that vein. Peter's thoughtfulness and generosity of spirit in that first encounter confirmed for me that there is indeed a philosophical community in which I not only belonged but in which I could find intellectual satisfaction.

It has been my great fortune to have sustained a relationship with Peter from that day until his death. Through all those years he never stopped helping, either with advice or with new ideas for me to work on. And I soon realized that there were countless others with whom he had a similar connection. For many of us Peter was instrumental in the directions our professional lives took. That this is the case is a testament to the seriousness with which he approached his colleagues, especially younger ones who needed his guidance, and the spontaneous respect he had for philosophy and philosophers.

The study of the history of American philosophy is much richer today for Peter's influence. His supervision of the *Transactions* is only the most obvious illustration of his impact. There is any number of books and articles that would not have been published or even written without his urging and support. And in an area close to my heart, the promotion of the study of American philosophy abroad, Peter was especially instrumental. When he hosted the annual

meeting of SAAP in Buffalo in 1990 he made a point of arranging for a number of international scholars to attend. He also traveled frequently to Russia to promote the study of Peirce, naturalism, and other aspects of American philosophy.

Peter Hare was a friend and a valued colleague. Many of us are in his debt; probably many more of us than realize it. He will be missed.

*State University of New York*



# 21

Peter H. Hare

*by John R. Shook*

February 17, 2009

My remembrance of Peter Hare is quite simple, really. I will forever remember him as the person who made my career in philosophy possible. I had found pragmatism while earning my MA elsewhere, and was determined to understand Dewey in my own way. My good fortune of finding Peter Hare upon transferring to the University at Buffalo made my dissertation possible. Then Peter showed me the world of professional philosophy as it was meant to be, in the enfolding arms of that friendly academic community called the Society for the Advancement of American Philosophy. Peter was my model for doing American intellectual history, and he introduced me to many more role models for my academic career. Not surprisingly, it later dawned on me that Peter's own collegial spirit was thoroughly woven into SAAP's fine character. So too was Peter's scholarship an essential part of the entire fabric of American philosophy during the decades of his very active and long career.

Hare earned his Ph.D. at Columbia University where, from the long years of Dewey's residence to the present day, pragmatic naturalism has thrived. Among Hare's teachers were John Herman Randall, Jr., Herbert W. Schneider, and Justus Buchler, who were the inheritors of Dewey's naturalistic perspective and each a major contributor to American philosophy in general and to naturalism in particular. Other prominent graduates from Columbia University who have enriched the tradition of pragmatic naturalism with their own thought include Irwin Edman, Sidney Hook, Abraham Edel, Joseph Blau, John E. Smith, H. S. Thayer, Paul Kurtz, Joseph Margolis, Ralph Sleeper, Isaac Levi, Stephen Ross, Steven Cahn, Joseph Ransdell, Beth Singer, James Gouinlock, and Naomi Zack. The list of their students who in turn have been imbued with respect for American philosophy would run many pages; it suffices to say that at the start of new century, pragmatic naturalism flourishes as a viable and vocal alternative worldview.

A good measure of credit for this flourishing, both nationally and internationally, belongs to Peter Hare. During the recent decades of dominance by other philosophical schools, at a time when mere survival would have been sufficiently astonishing, the voice of classical American philosophy only grew more powerful. This voice had its own forum, the *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society: A Quarterly Journal in American Philosophy*, and this forum was somehow always large enough to accommodate quality scholarship on any facet of American philosophy. What other philosophy journal has ever had such an amazingly broad capacity matched to such a narrow-sounding title? Of course, the subtitle conveys its true mission; and for decades that mission was executed admirably by the *Transactions* and its primary editor, Peter Hare. Not only were the journal pages consistently open to the breadth of American

philosophy, but Hare's tireless and enthusiastic support of younger scholars and international professors enriched the study of the history of American thought beyond calculation.

A finer ambassador of American philosophy to the wider philosophical world could hardly be imagined. And the world has responded to such generosity. The numerous international communities of scholars active today, eagerly applying ideas born in America to global problems, testify to the power of so simply a thing as communication. We all owe to Peter a great debt.

*PhD Buffalo 1994*



# 22

Peter H. Hare

by Beth J. Singer

I knew Peter Hare for many years and always held him in high regard.

As a graduate student at Columbia University, he studied with Joseph Blau and Justus Buchler, both of whom I had studied with. His doctoral dissertation (supervised by Buchler) was on George Herbert Mead's metaphysics of sociality and showed a unique and thorough understanding of Mead's systematic thought.

Peter H. Hare was a much respected philosopher and an important member of the Society for the Advancement of American Philosophy, of which he was one of the founders. He was President in 1988-90, as well as a member of the Executive Committee in 1977-80 and 1988-92. In 1996 the Society presented him with the Herbert W. Schneider Award for distinguished contributions to the understanding and development of American Philosophy.

Peter was also an excellent teacher and a valued colleague. As chair of the Philosophy Department at SUNY/Buffalo, he worked with an unusually diverse faculty. Among his colleagues the one he came to work with most was Edward Madden. Hare and Madden jointly authored several books. Most importantly, Hare assisted Madden for a time editing the *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society: A Quarterly Journal in American Philosophy*. Editing the journal came to be important for him. For a number of years he was co-editor with Richard Robin, and subsequently edited it with Robin and Randall R. Dipert. (In 2002, Robin became Editor Emeritus.) The last issue that Hare co-edited was dated Winter 2008.

For several years, Hare was on the editorial board of the *Journal of Speculative Philosophy*, which was published by the Pennsylvania State University Press in affiliation with the Society for the Advancement of American Philosophy.

Peter was also an active member of the American Philosophical Association, the Metaphysical Society of America, the Charles S. Peirce Society, and the Santayana Society. He was Secretary-Treasurer of the Peirce Society in 1974, and Vice-President in 1976.

In addition to all of his other work, Peter Hare was a prolific writer. He published a great many papers and presented many at the meetings of a number of philosophical organizations.

In short, Peter H. Hare was a most distinguished philosopher, and I was privileged to know him.



# 23

## Remembering Peter Hare

*by John J. Stuhr*

In 1976, just out of graduate school at Vanderbilt, I sent my first journal submission to *The Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society*. A couple of months later, I received a form letter stating that the journal could not accept my article due to a couple of criticisms raised by the reviewers. I was crushed. The next day I received a personal letter from Peter Hare. He told me that he thought my submission showed “real originality and promise,” and he suggested how I readily might address the reviewer criticisms. Most important, he invited me to resubmit my essay. I was elated. A couple of months later, after following his good advice, I received a form letter stating that the journal had accepted my submission.

I recount this little story—I certainly had many other more personal experiences with Peter over the years in SAAP—because it captures for me the two characteristics that I always found in everything Peter did: An intellectual commitment to the highest quality and a personal commitment to the high ideals of collegiality, friendship, and dedication to others.

Higher education is, or is supposed to be a service profession—and not a self-service one. Peter Hare never forgot that. A generation or two of scholars benefited deeply from his intelligence and his dedication to others. Part of Peter’s legacy is both evidenced and extended every time they, in turn, pass this on to their colleagues and their students. It is nearly impossible to do this as well as Peter did, but those who knew him are aware of the unending value of trying. I count it as part of my entirely undeserved good fortune to have been one of those who did know him.

*Arts & Sciences Distinguished Professor of Philosophy & American Studies  
Emory University*



# 24

Peter Hare

by Griffin Trotter, M.D., Ph.D.

My first published paper appeared in the *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society* in 1994. Beyond the fact that the peer-review process and publication details were handled by Professor Hare and his staff in professional manner rarely matched by other scholarly journals (as I soon found out), I am struck in retrospect by one very special aspect of this first contact with Peter Hare: He imparted to me a sense of being a new member, warmly welcomed to his scholarly family.

Indeed, these feelings have persisted over the years. I have spent more time as an emergency physician than as an American philosopher, and published far more work as a bio-ethicist. But the sense of belonging to a community of inquiry, and the comforting surround of loyal, keenly interested mentors, have always been strongest in my activities in American philosophy.

Professor Hare is one of several great figures in the field who have helped to bestow this gift. When I met him in person, long after the publication of this first essay, Professor Hare took the time to approach me, to engage me in conversation about my current work, and – to my amazement – to discuss his ruminations about my essay for *Transactions*. He was always keen to keep me on board at *Transactions* – as peer reviewer, book reviewer, brainstormer, and so forth – despite the relative shift in my focus away from mainstream American philosophy. He never failed to recognize me – at all the deeper levels in which most of us crave recognition. For that I will always be grateful. He is sorely missed, with great fondness and admiration.

*Center for Health Care Ethics,  
Saint Louis University*



# 25

Peter Hare

by Kathleen Wallace,

I first interacted with Peter Hare when, as a fresh Ph.D., I submitted an article to the *Transactions*. He was a superb Editor, tactful and judicious in handling criticisms of the article, its revisions and eventual publication. Eventually, of course, I met Peter through SAAP and was immediately impressed by his energy and enthusiasm for American Philosophy, as well as by the catholicity of his philosophical interests. Peter was intensely curious, exceptionally well-read, always interested in seeing new work and in encouraging young scholars to develop their own voice and intellectual trajectory. (I was especially appreciative of his interest in and support for the work I did on Buchler, a figure not widely read or appreciated.) Peter always greeted one with warmth and a generosity of spirit. In philosophical exchange, even when he thought you might be on the wrong track with an idea or an argument, he had a way of commenting with a smile and a gentle nudge to maybe try another direction, or to suggest a piece that could suggest an alternative or complementary perspective. His sudden passing was a great shock and sadness to me, and I miss his presence as someone I could consult and “run an idea by.” I am deeply grateful to him for his unflagging support from my very first scholarly efforts and for his generosity to and support for SAAP. He has left a lasting and unforgettable legacy, both in the hearts and minds of everyone with whom he interacted and in the institutions where he lived, led and contributed and which he cherished as places that support and make possible the ongoing life of query.

*Professor of Philosophy,  
Hofstra University*





**Peter & Friends in Potsdam**  
*Summer 2004*

*(From left: John Ryder, Paul Thompson, Kathleen Wallace, Peter,  
Erin McKenna, Linda Campbell, Armen Marsoobian)*

This book was designed and formatted by Samantha Lipman in April of 2009. Samantha can be contacted at [SLipman407@gmail.com](mailto:SLipman407@gmail.com) or at 419.699.5415. Bembo and Gotham are the typefaces used in the edition.

---

Bembo was cut by Francesco Griffo around 1496 for use by Venetian printer Aldus Manutius. The typeface got its name from being used in a book authored by Cardinal Bembo. The iteration that we currently use was created by Stanley Morison for The Monotype Corporation in 1929.

Gotham is a family of geometric sans serif typefaces designed by American type designer Tobias Frere-Jones in 2000 for publisher Hoefler & Frere-Jones. Gotham's letterforms are inspired by a form of architectural signage that achieved popularity in the mid-twentieth century, and are especially popular throughout New York City.

*April 2009*

The Society for the Advancement of American Philosophy