

Australasian Journal of Philosophy

90TH YEAR VIRTUAL SPECIAL ISSUE

[Skip to Editorial](#) by Stewart Candlish to read further details on the selection of articles in this virtual special issue and how they represent 90 years of publishing from this leading philosophy journal.

Click on the article titles below to find out more

Vagueness

Bertrand Russell F.R.S.
Volume 1, Issue 2, 1923

Psycho-analysis and Aesthetics

J. A. Passmore
Volume 14, Issue 2, 1936

Mathematics and the World

D. A. T. Gasking
Volume 18, Issue 2, 1940

Religious Discourse and Theological Discourse

R. F. Holland
Volume 34, Issue 3, 1956

Definition by Internal Relation

Judith Jarvis
Volume 39, Issue 2, 1961

Holes

David Lewis & Stephanie Lewis
Volume 48, Issue 2, 1970

Guilt beyond Reasonable Doubt

Barbara Davidson & Robert Pargetter
Volume 65, Issue 2, 1987

John Cage's 4'33": Is it music?

Stephen Davies
Volume 75, Issue 4, 1997

Frege's Judgement Stroke

Nicholas J. J. Smith
Volume 78, Issue 2, 2000

Waitangi Tales

Robert E. Goodin
Volume 78, Issue 3, 2000

Continued on page 2

AJP NINETIETH YEAR SPECIAL ISSUE: EDITORIAL

The publisher of *Australasian Journal of Philosophy*, Taylor and Francis, suggested to me that I should put together a 'Virtual Special Issue' in celebration of the ninetieth year of the Journal's publication.

This was a daunting task, and I was duly, even unduly, daunted. I asked for advice from those associated with the Journal, was appropriately grateful for its receipt, and then found myself unwilling to take most of it. Like those of investment bankers, the memories of most philosophers stretch back no more than a generation, and the lessons of the past are soon forgotten, with consequent impoverishment. So there were many suggestions of David Lewis, and of other philosophers, like David Armstrong, John Mackie, Jack Smart, and Richard Sylvan (né Routley), whose work has shaped the recent development of philosophy in Australasia and beyond. Hardly anyone now will need reminding that their writings and discussions thereof may be found in our pages (though, before the arrival of on-line searching, it might not have been evident that the *AJP* archive contains a particularly rich selection of Arthur Prior's work from the nineteen-forties).

Eventually, I decided to make this issue resemble a standard one by including about ten articles. But how to choose them? I contemplated, but promptly abandoned as absurd, the pretension of attempting to select the best ten papers of the last ninety years. Nor have I aimed at promoting any particular cause: for example, I have not tried to provide publicity or representativeness for Australasian philosophers (the excellence—and influence—of their work speaks for itself), nor for women (ditto), nor for analytic metaphysics (most readers would know that the Journal publishes the best in that field), nor . . . Instead, I decided to try to give some indication of the *variety* of riches to be found in our archive, and then to follow my own inclinations: choosing some papers which struck me as unusual (in the sense that most present-day readers might not expect to find such material in the *AJP*), some which seemed to me to have been unjustly overlooked, and some that are my particular favourites. Wishing to overcome the fragility of memory, and the dictates of fashion, I imposed on myself but one constraint: that of time. This special issue collects papers on the following basis: one from the twenties (when we began), one from the thirties, . . . , one from the nineties . . . and even then I could not be consistent, for I have two from the noughties and then I stop.

Every journal publishes material which subsequent changes in philosophical style render inaccessible, and I was not expecting to enjoy trawling for papers sixty years and more old. I was completely wrong. Perhaps in those days before universities effectively outsourced to journal editors their decisions on appointments, promotions, tenure, and now even redundancy, many articles remained mercifully unwritten, while those which did emerge were written with more freedom, more indifference to the expected demands of committees, and were produced because their authors felt that they had *something to say*, not that they had to say *something*. But no matter what the decade, the quality of editorial judgment is evident—it is, for example, remarkable how often one can find in our pages the early papers of philosophers who were on the way to international recognition. If there is a daunting task involved in editing *AJP*, it is that of living up to the standard of one's predecessors.

Stewart Candlish