

# EVALUATING THE ANALYTIC - CONTINENTAL DIVIDE: IMPACT ON EDUCATION IN CROATIA

IVONA NOVAK

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Rijeka,  
Sveučilišna avenija 4, HR-51000 Rijeka, Croatia  
E-mail address: [ivona.novak88@gmail.com](mailto:ivona.novak88@gmail.com)



## ABSTRACT

Contemporary Western philosophy has been generally perceived as one that encompasses two divergent traditions of philosophical thought: analytic and continental. A number of writers have drawn attention to the difficulty of explaining the differences between them. A small number of authors have even questioned the credibility of the analytic-continental division. In this paper I argue that the gulf between traditions is real and has a negative impact on three elements of education in Croatia: philosophy as an academic subject, students and university professors. Before delving into the aforementioned issue, I briefly specify areas of philosophical inquiry where the gulf is the most evident. I end paper with several suppositions concerning the future path of both traditions, which are mostly based on the idea of cooperation between analytic and continental philosophers as it would profoundly contribute to the advancement of teaching philosophy.

**Keywords:** Analytic-continental divide, gulf between traditions, teaching philosophy, problem-based approach, historical approach, cooperation at an academic level.

## INTRODUCTION

One of the most debated topics in recent metaphilosophy has been the topic of analytic-continental divide (*in further text A-C*), frequently referred to as analytic-continental rift, or occasionally, schism or gulf between two traditions of philosophical thought<sup>1</sup>. It has been debated whether the gulf has existed at all, and if it has, who initiated it and when. Moreover, those who accept that the gulf had existed at some point in the history of philosophy argue among themselves whether it still exists. Finally, those who accept that it does, cannot agree on how this gulf between analytic and continental philosophy is usually manifested, i.e. where the differences between two traditions are the most apparent.

<sup>1</sup> Some authors hold that contemporary philosophy is divided into three parts: analytic, continental and history of philosophy; (see Mulligan, Simons, & Smith 2006).

Although this paper touches upon the differences between traditions, its central focus, however, is to discuss the effects of A-C divide. More precisely, it will reflect on the social dimension of the divide by discussing one area that is profoundly affected by it – teaching of philosophy in Croatian secondary schools and universities. In this vein, it will be shown that the schism between analytic and continental tradition has negative consequences for education, and therefore, should be diminished.

In order to provide the reader with better understanding of the rift, in the first section of the paper I offer rather superficial but helpful analysis of the differences between analytic and continental tradition. The second and the focal section is divided into three subsections, each examining one aspect of education affected by the divide. To illustrate the point that the gulf has negative impact on education, I will describe the existing circumstances in Croatian secondary schools and two university departments of philosophy – the department in Osijek and the department in Rijeka. I will end the paper with a proposal of a way out of this predicament by means of cooperation at the academic level.

Before turning to the task, two caveats are in order. Firstly, asserting that A-C rift still exists does not mean that none of the Croatian or foreign universities successfully combines analytic with continental thought. There are excellent ‘pluralist’ departments which demonstrate that analytic and continental philosophy can indeed reside together. That kind of coexistence is what I have in mind when arguing against the common practice in Croatian schools and universities that revolves around one approach and one tradition exclusively. Secondly, this paper is primarily preoccupied with the current practice of teaching philosophy in Croatia and the impact that A-C divide has on it. However, what will be said about the philosophy at Croatian universities can be applied to universities worldwide, while what will be said about the teaching of philosophy in secondary schools applies only to Croatia. This deviation arises from differences in the structure of the secondary education system. After completing eight years of compulsory elementary education in Croatia, one may continue secondary education in either a gymnasium<sup>2</sup> that takes four years to complete, or in a vocational school that takes three to four years, depending on the programme. Philosophy is taught in the fourth year of gymnasium and in the fourth year of school of economics, but only in the administrative course. Investigating different ways of how philosophy is incorporated in the system of secondary education in other countries and what approaches to teaching are the most preferred as well as how philosophy textbooks are structured is not a part of this paper because it would be a huge project *per se*.

## DEPICTING THE DIFFERENCES

Pinning down the differences between the analytic and continental camps is a very ambitious and arduous endeavor. At first glance, it seems that the label itself tells us a lot. The label ‘continental’ refers to the location - continental Europe to be precise, while the label ‘analytic’ refers to the method of philosophizing. Nevertheless, if we characterize two traditions in the aforementioned manner, we come across a multitude of problems.

---

<sup>2</sup> Compared to grammar schools in the United Kingdom.

First, some problems relating to the label 'continental philosophy' will be clarified. One issue is obvious: the roots of analytic tradition can also be traced to continental Europe, namely Austria. Another issue is that many analytic philosophers as well as the analytically oriented departments of philosophy come from continental Europe. For instance, the European Society for Analytic Philosophy includes the Francophone Society for Analytic Philosophy, the German Society for Analytic Philosophy, the Swiss Philosophical Society, the Croatian Society for Analytic Philosophy, Central Europe Section and many others. This also proves the case against placing analytic current exclusively in the Anglo-American language area as many authors often do. In addition, the term implies that continental philosophy has been practiced only on the European continent, but many departments of philosophy supportive of or specializing in continental philosophy are located in the United States: Boston University, Boston College, DePaul University in Chicago, Emory University (Atlanta), Loyola Marymount University and others.

The label 'analytic' can likewise be misleading. It could lead one into thinking that analysis as a method of solving philosophical problems is used solely by analytic philosophers. That point of view could have been obtained at the beginning and until the middle of the twentieth century. The pioneers of logical positivism were perceived as such due to the method they used for solving philosophical problems - analysis of concepts and propositions. Yet, throughout the twentieth century they have had very different ideas as to what analysis was. Moreover, many of them have not been practicing analysis at all. One further point is that today there is a multitude of philosophers who are trained in both traditions and who approach continental discussions with analytic precision. Therefore, we can conclude that both labels, although conventional, could easily mislead the ones who do not possess in-depth knowledge of the problem and have them arrive to false assumptions.

Instead of undertaking the task of providing necessary and sufficient conditions for classification of some author into the analytic or continental camp, this section will focus on features that are generally taken to characterize one or other tradition. It is undisputable that these features had characterized one or the other at some point over the course of the history. However, since their emergence up to now both analytic and continental tradition have experienced many modifications with respect to the issues the philosophers have been dealing with, the style in which they have been expressing themselves and historical influences they have been subjected to. It is, hence, disputable whether these features can indeed be used to describe them today or if these are just "cultural stereotypes", as Simon Critchley cleverly puts it (2001, p. 34). Due to the scope of the paper this issue will not be discussed in detail here. Instead it will move on to the characteristics that are typically said to describe the analytic philosophy<sup>3</sup>.

Analytic philosophy usually indicates the style of philosophizing that was shared by logical positivists throughout the twentieth century and remained the main feature of modern analytic thought. According to this tradition, philosophers should approach philosophical problems with the clarity and precision of exact sciences. Therefore in addressing such problems analytic philosophers make use of tools of

<sup>3</sup> For more attempts to characterize differences between analytic and continental philosophy see Babette Babich (2003), Neil Levy (2003), Kile Jones (2009), and Brian Leiter (2011a). For concise overview of continental philosophy see Simon Critchley (2001) and for more on analytic philosophy see Hans-Johann Glock (2008) or Aloysius Martinich & David Sosa (2001).

logic and language. Although pioneers of analytic thought were concerned only with certain issues, completely excluding metaphysical and ethical questions from the domain of philosophy on basis that they were meaningless, contemporary analytics are dedicated to these disciplines. Furthermore, analytic philosophy is often related to mathematics and natural sciences rather than to humanities, with regard to the method of solving problems. Analytic philosophers approach philosophy in terms of discrete problems that can be analyzed free of their historical source or context of their discussion. The term 'discrete' implies that they deal with problems regardless of how they were treated throughout the philosophical tradition by using their main tool - conceptual analysis. The point is that concepts such as perception, knowledge, causality etc. are separated into simpler parts that can be explained in order to understand them better. Philosophical problems are solved in this manner without leaving the armchair, by a priori reflection. After Willard Van Orman Quine, who questioned this way of problem solving, analytics started to use a multitude of other methods. On the whole, the focus of analytic philosophers is to resolve isolated philosophical problems by approaching them with greater rigor and clarity. Therefore, analytic philosophy manifests itself as a problem-based approach to teaching philosophy in schools and universities, and contemporary analytically oriented departments usually offer courses such as Philosophy of Mind, Philosophy of Science, Political Philosophy, Theory of Knowledge, Metaphysics, Philosophy of Religion, Philosophy of Logic, Philosophy of Mathematics, Philosophy of Language and many others.

According to S. Critchley, the bulk of philosophical thought that we often call continental tradition refers to a "disparate series of intellectual currents that could hardly be said to amount to a unified tradition. As such, Continental philosophy is an invention or, more accurately, a projection of the Anglo-American academy onto a Continental Europe" (Critchley, 2001, p. 32). While the analytic current can be directly linked to the programme of logical positivism, continental current has never made a coherent unified programme with respect to the ideas and doctrines that have been represented within it. It is therefore evident why it is almost impossible to determine the general characteristics shared by all continental philosophers. Nonetheless, for the purposes of this paper, one can state that continental philosophy, as opposed to analytic, does not access problems from the detached third person view while closely following natural sciences and mathematics but instead emphasizes the first person involvement. This applies to the existentialists in particular, who were concerned with the problem of finitude of human existence. One can say with greater certainty that the majority of continentals refuse the approach to philosophical problems via the method of natural sciences. In addition, it is sometimes argued that the continental method, as opposed to analytic, is hermeneutical because continental philosophers do not aim to solve essential philosophical problems by separating them into their constituent parts and analyzing them one by one<sup>□</sup>. Rather, they aim to understand them. To succeed in that, it is necessary to grasp them within the historical context in which these problems occur, as well as to grasp various areas in which they manifest themselves. Hence, continental philosophy is said to be contextual and historical. Also, continentals are often preoccupied with the cultural and political issues of their time and their critics since these are the conditions in which our existential problems are expressed. As for their style of writing, it is usually considered more literary and a large part of the continental writings is associated with literature and art, i.e. the humanities. In academic terms, continental philosophy is manifested as a historical

approach to teaching. Courses being offered vary from one department to other, but at a graduate level they will usually assume the name of the author they discuss (Nietzsche, Heidegger, Scheler, Foucault), the name of the discipline (Existentialism, Phenomenology, Anthropology, Social and Political Philosophy, Feminist Theory) or the name of the philosophical epoch (Modern Philosophy, 20th Century Philosophy).

## SWAYS OF THE ANALYTIC-CONTINENTAL SPLIT

This section deals with the central task of the paper. Its aim is to demonstrate that A-C divide has negatively influenced the teaching of philosophy at universities and secondary schools. There are three elements of education that have been negatively impacted by the split: philosophy as an academic subject, students (at universities and secondary schools) and university professors. A major part of this idea is built on the assumption that analytic philosophy is most frequently manifested as a problem-based approach to teaching philosophy in secondary schools and universities, while the continental is manifested as a historical approach. While these two traditions are manifested only as approach to teaching or style of teaching in Croatian secondary schools, they are also manifested through the choice of authors incorporated in the undergraduate and even more frequently graduate programme in departments of philosophy. As it will be illustrated later in this section, the programme of the analytically oriented department will incorporate authors specific to the analytic tradition, while a continentally oriented department will include those who belong to the continental tradition.

Prior to discussion of the abovementioned elements, this paper will outline the present state of philosophy in Croatian universities. This will demonstrate how far the rift between the two philosophical traditions actually goes. With respect to the existing schism, the situation that will be described is close to the one at Western universities, particularly in the U.S. and other English speaking countries. Croatian departments are frequently established as exclusively analytic or continental. Some departments successfully combine the two, usually in a way that they are focused predominantly on one tradition, but are also friendly towards the other. Yet, it should be noted that the significant difference lies in the fact that, while Croatian departments of philosophy are dominated by continental current, departments in the U.S. and other English speaking countries are mainly analytic.

Today there are six major departments of philosophy in Croatian universities: departments in Zagreb, Split, Rijeka, Osijek, Zadar and Department of Philosophy in the Centre for Croatian Studies at University of Zagreb. As it has been said, most of them are primarily continentally orientated. Predominantly analytically oriented are departments in Rijeka and Centre for Croatian Studies. Although the curriculum of a few other departments include some courses specific to the analytic tradition, it takes a lot more than that for the department to be reputed as a successful blend of analytic and continental tradition. Departments that aim to offer a combination of both, in addition to teaching about analytic authors, should also adopt a different approach to teaching philosophy - the problem-based approach. In order to realize it, departments should employ professors who were trained in this approach, since someone who has never had contact with the tradition of analytic thought will hardly be an expert in teaching students in this manner. Furthermore, it can be easily determined how well departments combine these two currents by considering their host-

ing lecturers as well as journals, associations, and universities they tend to cooperate with. Taking all this into account, analytic tradition in Croatia is overshadowed by prevailing dedication to the continental<sup>4</sup>. Now, the structure of two departments of philosophy will be briefly described - departments in Osijek and Rijeka.

The Department of Philosophy in Osijek describes its main task as “to introduce students with major argumentative thesis of history of philosophy within the problem-based approach of asking questions” where professors tend to use “the classical examples for depicting certain problems with the aim to exercise text comprehension, hermeneutic effort for a critical overview of what is set in the thinking” (Ffos.unios.hr, 2011a). This is accomplished via the following compulsory courses at the undergraduate level: Introduction to Philosophy, Ancient Philosophy, Logic, Medieval Philosophy, Gnoseology, Ontology, Aesthetics, Social Philosophy, Ethics, and Philosophy of the Modern Age (Ffos.unios.hr, 2011b). Students are introduced through these with significant figures that marked the philosophical tradition from ancient times up to the twentieth century. Although for some courses the list of additional resources includes figures such as Alfred Jules Ayer, Jeremy Bentham, John Stuart Mill or John Rawls, the description of the compulsory courses usually includes the following thinkers: Friedrich Nietzsche, Ernst Bloch, Theodor Adorno, Karl Jaspers, Martin Heidegger, Slavoj Žižek, Michel Foucault, Hans-Georg Gadamer, Max Scheler, Jean-Paul Sartre, Albert Camus, Arnold Gehlen, and other intellects of the continental tradition (Ffos.unios.hr, 2011b). Additionally, at the very end of a lengthy description of the Ontology course one can find “Ontology and understanding of the language in analytic philosophy. Atomistic theory of symbols in L. Wittgenstein. Ontological relevance of the theory of language games (Ryle, Strawson, Austin, Hintikka, etc.)” (Ffos.unios.hr, 2011b). Nevertheless, the course is predominantly devoted to studying ontological problems within the history of philosophy and continental philosophy, more specifically phenomenology and existentialism. At the graduate level students are required to take two compulsory courses in philosophy: Philosophy of Language and Philosophical Anthropology. Electives include Philosophy of History, Contemporary Philosophy, Philosophy of Education, Phenomenology and Reading Nietzsche. Students in Osijek at this level come into contact with analytic tradition through Philosophy of Language (Ludwig Wittgenstein, Gottlob Frege), and elective courses such as Contemporary philosophy I and II (Rudolf Carnap, Peter Strawson, W.V.O. Quine, Michael Dummett, Michael Devitt, Donald Davidson) (Ffos.unios.hr, 2011c). Apart from these few exceptions, the Department of Philosophy in Osijek is characterized by essentially continental philosophical climate manifested in a predominantly historical approach to the subject<sup>5</sup>.

The Department of Philosophy in Rijeka is committed to “promoting high quality teaching at the undergraduate and postgraduate level, philosophical research within the analytic tradition aiming at the highest standards of clarity, rigor and rational

<sup>4</sup> Some authors hold that contemporary philosophy is divided into three parts: analytic, continental and history of philosophy; (see Mulligan, Simons, & Smith 2006).

<sup>5</sup> One should keep in mind that programmes downloadable from the website of certain departments are often out of date. When contacting one professor from the Department of Philosophy at Osijek with the aim of verifying the credibility of the uploaded programme, a reply was sent that some course descriptions are outdated and that Department in Osijek is primarily focused on classical philosophical teachings, outside of Anglo-Saxon tradition.

argumentation, exchanges with internationally renowned philosophers and institutions" (Ffri.uniri.hr, 2014a). Students are exposed to the problem-based approach to philosophy starting at the undergraduate level. Objectives of the courses, except for the introduction to fundamental problems of philosophical periods, often include the "development of critical thinking by practicing problem-based approach through lectures, essays, discussions and debating working groups" or "development of independent and critical thinking, development of clarity and precision in oral and written presentation of philosophical arguments" (Ffri.uniri.hr, 2014b). The contrast between the Department in Rijeka and the Department in Osijek is the most evident in terms of courses offered to students at the graduate level. Courses such as Philosophy of Science, Philosophy of the Mind, and Philosophy of Politics which have reading lists including such authors as Friedman, Peter Godfrey-Smith, Carl Gustav Hempel, Thomas Kuhn, J. Rawls, Robert Nozick, and J. S. Mill appear only in the study programme of a department that leans toward an analytic view (Ffri.uniri.hr, 2014c).

The current academic state of philosophy in two departments in the region has been presented: the Department of Philosophy in Osijek and the Department of Philosophy in Rijeka. Taking into account everything that has been said so far, it can be concluded that a person who opts for studying in Osijek will receive a thoroughly different experience from a person who decides to study philosophy in Rijeka. Discussing whether the first experience would be more valuable than the other, or vice versa, would be a diversion from the original goal of this paper. The question that will be discussed in detail is the question of which elements of education are the most disadvantaged due to A-C rift and why. They are considered as follows.

## THE IMPACT ON PHILOSOPHY AS AN ACADEMIC SUBJECT

First, the paper considers the impact that the split has on the subject of philosophy taught in secondary schools and faculties. As it has been mentioned, two approaches to the subject of philosophy are predominant: problem-based and the historical approach. This split between two approaches to teaching is an effect of A-C split. That is demonstrated by the fact that analytically oriented departments of philosophy practice problem-based approach focusing on discussing specific problems of philosophical disciplines, while continentally oriented departments mostly focus on providing a historical overview of authors and disciplines. As far as secondary teaching of philosophy in Croatia is concerned, the most popular textbook in philosophy is *History of Philosophy (Povijest Filozofije)* written by Boris Kalin (2010) and it has been used for decades. The value of it lies in providing a rudimentary and concise overview of the development of philosophical thought. Unfortunately it does that at the expense of problem-based approach to the subject. Whether students in a philosophy class will ever be asked to truly think about a problem, solve it themselves, and offer argumentative explanation for their answers is a task that entirely hinges upon the teacher. In reality, what is most frequently required of students is to familiarize themselves with the philosophical views of various authors throughout the history who maintained different approaches to resolving problems

specific to a particular philosophical discipline. Finally, they are expected to offer their own assessment of these approaches and choose the one that they find most plausible. This is the so called “debate” that should be the focus of every lesson in philosophy.<sup>6</sup> Recently we notice that the textbook written by Tomislav Reškovic (2008) *Philosophy: Textbook for the 4<sup>th</sup> Year of Gymnasium (Filozofija: udžbenik filozofije za 4. razred gimnazije)* has been gaining some popularity in Croatian secondary schools. His textbook is centered primarily on the problem-based approach to philosophy, but at the expense of its historical development.

Since most teachers in secondary schools follow Kalin’s textbook that is based on the purely historical approach, continental philosophy dominates Croatian universities and the majority regards the continental tradition as “real philosophy.” Interestingly, the situation at the U. S. universities is exactly the opposite:

In the naming of academic departments for instance, it is typical to make a distinction between ‘philosophy’ and ‘history of philosophy’. This is quite ironic since this implies, strictly speaking, that only analytic philosophy is real philosophy because the department ‘philosophy’ only represents analytic philosophy. Hence, continental philosophical research is already considered to be a part of history. Similarly, for a long time now the prominent American Philosophical Association has only been interested in analytic philosophy (Vanderbeeken, 2011, p. 17).

Setting that fact aside, one will see how the state of philosophy in secondary schools and universities could be improved through the cooperation of analytic and continental philosophers, i.e. through the cooperation of problem-based and historical approach. More on that will be said in the last section of the paper.

## THE IMPACT ON STUDENTS

There are two reasons why students are disadvantaged because of the A-C split. Firstly many of them are not even aware of this split in philosophy and therefore enroll in the university completely ignorant of its philosophical department’s orientation. The second is that when studying one tradition, students often develop negative attitudes towards the other. The former reason is concerned with students in secondary schools, and the latter with students of philosophy at universities.

Unfortunately, the first is a very serious problem but its solution is quite simple and it lies in raising students’ awareness of the divide. The problem is that very few teachers of philosophy in secondary schools inform their students about the significant split in philosophy that occurred in the early twentieth century. The reason may be that the most popular textbook, *History of Philosophy*, does not explicitly mention the split

---

<sup>6</sup> The situation is very similar in the continental departments where the aforementioned goal should be apparently accomplished by introducing students to the original philosophical texts of relevant authors.



of contemporary philosophical thought (Kalin, 2010). Very few teachers actually teach philosophy beyond the scope of Kalin's textbook, while most of them uncritically follow presented material. Moreover, two lessons of philosophy per week taught only in fourth grade are not sufficient to teach students about the entire history of philosophical thought and to initiate discussion about the problem in question. Hence, it comes as no surprise that there is simply not enough space for one lecture on A-C split within the programme of philosophy. The unfortunate effect is that a huge percentage of students never learn of this division so once they enroll at the university they never become aware of the tradition which they are studying. The topic of A-C divide should be introduced as a part of the secondary school programme in philosophy to avoid this. If the only way to motivate teachers to start raising students' awareness regarding the split is to devote at least one page of the textbook to this topic, then this should be done. Perhaps it would not have a great significance for the majority of the class but it would be of crucial importance for those who intend to study philosophy. It would encourage them to skim through the study programme of the existing faculties and to opt for a philosophical approach that better fits their needs.

As noted above, the second way in which students are put into a bad position (in this case the students who are already enrolled in philosophy studies) is that while studying one tradition they often develop a negative attitude towards the other. Naturally, this happens only if they are aware of the existence of the other tradition. One reason for this might be that analytically (continentally) oriented departments usually employ professors who were educated in this tradition, and who will not enter into debate with continental (analytic) philosophers because they have nothing to say to each other seeing as they deal with different problems which they approach by using different tools. Among the philosophers of both traditions there is frequently the hidden attitude that their tradition is a superior one, while the opposite one is less valuable and should not even be called philosophy. This attitude is then passed on to students. Another reason might be that students are not given the opportunity to familiarize themselves with the other current. Even if such opportunity is provided, it occurs in the form of elective courses that are taken only by a handful of them who want to gain the experience of studying another tradition, unaware of the fact that this is rather too ambitious a task for one elective course. All that such a course can offer is only a small excerpt of what typifies analytic or continental tradition, and this often results in even greater repulsion towards the tradition in question. At the analytic department on one hand, repulsion could arise as a result of the lack of appreciation for the context of a particular philosophical problem and the lack of habit to invest huge intellectual effort while reading philosophical texts. On the other hand, at the continental department repulsion could arise due to the lack of appreciation for the method of conceptual analysis and argumentative discussion, as well as the lack of appreciation for the scientific knowledge. Faculties that aim to offer their students an adequate experience of studying both traditions should hire both analytic and continental professors. Moreover, they should organize their compulsory and not only elective courses in such a way that there is an even number of courses that incorporate areas of analytic and continental philosophy. This implies the implementation of different ways to approach the subject's materials and moving away from the routine ways of teaching. Not surprisingly, the real situation is still far from that.

## THE IMPACT ON UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

This section tackles the problem of cooperation between traditions which will be discussed in more detail at the end of the paper. Philosophical Gourmet presents the list of the premium colleges for the study of philosophy in the English speaking area. According to its rankings, the first few places are occupied by universities that are proclaimed as analytically oriented (Leiter, 2011b). These statistics may be very discouraging for continental philosophers. Furthermore, it seems that high interest in scientific discoveries and regular organization of conferences with contemporary topics in philosophy and science puts continental departments in an undesirable position. Can we thus say that continental professors are put in somewhat undesirable position since many of them focus on the history of philosophy? Most would agree that such a claim is possible only if we take the view that the features of the analytic philosophy should be a measure of good philosophy in general. Since continentals will not accept this view they probably would not feel like they lag behind the analytics.

But how does the A-C divide affect professors of philosophy negatively? This influence is evident in the form of pressure and constraints faced by professors from both divisions. The point is that the general division of departments does not leave much room for philosophers who have strong inclinations towards both traditions. When hiring, most departments pay great attention to where the person has completed their studies in philosophy, i.e. in which tradition they were educated. The post-graduate study in philosophy is not regarded as a profitable study and that only further limits the employment opportunities at universities. There is a very small chance that a person who has completed post-graduate studies in analytic philosophy will be employed by a continental philosophy department. Obviously, this is not always the case. It is possible that a continental department with strong inclinations towards analytic philosophy would hire professors from the opposite tradition or vice versa in order to provide students with the experience of studying both. However, it does not happen often. Furthermore, even if an analytic or continental professor manages to get a job in the department of the opposite orientation, his experience on the job might be uncomfortable.

An illustration of such case is the example of Richard Rorty, the controversial American pragmatist from whose biography we learn that he first studied at the University of Chicago until 1952, and then got a Ph.D. in philosophy at Yale University in 1956. Later, he taught at Wellesley College and afterwards at Princeton from 1961 to 1982. He was also a professor of humanities at the University of Virginia from 1982 to 1998 until his first retirement when he accepted to teach at Stanford as a professor of comparative literature. He retired for the second time in 2005 (Bernstein, 2007a). Someone who is not familiar with the situation in the universities of the U.S. with regard to A-C divide could think of this as just another biography of a modern philosopher. But what is thought-provoking in Rorty's case is that in the early 1970s he broke off from analytic philosophy and converted to pragmatism, which resulted in disapproval and rejection not only by his analytic colleagues at Princeton but also by analytic philosophers worldwide:

His dismissal of analytic philosophy led some of his harshest critics, including Bernard Williams of Oxford University, to write that Dr. Rorty was a relativist who believed truth was dispensable. Dr. Rorty's supporters saw an important distinction: that Dr. Rorty was carrying on the pragmatic tradition of seeing truth as something created by humans in their struggle to cope with the world around them and not simply eternal truths suddenly found by them (Bernstein, 2007b).

This is just one of the cases in which a philosopher encounters a negative criticism by his colleagues after he crosses over to the opposite philosophical camp. It is certainly an example of the harmful effect that the A-C rift has within the academic community. Yet Rorty's case does not imply that it is not possible for a philosopher to devote to both traditions simultaneously. What it does imply is that the present situation at the universities makes this very difficult by "pushing" professors in one direction and excluding the other.

## WHY COOPERATION INSTEAD OF UNIFICATION?

Nowadays many philosophers promote the idea of merger between analytic and continental factions. When discussing the idea of unification or the idea of overcoming the split between two traditions, the majority aim to achieve it in a manner that G. Gutting (2012) endorses. He maintains that bridging of the gulf could be accomplished if continental philosophers start to engage in the work of analytic philosophers and vice versa. That could be realized through the interpretation of obscure and intellectually incomprehensible continental authors with analytic clarity. But continental philosophy is not the only one that could benefit from this approach. For instance, analytic epistemology could certainly benefit from some ideas offered by major continental philosophers such as Edmund Husserl and Maurice Merleau-Ponty in the field of phenomenology. Ultimately, he says that "discussions across the divide would make for a better philosophical world" (Gutting, 2012).

Not everyone agrees that this is the best approach. Vanderbeeken (2011) argues that the unification would result in the loss of authenticity of both traditions, and the charm of philosophy that arises from the plurality of views would be gone. He believes that the unification would destroy the "soul" of these two traditions (Vanderbeeken, 2011, p. 19). Let us look more closely at the place where the danger of unification lies and why the author advocates some sort of "agonism" regarding the split, which should be understood as "situated in between mutual reciprocity and hostile controversy" (Vanderbeeken, 2011, p. 21).

[...] unificationists unilaterally aim for consensus and for comprehensive compatibility all the way down. While doing so, they neglect the negative effects of such expectancies on the production of inquiry as well as the accuracy and the revealing power of philosophical views. [...] unificationists easily tend to forget that competing views or theories often are accompanied

by psychological tensions or (hidden) political agitations that represent important relational elements. Masking them, pretending that they are negligible, often is in itself a severe form of abuse of power or authority (Vanderbeeken, 2011, p. 21).

Even though the idea of merger is *prima facie* a very plausible approach to this problem, we should definitely take into account the dangers underlying in its implementation. Bearing the threat in mind, this paper represents a diluted version of the idea which is based on the cooperation of analytic and continental thinkers. The idea of cooperation avoids the danger that the “soul” of each tradition would be lost. The cooperation of philosophers from both sides takes into consideration the “psychological tension or (hidden) political agitations” that lies behind the split, while unification does not (Vanderbeeken, 2011, p. 21). How should this cooperation be achieved? Areas where cooperation between analytic and continental philosophy should start are philosophy lessons in secondary schools and departments of philosophy at the universities. In other words, cooperation should start by combining problem-based with historical approach when teaching philosophy. So far we have seen that schools and universities usually focus on one or the other approach, depending on whether they favor the analytic or continental tradition. However, the combination of these two approaches would be the optimal solution. It goes without saying that philosophy is about asking questions, setting problems, seeking solutions and providing arguments. Philosophy teachers should be above all led by these important traits when teaching. Only after they examine students’ views regarding certain philosophical issue should they provide them with historical background. This allows students to learn that they came up with the similar solution as a number of famous thinkers much sooner before them, and it might encourage them to engage in further discussions. Although this way of teaching requires much more effort by philosophy teachers, it is certainly the best way to expose students to both philosophical traditions. As far as the departments of philosophy at the universities are concerned, undergraduate level should certainly provide a combination of analytic and continental current. Again, this could be achieved by combination of two approaches to teaching philosophy. As it has been put forward, the analytic departments often neglect the importance of the historical background and context of discussion. Students often complain that they miss this background and believe they would gain much deeper understanding of the problem if they could learn the circumstances of its emergence. Therefore, professors at analytic departments should start putting more emphasis on the history of philosophy. That will certainly clear up the complexity of certain philosophical problems to students, but preserve the analytic credo of the departments at the same time. On the other hand, continental departments should attach more importance to discussion and argumentation. Providing students solely with historical data related to certain issue in philosophy misinterprets the very idea of philosophizing. It seems that, in this case, learning *about* philosophy is being equated to *doing* philosophy when it should not. To achieve balance between learning about philosophy and actually doing philosophy, all departments should employ both analytic and continental professors.

As a final point, it is questionable whether such an approach would eventually lead to the unification of the analytic and continental traditions or if the differences between them would remain to reflect through problems (authors) analytic (continental) thinkers deal with, publications they prefer, symposia they attend, etc. However, given the danger

that may arise from unification, that is not the ultimate aim of this approach. The aim of cooperationist approach is to reduce tensions that exist between traditions that are most evident at the academic level and therefore adversely affect the teaching of philosophy.

## CONCLUSION

In this paper I have argued that A-C divide has had a negative influence on the teaching of philosophy. The underpinning of that claim is the view that A-C gulf is embodied in the existing philosophical practice and that areas of its expression can, albeit roughly, still be identified. Besides briefly investigating other areas of philosophical inquiry that have been subjected to its influence, three constituents of education have been examined in more detail: philosophy as an academic subject, students and professors. It has been shown how each of them undergoes the consequences of the divide, and cooperation between two traditions at the academic level has been suggested as the optimum solution to lessen its effects. The question that remains left open is whether cooperation could really contribute to reducing the gulf between the analytic and continental traditions or if it would only widen it.

## REFERENCES

- Babich, B. E. (2003). On the Analytic-Continental Divide in Philosophy: Nietzsche's Lying Truth, Heidegger's Speaking Language, and Philosophy. In: C. G. Prado (Ed.), *A House Divided: Comparing Analytic and Continental Philosophy* (pp. 63-103). New York: Humanity Books.
- Bernstein, A. (2007a). Richard Rorty, 75; Leading U.S. Pragmatist Philosopher. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved April 4, 2014, from <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/06/10/AR2007061001268.html>.
- Bernstein, A. (2007b). Richard Rorty, 75; Leading U.S. Pragmatist Philosopher. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved April 4, 2014, from [http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/06/10/AR2007061001268\\_2.html](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/06/10/AR2007061001268_2.html).
- Critchley, S. (2001). *Continental philosophy: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ffos.unios.hr. (2011a). *Odsjek za filozofiju* [Department of Philosophy]. Retrieved April 4, 2014, from <http://www.ffos.unios.hr/filozofija/?id=107>.
- Ffos.unios.hr. (2011b). *Odsjek za filozofiju* [Department of Philosophy]. Retrieved April 4, 2014, from <http://www.ffos.unios.hr/filozofija/?id=111>.
- Ffos.unios.hr. (2011c). *Odsjek za filozofiju* [Department of Philosophy]. Retrieved April 4, 2014, from <http://www.ffos.unios.hr/filozofija/?id=105>.
- Ffri.uniri.hr. (2014a). *Filozofski fakultet - Department of Philosophy*. Retrieved April 4, 2014, from <http://www.ffri.uniri.hr/en/departments-and-divisions/department-of-philosophy.html>.
- Ffri.uniri.hr. (2014b). *Filozofski fakultet - Department of Philosophy*. Retrieved April 4, 2014, from <http://www.ffri.uniri.hr/hr/odsjeci-i-katedre/filozofija/2-uncategorised/234-preddiplfil.html>.
- Ffri.uniri.hr. (2014c). *Filozofski fakultet - Department of Philosophy*. Retrieved April 4, 2014, from <http://www.ffri.uniri.hr/hr/odsjeci-i-katedre/filozofija/2-uncategorised/247-diplfilnast.html>.
- Glock, H.-J. (2008). *What is analytic philosophy?*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
- Grondin, J. (2000). Continental or hermeneutical philosophy: The tragedies of understanding in the analytic and continental perspectives. In: J. Sallis, & C. Scott (Eds.), *Interrogating the tradition: Hermeneutics and the history of philosophy*. (pp. 75-83). Albany: SUNY Press.

- Gutting, G. (2012). Bridging the Analytic-Continental Divide. *The New York Times*. Retrieved April 4, 2014, from <http://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/02/19/bridging-the-analytic-continental-divide/>.
- Jones, K. (2009). Analytic versus Continental Philosophy. *Philosophy Now*, 74, 8-11. Retrieved April 4, 2014, from [http://philosophynow.org/issues/74/Analytic\\_versus\\_Continental\\_Philosophy](http://philosophynow.org/issues/74/Analytic_versus_Continental_Philosophy).
- Kalin, B. (2010). *Povijest filozofije* [The History of Philosophy]. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Leiter, B. (2011a). *The Philosophical Gourmet Report 2011: Analytic and Continental Philosophy*. Retrieved April 4, 2014, from <http://www.philosophicalgourmet.com/analytic.asp>.
- Leiter, B. (2011b). *The Philosophical Gourmet Report 2011: Welcome*. Retrieved April 4, 2014, from <http://www.philosophicalgourmet.com/>.
- Levy, N. (2003). Analytic and continental philosophy: Explaining the differences. *Metaphilosophy*, 34 (3), 284-304.
- Martinich, A., & Sosa, D. (2001) *A companion to analytic philosophy*. Malden, Mass: Blackwell.
- Mulligan, K., Simons, P., & Smith, B. (2006). What's wrong with contemporary philosophy? *Topoi*, 25 (1-2), 63-67.
- Reškovic, T. (2008) *Filozofija: udžbenik filozofije za 4. razred gimnazije* [Philosophy: Textbook for the 4<sup>th</sup> Year of Gymnasium]. Zagreb: Profil.
- Vanderbeeken, R. (2011). A Plea for Agonism between Analytic and Continental Philosophy. *Open Journal of Philosophy*. 1 (1), 16-21.