

February 2007  
Volume 80, Issue 4

# Proceedings and Addresses

## of The American Philosophical Association



**apa**

THE AMERICAN  
PHILOSOPHICAL ASSOCIATION

**Central Division Program**

---

The American Philosophical  
Association  
Central Division

One Hundred Fourth  
Annual Meeting



Palmer House Hilton Hotel  
Chicago, IL

April 18 - 21, 2007

---

# ***Proceedings and Addresses of The American Philosophical Association***

*Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* (ISSN 0065-972X) is published five times each year and is distributed to members of the APA as a benefit of membership and to libraries, departments, and institutions for \$75 per year. It is published by The American Philosophical Association, 31 Amstel Ave., University of Delaware, Newark, DE 19716. Periodicals Postage Paid at Newark, DE and additional mailing offices. POSTMASTER: Send address changes to *Proceedings and Addresses*, The American Philosophical Association, University of Delaware, Newark, DE 19716.

**Editor:** David E. Schrader      **Phone:** (302) 831-1112  
**Publications Coordinator:** Erin Shepherd      **Fax:** (302) 831-8690  
**Associate Editor:** Robin Smith      **Web:** [www.apaonline.org](http://www.apaonline.org)  
**Meeting Coordinator:** Linda Smallbrook

*Proceedings and Addresses of The American Philosophical Association*, the major publication of The American Philosophical Association, is published five times each academic year in the months of September, November, January, February, and May.

Each annual volume contains the programs for the meetings of the three Divisions; the membership list; Presidential Addresses; news of the Association, its Divisions and Committees, and announcements of interest to philosophers. Other items of interest to the community of philosophers may be included by decision of the Editor or the APA Board of Officers.

Microfilm copies are available through National Archive Publishing Company, Periodicals/Acquisitions Dept., P.O. Box 998, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-0998. ([HTTP://WWW.NAPUBCO.COM](http://www.napubco.com)). Certain back issues may be obtained from the APA.

All correspondence should be sent to the APA, 31 Amstel Avenue, University of Delaware, Newark, DE 19716, directed to the appropriate staff member as follows: Erin Shepherd for inquiries and publication copy concerning programs of the Divisional meetings, general issues of the *Proceedings*, announcements, awards to members and advertising; Janet Sample for membership information, address changes, and memorial minutes; and the Executive Director for letters to the editor.

**Copyright © 2007 by The American Philosophical Association**  
**ISSN 0065-972X**

---

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

LETTER FROM THE SECRETARY-TREASURER.....	1
CENTRAL DIVISION OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES.....	9
MAIN PROGRAM .....	11
GROUP PROGRAM.....	43
MAIN AND GROUP PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS .....	65
ABSTRACTS OF COLLOQUIUM PAPERS.....	85
ABSTRACTS OF SYMPOSIUM PAPERS .....	113
SPECIAL SESSIONS SPONSORED BY APA COMMITTEES.....	121
GROUP SESSIONS.....	123
APA PLACEMENT SERVICE INFORMATION.....	127
PLACEMENT SERVICE REGISTRATION FORM.....	135
APA PLACEMENT BROCHURE .....	137
PAPER SUBMISSION GUIDELINES .....	149
DRAFT MINUTES OF THE 2006 CENTRAL DIVISION BUSINESS MEETING ...	153
DRAFT MINUTES OF THE 2006 CENTRAL DIVISION EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING .....	157
REPORT OF THE 2006-2007 NOMINATING COMMITTEE .....	161
RESULTS OF THE 2006 CENTRAL DIVISION ELECTIONS.....	163
LIST OF BOOK EXHIBITORS.....	165
LIST OF ADVERTISERS .....	167
FORMS .....	191
ADVANCE REGISTRATION FORM.....	193
HOTEL RESERVATION FORM .....	195
RECEPTION TABLE REQUEST FORM .....	197
PROGRAM SUGGESTION FORM.....	199
RESTAURANTS WITHIN A FIVE-MINUTE WALK .....	201
CHILDCARE INFORMATION.....	203
HOTEL DIAGRAMS .....	205

---

---

# LETTER FROM THE SECRETARY-TREASURER

To All Members of the Association:

You are cordially invited to attend the one hundred fourth Annual Meeting of the Central Division at the Palmer House Hilton Hotel, Chicago, Illinois, April 18-21, 2007. This year's program committee has organized an extensive array of twenty-nine Colloquium sessions, twenty-two Symposia, and two Author Meets Critics sessions. Our program also includes fourteen special sessions organized by Committees of the APA and over seventy affiliated group sessions. The Association for Symbolic Logic is meeting jointly with the Central Division, as it does every third year, and is sponsoring five sessions on the program.

This issue of the *Proceedings* contains the following items:

- 1) The complete convention program, including scheduled group meetings.
- 2) An advance registration form for individuals.
- 3) An advance registration form for departments planning to interview candidates and wishing to use the APA Placement Service.
- 4) A hotel reservation form, with information on room reservations at student rates.
- 5) A form for reserving tables at the receptions.
- 6) Minutes of the 2006 Central Division Executive Committee meeting and Business meeting, report of the 2006-2007 Nominating Committee, and results of the 2006 Central Division elections.
- 7) Maps of the hotel's location and meeting rooms.
- 8) Information forms concerning the 2008 meeting and the 2007-2008 Nominating Committee, for your use if you have suggestions for future meetings or wish to offer your services to the Division.

## **1. MEETING REGISTRATION**

Rates for registration are as follows:

APA Members	\$50
Non-Members	\$60
Student members	\$10

The Central Division rebates \$15 of the Member's and Non-Member's fee to the APA national office to support the general costs of the APA. All remaining registration income is used to support the expenses of the meeting and the operations of the Central Division. You may pre-register for the meeting by using the pre-registration information form found at the back of this issue.

---

The deadline for pre-registration is **April 7, 2007**. Payment is accepted by cash, check, or credit card.

Registration includes admission to the reception on Thursday evening; non-registrants who wish to attend this reception may purchase tickets at the Registration Desk, or at the door of the reception, for \$10. **Please note that all persons attending the convention are expected to register (this includes invited participants and participants in Group Meetings).** Registration fees are vital to the conduct of APA conventions, since convention revenues are the only source of income for the Divisions.

## 2. HOTEL INFORMATION

Most Central Division members will already be familiar with the Palmer House Hilton, a frequent location of Central (and Western) Division meetings for many decades. The Palmer House is located in the Chicago Loop, a short walk from Symphony Center and the Chicago Art Institute, among many other local attractions.

Hotel reservations should be made directly with the hotel in one of the following ways:

- *By mail:* Use the form printed in this issue of the *Proceedings*.
- *By telephone:* Call the Palmer House reservations department directly at 1-877-865-5321. Explain that you are attending the American Philosophical Association meeting. If you are a graduate student member, please indicate that you want the graduate student rate (NOTE: the National Office staff will confirm the graduate student status of all those requesting the graduate student rate).
- *Through the Internet:* Go to the Hilton's web site at <http://www.hilton.com/> and make a reservation for your preferred dates (use the 'Reservations' or 'Find a hotel' tabs). When you reach a page asking for your personal information, enter the code 'API' in the 'Group/Convention Code' box in order to get the convention rate. Please note that *reservations at the special graduate student rate cannot be made through this online link*. Graduate students must instead call 1-877-865-5231 or use the printed form.

To be assured of a room at the special convention rate, you should **act promptly**. Our convention block of rooms will be maintained by the hotel only until **March 20, 2007**. After that time, any unused rooms in the block will be released to other guests, and convention registrants may be unable to obtain the special rates or appropriate rooms. April is an extremely busy time for conventions in Chicago, and hotel rooms go fast.

## 3. GETTING TO CHICAGO AND THE HOTEL

- **Chicago Airports:** Chicago is served by O'Hare International and Chicago Midway airports. Virtually all airlines fly to O'Hare, and many also fly to Midway, which has the advantage of being closer to the Loop.
  - **Ground Transportation from O'Hare and Midway:** The most economical way to reach the hotel is the **Chicago Transit Authority** trains (fare \$1.75).
-

---

From O'Hare, take the **CTA Blue Line** from the station between Terminals 2 and 3 (follow the signs for "Trains to City"). Get off at the Monroe/Dearborn station and go east on Monroe to the hotel entrance between State and Wabash. Travel time is about forty-five minutes, and trains run every ten minutes (with reduced schedules Sunday and late at night). From Midway, the **CTA Orange Line** runs every ten minutes and will take you to the Loop in about half an hour (get off at the Adams/Wabash stop. The hotel entrance is on the west side of Wabash. A **map of the downtown area CTA routes and stations** is available from the CTA web site at <http://www.transitchicago.com/>.

• **Airport shuttle buses** to the loop are (at this writing) \$25 one way from O'Hare, \$20 one way from Midway. Buses go directly to Loop hotels, including the Palmer House. Allow an hour from Midway, an hour and a half from O'Hare (time varies considerably, especially with heavy traffic). Buses leave every ten to fifteen minutes, and return buses leave the Palmer House every half hour from the Monroe Street side. You can make advance reservations (and get a coupon for \$2 off) at <http://www.airportexpress.com/>.

• **Taxi fare** is \$35-\$40 from O'Hare, \$25 from Midway. With more than two passengers, a taxi is cheaper than the shuttle. Travel time to/from O'Hare can be under half an hour in light traffic, or an hour or more in heavy traffic (on Friday afternoon, it can exceed two hours). If you're in a hurry, a taxi is usually the fastest way to go except when traffic is at its worst, when the CTA may be fastest (provided that you are traveling with one small suitcase).

• **Accessible transportation:** The CTA stations at both Midway and O'Hare are wheelchair-accessible, but not all stations in the Loop area have elevators. The closest Blue Line stop to the Palmer House with an elevator is Jackson, two long blocks from the Palmer House at Jackson and State Streets. Please note that the entrance to the Palmer House on State Street does not have an automatic door opener. Users in wheelchairs should go to the entrances on Monroe or Wabash instead. In the Loop area, the Orange Line from Midway is on elevated tracks. The closest elevator-equipped Orange Line station is Van Buren, another long block south of the Jackson station. Call the Elevator Status Hotline at 1-888-968-7282 and press 5 to check for elevator service problems (TTY 1-888-282-8891). All CTA buses have lifts or ramps. Contact the RTA Travel Information Center at 312-836-7000 for updated information. Maps and other information are available at <http://www.transitchicago.com/maps/accessible.html>, and a brochure on accessibility is at <http://www.transitchicago.com/downloads/brochures/ada.pdf> (text version <http://www.transitchicago.com/welcome/ada.txt>).

• **Driving to Chicago:** See the Palmer House's web site at [http://www.hilton.com/en/hi/hotels/maps\\_directions.jhtml?ctyhocn=CHIPHHH](http://www.hilton.com/en/hi/hotels/maps_directions.jhtml?ctyhocn=CHIPHHH) for maps and driving directions. Valet parking is \$38 per day, self-parking \$30 per day for hotel guests.

• **Amtrak:** Amtrak trains arrive at Union Station, which is about ten blocks (some long) west on Canal between Adams and Jackson, across the

---

Chicago River. The 151 bus goes to the hotel area (stop at State and Adams). A taxi to the Palmer House is under \$10. Consult <http://www.amtrak.com> for schedules and fares.

#### 4. ACCESS TO MEETING ROOMS IN THE PALMER HOUSE

The meeting rooms for this meeting are located on floors 3-6 of the Palmer House. Please note that **there are two banks of elevators** and that **not all floors are accessible from both banks**. The main elevators, located at the back of the hotel lobby, go to all sleeping room floors. A second bank of elevators, the State Street elevators, is located to the right of the main elevators in the lobby, next to Windsor's bar. These elevators go only as far as the 10th floor. All elevators go to the lobby, the street level, and the 6th floor. For meeting rooms on the 3rd, 4th, and 5th floors, the situation is more complicated: see the explanation below (note in particular that the 3rd floor is divided into two parts, each served by only one of the banks of elevators). In the meeting program, the room for each session is followed by the floor and by an indication of which elevators can be used to access this room: 'M' for the main elevators, 'S' for the State Street elevators. If it is necessary to change from one bank of elevators to the other, this can be done at the street, lobby, and 6th floor levels.

- **Third Floor Meeting Rooms.** The 3rd floor is divided into two sections that are at different elevations, and access directly between the two sections is possible only by a short stairway. The Lower Exhibit Hall, which is in the lower part of the 3rd floor, is accessible only by the State Street elevators or by escalator from the lobby. The upper side of the floor is connected to the lower part by a short stairway. This part is accessible only via the main elevators.
- **Fourth and Fifth Floors.** The 4th floor is accessible only by the main elevators or by escalator and stairway from the lower part of the 3rd floor. The meeting rooms on the 5th floor are accessible only by the State Street elevators and by a stairway from the 4th floor.
- **Sixth Floor.** The 6th floor is accessible by means of all elevators.

#### 5. PLACEMENT SERVICE

The Placement Center will open for business at 5:00 p.m. on Wednesday, April 18, and continue in operation through Noon, Saturday, April 21 (see the Program for specific times). Job seekers are urged to pre-register for Placement by submitting the pre-registration form provided at the back of this issue. Since many job interviews are pre-arranged on the basis of advertisements in *Jobs for Philosophers (JFP)*, and since the Placement Center will not post notices of positions that have already been advertised in *JFP*, job seekers are advised to obtain copies of *JFP* in advance of the meeting and to bring them to the meeting. (*JFP* is available to APA members upon request, at no extra charge. Requests should be addressed to the APA National Office, University of Delaware, Newark, DE 19716.)

---



---

**Policy on Interviews in Sleeping Rooms.** At its 1994 meeting the APA Board of Officers adopted the policy of prohibiting job interviews in sleeping rooms at Divisional meetings. We ask your cooperation in implementing this policy. Interviews in the living rooms of suites are, of course, permissible under this policy, and interviewing departments may also make use of the Placement Center interview area in Salon 2 (within the Lower Exhibit Hall on the 3rd floor: use State Street elevators).

## **6. BOOK EXHIBITS**

The publishers' book exhibits will be open 9:00 a.m.-5:00 p.m. on Thursday and Friday and 9:00 a.m.-Noon on Saturday.

## **7. RECEPTIONS**

The reception on Thursday, April 19, will begin at 8:30 p.m. Complimentary beer and soft drinks are provided at this reception, which is open only to those who have either registered for the convention or purchased special tickets for the reception (available for \$10 both at the registration desk and at the door of the reception). The Presidential Reception on Friday, April 20, will begin at 9:00 p.m. Tickets are not required for admission to the Friday reception, and refreshments are available on a cash-bar basis. Departments that wish to reserve a numbered table at the two receptions may do so for a fee of \$25 (see the form at the back of this issue of the *Proceedings*).

## **8. BUSINESS MEETING**

The annual Business Meeting of the Central Division will be held Friday, April 20, at 12:15 p.m. Please note that only APA members who are affiliates of the Central Division have voting rights at this meeting. Regular items of business include reports from Divisional and National officers and committees and the nomination of officers for 2007-2008. The 2007 Nominating Committee will present a slate of nominees for the positions of Vice President, Member-at-Large of the Executive Committee, Secretary-Treasurer, and the four members of the 2008 Nominating Committee. The recommendations of the Nominating Committee will be posted in the registration area 24 hours prior to the Business Meeting and are also printed on page 162 of this issue of the *Proceedings*. Nominations from the floor are also accepted if proposed by a group of ten members. In accordance with Divisional rules, voting for candidates will be by mail ballot.

The Minutes of the 2006 Executive Committee Meeting and draft minutes of the 2006 Business Meeting are published in this issue of the *Proceedings*, pp. 155-161.

## **9. PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS**

President Ted Cohen will present the 2007 Presidential Address, "Stories," at 5:00 p.m. on Friday. He will be introduced by James P. Sterba, vice president of the Central Division.

---

**10. ASSOCIATION FOR SYMBOLIC LOGIC SESSIONS**

The Association for Symbolic Logic is meeting jointly with the Central Division this year. There are five ASL sessions: GI-8, II-N, IV-O, GV-13, and V-L. See the details for each session in the Main and Group Programs.

**11. GRADUATE STUDENT TRAVEL STIPEND RECIPIENTS**

As in past years, the Central Division Executive Committee awards stipends of \$300 each to help defray the travel expenses of graduate students whose papers are accepted for the program. Starting with the 2006 program, the Executive Committee has decided to provide a stipend for every graduate student whose paper is accepted. The Executive and Program Committees are pleased to announce the 17 winners of stipends for this year:

**Alexander Jech** (University of Notre Dame): "Open Duties." Paper 1 in Session I-F, 'Normative Ethical Theory' (Thursday, 1:30 p.m.)

**Kevin Sharpe** (Purdue University): "Tropes and the Zombie Argument." Paper 2 in Session I-K, 'Metaphysics of Mind' (Thursday, 1:30 p.m.)

**Jennifer Smalligan** (University of California–Berkeley): "Does Hume Hold a Dispositional Account of Belief?" Paper 3 in Session III-G, 'Locke and Hume' (Friday, 1:45 p.m.)

**Shieva Kleinschmidt** (Rutgers University): "Multilocation and Motion." Paper 1 in Session I-H, 'Ontology' (Thursday, 1:30 p.m.)

**Jennifer Lynn Wright** (University of Wyoming) and **John T. Bengson** (University of Texas–Austin): "Asymmetries in Folk Judgments of Moral Responsibility and Intentional Action." Paper 3 in Session IV-H, 'Experimental Philosophy' (Saturday, 9:00 a.m.)

**Benjamin Bayer** (University of Illinois–Urbana-Champaign): "Taking Sellarsian Holism Seriously." Paper 2 in Session II-H, 'Crossing the Analytic-Continental Divide' (Friday, 9:00 a.m.)

**Kelly Trogdon** (University of Massachusetts): "Monism and Intrinsicity." Paper 1 in Session IV-K, 'Intrinsicity' (Saturday, 9:00 a.m.)

**Salvatore Florio** (The Ohio State University): "Knowability and Cartesian Propositions." Paper 3 in Session I-I, 'Philosophy of Language I' (Thursday, 1:30 p.m.)

**Mark T. Phelan** (University of North Carolina–Chapel Hill) and **Hagop Sarkissian** (Duke University): "The Folk Strike Back; Or, Why You Didn't Do It Intentionally, Though It Was Bad and You Knew It." Paper 1 in Session IV-H, 'Experimental Philosophy' (Saturday, 9:00 a.m.)

**Joshua Thurow** (University of Wisconsin–Madison): "The A Priori Defended: A Defense of the Generality Argument." Paper 2 in Session IV-J, 'Justification' (Saturday, 9:00 a.m.)

**Sarah K. Paul** (Stanford University): "Narrative Understanding and Practical Knowledge." Paper 3 in Session III-F, 'Normative Ethics II' (Friday, 1:45 p.m.)

---

**Thomas D. Harter** (University of Tennessee): “Overcoming the Organ Shortage: The Need for Radical Reform.” Paper 3 in Session V-H, ‘Applied Ethics’ (Saturday, 2:30 p.m.)

**Thaddeus Robinson** (Purdue University): “Motion in the Whole: Spinoza’s Infinite Mode of Extension.” Paper 3 in Session V-F, ‘Spinoza’ (Saturday, 2:30 p.m.)

**Christopher Martin** (Purdue University): “Spinoza’s Definition of the Essence of a Thing.” Paper 1 in Session V-F, ‘Spinoza’ (Saturday, 2:30 p.m.)

**Nicholaos Jones** (The Ohio State University): “Resolving the Bayesian Problem of Idealization.” Paper 2 in Session III-H, ‘Philosophy of Science’ (Friday, 1:45 p.m.)

**Jennifer Neilson** (University of Texas–Austin): “Can Moral Flaws Count as Aesthetic Virtues?” Paper 1 in Session I-J, ‘Aesthetics’ (Thursday, 1:30 p.m.)

**Melissa Yates** (Northwestern University): “Does Political Liberalism Require Citizens to Split Their Identities?” Paper 3 in Session V-I, ‘Politics and Identity’ (Saturday, 2:30 p.m.)

## 12. 2008 PROGRAM COMMITTEE

Vice President James P. Sterba has appointed Ann E. Cudd (University of Kansas) as chair of the Program Committee for the 2008 Central Division Meeting. They have appointed the following members to the 2008 Program Committee: C. F. Delaney (University of Notre Dame), Sanford Goldberg (University of Kentucky), Michelle Kosch (Cornell University), Tomis Kapitan (Northern Illinois University), Thomas Senor (University of Arkansas), Nancy Snow (Marquette University), Anita Superson (University of Kentucky), Mariam Thalos (University of Utah), Thomas Tuozzo (University of Kansas), and Julie Ward (Loyola University–Chicago).

## 13. CALL FOR PAPERS, 2008

The Program Committee for 2008 invites APA members to submit papers for presentation at the one hundred fifth annual meeting, to be held in Chicago, Illinois, at the Palmer House Hilton hotel, April 18-20, 2008. The deadline for submission is **July 1, 2007**. For additional details on how and where to submit papers for consideration, see the section on Paper Submission Guidelines later in this issue.

## 14. PARTICIPATION

APA members who wish to be considered as commentators or session chairs for the 2008 meeting should use the Program Suggestion Form provided later in this issue of the *Proceedings*. The following resolution of the Central Division, adopted at the 1980 Business Meeting, will be of interest to prospective participants:

“The APA is the sole professional organization that serves and represents all American philosophers. To give better effect to the foregoing statement,

the Executive Committee of the Central Division publicly affirms its desire that the composition of its officers, committees, and programs reflect the diversity of its membership in such respects as methodology, problem area, and type of employment or institutional affiliation.”

### **15. NOMINATIONS**

The Central Division Executive Committee also invites suggestions from Central Division affiliates about appropriate candidates for Central Division offices. If you would like to propose anyone for consideration, please see the instructions in this issue of the *Proceedings*.

### **16. PROGRAM INFORMATION**

The Program of the meeting, including the main sessions organized by the APA and group sessions organized by affiliated groups, forms part of this issue. Abstracts of invited and contributed papers are also included. A limited number of copies of the Program will also be available at registration. A world-wide-web version of the Program is also available at the APA's web site, <http://www.udel.edu/apa/> (this site also includes pointers to additional sources of information on the Internet about the Chicago area). The web version may be updated periodically, as necessary, to incorporate late changes in the Program.

### **17. SPECIAL THANKS FROM THE SECRETARY-TREASURER**

I wish to acknowledge with gratitude the generous support of Texas A&M University for the Central Division office.

On behalf of the Executive and Program Committees, I extend to every member of the American Philosophical Association an invitation to take part in our One Hundred Fourth Annual Meeting.

Robin Smith

Secretary-Treasurer, APA Central Division

---

---

# CENTRAL DIVISION OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES, 2006-2007

## EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, 2006-2007

**President:** Ted Cohen

**Vice President:** James P. Sterba

**Past President:** Eleonore Stump

**Divisional Representative:** Marilyn Friedman

**Secretary-Treasurer:** Robin Smith

**Term 2004-2007:** Joan Weiner

**Term 2005-2008:** Charlotte Brown

**Term 2006-2009:** Peter van Inwagen

## PROGRAM COMMITTEE, 2007

Jenefer Robinson, *Chair*

Margaret Atherton

Eric A. Brown

Ann E. Cudd

Justin D'Arms

John M. Doris

Anne Eaton

Robert Howell

Peter Ludlow

Steven Nadler

Laura Perini

Fred Rush

Carlina Sartorio

Alan D. Schrift

Robin Smith, *ex officio*

James Tappenden

Jonathan Weinberg

## NOMINATING COMMITTEE, 2006-2007

Eleonore Stump, *Chair*

Robert Audi

Gary Ebbs

Sarah Holtman

Sally Sedgwick

---

---

# THE AMERICAN PHILOSOPHICAL ASSOCIATION

## CENTRAL DIVISION ONE HUNDRED FOURTH ANNUAL MEETING PROGRAM

**APRIL 18-21, 2007**

**PALMER HOUSE HILTON HOTEL, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS**

### **PROGRAM FOR WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON/EVENING, APRIL 18**

**PLACEMENT INTERVIEW AREA**

*5:00-10:00 p.m.*

**PLACEMENT SERVICE**

*5:00-10:00 p.m.*

**REGISTRATION**

*5:00-10:00 p.m.*

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

*7:00-11:00 p.m.*

### **PROGRAM FOR THURSDAY MORNING, APRIL 19**

**REGISTRATION**

*9:00 a.m.-7:00 p.m.*

**PLACEMENT INTERVIEW AREA**

*9:00 a.m.-7:00 p.m.*

**PLACEMENT SERVICE**

*9:00 a.m.-7:00 p.m.*

---

**BOOK EXHIBITS***9:00 a.m.-5:00 p.m.***GROUP AND COMMITTEE SESSIONS, THURSDAY MORNING**

(See Group Meeting Program for details)

**Session GI: 9:00 a.m.-Noon**

- GI-1:* American Association of Philosophy Teachers
- GI-2:* Society for Analytical Feminism
- GI-3:* International Society for Environmental Ethics
- GI-4:* North American Kant Society
- GI-5:* Society for Asian and Comparative Philosophy
- GI-6:* Society for Realist-Antirealist Discussion
- GI-7:* William James Society
- GI-8:* Association for Symbolic Logic
- GI-9:* Society for Philosophy in the Contemporary World
- GI-10:* Karl Jaspers Society of North America
- GI-11:* Hegel Society of America
- GI-12:* Association of Chinese Philosophers in America
- GI-13:* American Society for Aesthetics
- GI-14:* International Institute for Field-Being

**PROGRAM FOR THURSDAY AFTERNOON, APRIL 19****GROUP AND COMMITTEE SESSIONS, THURSDAY AFTERNOON/EVENING**

(See Group Meeting Program for details)

**Session GII: 5:15-7:15 p.m.**

- GII-1:* Society of Christian Philosophers
- GII-2:* Joint Session: APA Committee on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender People in the Profession and the Society for Lesbian and Gay Philosophy
- GII-3:* Joint Session: International Society for Environmental Ethics and Society for Philosophy and Technology
- GII-4:* Society for the Advancement of American Philosophy
- GII-5:* Conference of Philosophical Societies
- GII-6:* Association for Informal Logic and Critical Thinking
- GII-7:* Hume Society
- GII-8:* Society for the Metaphysics of Science

*GII-9:* Society for Student Philosophers

*GII-10:* North American Division of the Schopenhauer Society

*GII-11:* North American Spinoza Society

*GII-12:* North American Nietzsche Society

**Session GIII: 7:30-10:30 p.m.**

*GIII-1:* Joint Session: North American Society for Social Philosophy and Society for Philosophy and Public Affairs

*GIII-2:* Concerned Philosophers for Peace

*GIII-3:* Society for Analytical Feminism

*GIII-4:* Association for the Development of Philosophy Teaching

*GIII-5:* Philosophy of Time Society

*GIII-6:* Joint Session: Society for the Philosophy of Creativity and Society for the Study of Process Philosophy

*GIII-7:* Society for the Philosophy of History

*GIII-8:* Society for the Philosophic Study of the Contemporary Visual Arts

*GIII-9:* Society for Realist-Antirealist Discussion

*GIII-10:* Society for the Study of Ethics and Animals

*GIII-11:* Radical Philosophy Association

*GIII-12:* Society for the Study of Indian and Tibetan Buddhist Philosophy

*GIII-13:* Society for Empirical Ethics

*GIII-14:* Personalist Discussion Group

**I-A. Symposium: Philosophy and Neuroscience: Cognitive and Moral Mechanisms**

*1:30-4:30 p.m.*

Chair: Thomas W. Polger (University of Cincinnati)

Speakers: Alcino Silva (University of California–Los Angeles and National Institute of Mental Health)

“Understanding the Strategies for the Search for Cognitive Mechanisms”

John Bickle (University of Cincinnati)

“Mind-to-Molecules Reductionism and Social Cognition”

Patricia Smith Churchland (University of California–San Diego)

“Inference to the Best Decision”

Carl F. Craver (Washington University in St. Louis)

“Memory and Moral Agency: Toward a Clinical Moral Psychology”



Randy Buckner (Harvard University)  
 “Self-Projection: The Brain’s Scaffolding for  
 Remembering, Imagining, and Moral Reasoning”

### **I-B. Symposium: Does Democracy Still Work?**

*1:30-4:30 p.m.*

Chair: William McBride (Purdue University)

Speakers: Emily Zakin (Miami University)

“Rethinking ‘The Concept of the Political’ from the  
 Left”

Bonnie Honig (Northwestern University)

“Miracles and Metaphors: Toward a Pluralist Political  
 Theology”

Todd May (Clemson University)

“Democracy is Where We Make It: The Relevance of  
 Jacques Rancière”

### **I-C. Symposium: Plato on Eros**

*1:30-4:30 p.m.*

Chair: Tad Brennan (Northwestern University)

Speakers: Rachel Barney (University of Toronto)

“Eros in the *Republic*”

Rachana Kamtekar (University of Arizona)

“Eros in the *Phaedrus*”

Suzanne Obdrzalek (Claremont McKenna College)

“Eros in the *Symposium*”

### **I-D. Symposium: Rethinking Rationalism: Revising the Canon**

*1:30-4:30 p.m.*

Chair: Yitzhak Melamed (University of Chicago)

Speakers: Alan Nelson (University of North Carolina–Chapel  
 Hill)

Lisa Downing (Ohio State University)

Andrew Pyle (University of Bristol)

### **I-E. Author Meets Critics: Paul Franks, *All or Nothing: Systematicity, Transcendental Arguments, and Skepticism in German Idealism***

*1:30-4:30 p.m.*

Chair: Karl Ameriks (University of Notre Dame)

Critics: Michael Forster (University of Chicago)

Sebastian Rödl (Universität Basel)

Author: Paul Franks (University of Toronto)

**I-F. Colloquium: Normative Ethical Theory***1:30-4:30 p.m.**1:30-2:30 p.m.*

Chair: Barbara Martin (University of Illinois–Chicago)

Speaker: Alexander Jech (University of Notre Dame)  
“Open Duties”**\*\*Graduate Student Travel Stipend Winner\*\***

Commentator: Andrew Blom (University of Illinois–Chicago)

*2:30-3:30 p.m.*

Chair: Colin Klein (University of Illinois–Chicago)

Speaker: Caspar Hare (Massachusetts Institute of Technology)  
“Rationality and the Distant Needy”

Commentator: Tristram McPherson (Princeton University)

*3:30-4:30 p.m.*

Chair: Thomas L. Carson (Loyola University–Chicago)

Speaker: R. Zachary Manis (Southwest Baptist University)  
“Kierkegaard and Divine Command Theory: A Reply to Evans”

Commentator: Noel S. Adams (Marquette University)

**I-G. Colloquium: Assertion and Testimony***1:30-4:30 p.m.**1:30-2:30 p.m.*

Chair: Greg Sax (University of Michigan–Ann Arbor)

Speaker: E. J. Coffman (University of Notre Dame)  
“Assertion, Knowledge, and Justification”

Commentator: Otávio A. Bueno (University of Miami)

*2:30-3:30 p.m.*

Chair: Mark Criley (Illinois Wesleyan University)

Speaker: Edward S. Hinchman (University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee)  
“Assertion, Judgment, and Knowledge”

Commentator: Henry Jackman (York University)

*3:30-4:30 p.m.*

Chair: Ronald Loeffler (Grand Valley State University)

Speaker: Jennifer Lackey (Northern Illinois University)  
“Why Reliable Testimony Is Necessary for Testimonial Knowledge”

Commentator: Scott C. Hendricks (Clark University)

**I-H. Colloquium: Ontology***1:30-4:30 p.m.**1:30-2:30 p.m.*

Chair: Dana Lynne Goswick (University of California–Davis)

Speaker: Shieva Kleinschmidt (Rutgers University)

“Multilocation and Motion”

*\*\*Graduate Student Travel Stipend Winner\*\**

Commentator: Cody S. Gilmore (University of California–Davis)

*2:30-3:30 p.m.*

Chair: Holly Kantin (University of Wisconsin–Madison)

Speaker: Nathaniel J. Goldberg (Ohio University)

“Response-Dependence, Noumenalism, and  
Ontological Mystery”

Commentator: Ásta Sveinsdóttir (San Francisco State University)

*3:30-4:30 p.m.*

Chair: Peter Nichols (University of Wisconsin–Madison)

Speaker: Thomas Sattig (Tulane University)

“Identity in 4D”

Commentator: Elizabeth Harman (Princeton University)

**I-I. Colloquium: Philosophy of Language I***1:30-4:30 p.m.**1:30-2:30 p.m.*

Chair: Mitchell S. Green (University of Virginia)

Speaker: Christopher J. Tillman (University of Manitoba)

“Semantic Stipulation and Knowledge De Re”

Commentator: Bradley Armour-Garb (SUNY–University at Albany)

*2:30-3:30 p.m.*

Chair: Kevin Coffey (University of Michigan–Ann Arbor)

Speaker: Glen A. Hoffman (Ryerson University)

“The Semantic Theory of Truth: Field’s  
Incompleteness Objection”

Commentator: James A. Woodbridge (University of Nevada–Las Vegas)

*3:30-4:30 p.m.*

Chair: Sarah Black Jones (Northern Michigan University)

Speaker: Salvatore Florio (The Ohio State University)

“Knowability and Cartesian Propositions”

*\*\*Graduate Student Travel Stipend Winner\*\**

Commentator: John M. Collins (East Carolina University)

**I-J. Colloquium: Aesthetics***1:30-4:30 p.m.**1:30-2:30 p.m.*

Chair: Jeff Dean (Blackwell Publishing)

Speaker: Jennifer Neilson (University of Texas–Austin)  
“Can Moral Flaws Count as Aesthetic Virtues?”*\*\*Graduate Student Travel Stipend Winner\*\**

Commentator: Amy Mullin (University of Toronto–Mississauga)

*2:30-3:30 p.m.*

Chair: Amie L. Thomasson (University of Miami)

Speaker: Nicholas Diehl (University of California–Davis)  
“Fictional Narration and the Ontological Gap Debate”

Commentator: Andrew Kania (Trinity University)

*3:30-4:30 p.m.*

Chair: Carolyn W. Korsmeyer (University at Buffalo)

Speaker: William P. Seeley (Franklin & Marshall College)  
“Can Neuroaesthetics Earn Its Keep?”

Commentator: Barbara G. Montero (City University of New York)

**I-K. Colloquium: Metaphysics of Mind***1:30-4:30 p.m.**1:30-2:30 p.m.*

Chair: David Hilbert (University of Illinois–Chicago)

Speaker: Robert J. Howell (Southern Methodist University)  
“The Two-Dimensionalist Reductio”

Commentator: Brendan Murday (Ithaca College)

*2:30-3:30 p.m.*

Chair: Jonathan D. Jacobs (University of Saint Thomas)

Speaker: Kevin Sharpe (Purdue University)  
“Tropes and the Zombie Argument”*\*\*Graduate Student Travel Stipend Winner\*\**

Commentator: David Robb (Davidson College)

*3:30-4:30 p.m.*

Chair: Jason Bridges (University of Chicago)

Speaker: Alyssa Ney (University of Rochester)  
“Parsimony, Parity, and the Extended Mind Thesis”

Commentator: Steven Harris (Luther College)

**I-L. Special Session Sponsored by the APA Committee on Philosophy and Medicine: Medicine and the Pharmaceutical Industry: Ethics and Conflicts of Interest**

*1:30-4:30 p.m.*

Chair: Mark Sheldon (Northwestern University)

Speakers: Howard Brody (University of Texas Medical Branch)  
Leonard J. Weber (University of Detroit Mercy)  
Lance Stell (Davidson College)

**I-M. Joint Session Sponsored by the APA Committee on the Teaching of Philosophy and the Association for Informal Logic and Critical Thinking: Assessing Critical Thinking**

*1:30-4:30 p.m.*

Chair: David Hunter (Ryerson University)

Speakers: Robert H. Ennis (University of Illinois–Urbana-Champaign)  
“A Required Nationwide Test of Thinking for College Students in the U.S.A. Whose Institutions Receive Federal Money”  
Leo Groarke (Wilfrid Laurier University)  
“Thinking Critically about Critical Thinking Teaching”  
Don Hatcher (Baker University)  
“Comparing Standardized Critical Thinking Tests”

Commentator: Stephen Norris (University of Alberta)

**I-N. Joint Session Sponsored by the APA Committee on the Status of Women and the APA Committee on Inclusiveness: Why Are Women Only 21% of Philosophy?**

*1:30-4:30 p.m.*

Chair: Erin McKenna (Pacific Luthern University)

Speakers: Sharon Crasnow (Riverside Community College–Norco Campus)  
“What Do the Numbers Mean?”  
Elizabeth Minnich (Association of American Colleges and Universities)  
“21% of What?, Or: What Are We Getting Ourselves Into?”  
Sally Haslanger (Massachusetts Institute of Technology)  
“Changing Ideology and Culture, Not by Reason (Alone)”  
Abigail Stewart (University of Michigan)  
“What Might Be Learned from the Natural and Social Sciences?”

**RECEPTION***8:30 p.m.-Midnight***PROGRAM FOR FRIDAY MORNING, APRIL 20****REGISTRATION***9:00 a.m.-5:00 p.m.***PLACEMENT INTERVIEW AREA***9:00 a.m.-5:00 p.m.***PLACEMENT SERVICE***9:00 a.m.-5:00 p.m.***BOOK EXHIBITS***9:00 a.m.-5:00 p.m.***II-A. Symposium: Humanitarian Intervention***9:00 a.m.-Noon*

Chair: Ann E. Cudd (University of Kansas)

Speakers: Rex Martin (University of Kansas)

"Toleration and Coercive Intervention in the International Sphere"

Marilyn Friedman (Washington University in St. Louis)

"Female Terrorists and Humanitarian Interventions"

Larry May (Washington University in St. Louis)

"Genocide and Humanitarian Intervention"

**II-B. Symposium: Aesthetics and Race***9:00 a.m.-Noon*

Chair: Monique Roelofs (Hampshire College)

Speakers: Richard Shusterman (Florida Atlantic University)

*Title TBA*

Paul C. Taylor (Temple University)

*Title TBA*

Robert Gooding-Williams (University of Chicago)

"Black Aesthetics, Racial Representations, Sensibility"

Souleymane Bachir Diagne (Northwestern University)

*Title TBA*

**II-C. Symposium: Eudaimonism in Early Modern Philosophy***9:00 a.m.-Noon*

Chair: Steven Nadler (University of Wisconsin)

Speakers: Donald Rutherford (University of California–San Diego)

“Happiness, Ancient and Modern”

Lisa Shapiro (Simon Fraser University)

“Descartes’s Conception of the Human Good”

Jon Miller (Queens University)

*Title TBA***II-D. Symposium: Subjective Accounts of Reasons for Action***9:00 a.m.-Noon*

Chair: Donald Hubin (Ohio State University)

Speakers: Peter Railton (University of Michigan)

James Dreier (Brown University)

David Sobel (Bowling Green State University)

**II-E. Author Meets Critics: Mark Wilson, *Wandering Significance: An Essay on Conceptual Behaviour****9:00 a.m.-Noon*

Chair: Robert Schwartz (University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee)

Critics: Mark Richard (Tufts University)

Joseph Almog (University of California–Los Angeles)

Robert Brandom (University of Pittsburgh)

Author: Mark Wilson (University of Pittsburgh)

**II-F. Colloquium: Property and Justice***9:00 a.m.-Noon**9:00-10:00 a.m.*

Chair: Ruth Abbey (University of Notre Dame)

Speaker: Idil Boran (York University)

“Challenging Global Distributive Justice on Cosmopolitan Grounds”

Commentator: Robert Talisse (Vanderbilt University)

*10:00-11:00 a.m.*

Chair: Kyla Ebels Duggan (Northwestern University)

Speaker: Helga Varden (University of Illinois–Urbana-Champaign)

“The Failure of Nozick’s Bilateral Voluntarism”

Commentator: Matthew Zwolinski (University of San Diego)

*11:00 a.m.-Noon*

Chair: Cornelius Delaney (University of Notre Dame)

Speaker: Marc A. Cohen (George Washington University)  
 “A Rawlsian (Political) Conception of Exploitation for  
 Business Ethics ”

Commentator: Richard Buck (Mount Saint Mary’s University)

## **II-G. Colloquium: Agency and Rationality**

*9:00 a.m.-Noon*

*9:00-10:00 a.m.*

Chair: Ted A. Warfield (University of Notre Dame)

Speaker: Juan M. Comesana (University of Wisconsin-  
 Madison)  
 “Neo-Pyrrhonism, Contrastivism, and Normativity”

Commentator: Walter Sinnott-Armstrong (Dartmouth College)

*10:00-11:00 a.m.*

Chair: Brie Gertler (University of Virginia)

Speaker: Baron Reed (Northern Illinois University)  
 “Self-Knowledge and Rationality”

Commentator: Gurpreet Rattan (University of Toronto)

*11:00 a.m.-Noon*

Chair: Josh Brown (University of Michigan–Ann Arbor)

Speaker: Jennifer Nagel (University of Toronto)  
 “Practical Interests and Need for Closure in Belief  
 Formation”

Commentator: Jason Stanley (Rutgers University)

## **II-H. Colloquium: Crossing the Analytic-Continental Divide**

*9:00 a.m.-Noon*

*9:00-10:00 a.m.*

Chair: Joshua Shaw (Penn State Erie, The Behrend College)

Speaker: Scott C. Davidson (Oklahoma City University)  
 “The Scandal of Philosophy: Cavell and Levinas on  
 the Problem of Skepticism”

Commentator: Tyler Roberts (Grinnell College)

*10:00-11:00 a.m.*

Chair: Cristina Lafont (Northwestern University)

Speaker: Benjamin Bayer (University of Illinois–Urbana-  
 Champaign)  
 “Taking Sellarsian Holism Seriously”

*\*\*Graduate Student Travel Stipend Winner\*\**

Commentator: John Fennell (Grinnell College)



*11:00 a.m.-Noon*

Chair: Joseph K. Schear (California Polytechnic State University–San Luis Obispo)

Speaker: Joseph C. Berendzen (Loyola University–New Orleans)  
 “Is Coping Nonconceptual? On Merleau-Ponty, Dreyfus, and McDowell”

Commentator: Joseph Neisser (Sam Houston State University)

## **II-I. Colloquium: Themes in Kant**

*9:00 a.m.-Noon*

*9:00-10:00 a.m.*

Chair: Brandon C. Look (University of Kentucky)

Speaker: Corey Dyck (University of British Columbia)  
 “Kant’s Account of Sensibility in the Early 1770s”

Commentator: Alison Laywine (McGill University)

*10:00-11:00 a.m.*

Chair: Ian Proops (University of Michigan–Ann Arbor)

Speaker: Katherine Dunlop (Stanford University)  
 “Kant on the Content of Geometrical Concepts”

Commentator: Emily Carson (McGill University)

*11:00 a.m.-Noon*

Chair: Jeanine M. Grenberg (St. Olaf College)

Speaker: Sorin Baiasu (University of Manchester, Centre for Political Theory)  
 “Is Kant’s Moral Law Prior to the Good?”

Commentator: Tatiana Patrone (Montclair State University)

## **II-J. Colloquium: Moral Psychology**

*9:00 a.m.-Noon*

*9:00-10:00 a.m.*

Chair: Julie Kirsch (Marymount University)

Speaker: Tadeusz W. Zawidzki (George Washington University)  
 “The Function of Folk Psychology: Mind Reading or Mind Shaping?”

Commentator: Amy Kind (Claremont McKenna College)

*10:00-11:00 a.m.*

Chair: Steven E. Viner (Washington University in St. Louis)

Speaker: Scott M. James (University of Kentucky)  
 “The Caveman’s Conscience: Evolution and Moral Realism”

Commentator: Alexandra A. Plakias (University of Michigan–Ann Arbor)

*11:00 a.m.-Noon*

- Chair: Anastasia Panagopoulos (University of Minnesota)  
 Speaker: Timothy Schroeder (Ohio State University)  
 “The Neuroscience of Moral Motivation”  
 Commentator: Anthony Landreth (University of Cincinnati)

## **II-K. Colloquium: Autonomy and Choice**

*9:00 a.m.-Noon*

*9:00-10:00 a.m.*

- Chair: Noell Birondo (Pomona College)  
 Speaker: Andrea Westlund (University of Wisconsin–  
 Milwaukee)  
 “Rethinking Relational Autonomy”  
 Commentator: Ingra Schellenberg (University of Kansas)

*10:00-11:00 a.m.*

- Chair: Jennifer Caseldine-Bracht (Indiana University–Purdue  
 University Fort Wayne)  
 Speaker: Joel Anderson (Utrecht University, The Netherlands)  
 “Autonomy Gaps: Reframing the Problem of Too  
 Much Choice”  
 Commentator: Peter Brian Barry (Saginaw Valley State University)

*11:00 a.m.-Noon*

- Chair: Bradford Cokelet (Northwestern University)  
 Speaker: James M. Okapal (Missouri Western University)  
 “Comparative Choice without Comprehensive Factors”  
 Commentator: Joseph Moore (Amherst College)

## **II-L. Special Session Sponsored by the APA Committee on Philosophy and Computers: Issues in the Pedagogical Use of Computers in Philosophy**

*9:00 a.m.-Noon*

- Chair: Jerry Kapus (University of Wisconsin–Stout)  
 Speakers: Renée Smith (Coastal Carolina University)  
 “Lectures and Discussions for the Virtual Classroom”  
 Scott Chattin (Southeastern Community College)  
 “Designing Distance Philosophy Courses in a  
 Community College Setting”  
 Peter Boltuc (University of Illinois–Springfield)  
 “A Blended Argument”  
 Marvin Croy (University of North Carolina–Charlotte)  
 “Understanding the ‘No Significant Difference  
 Phenomenon’”

## II-M. Joint Session Sponsored by Committee on the Status of Women and the Committee on Inclusiveness: Celebrating Iris Marion Young: Her Life and Work

9:00 a.m.-Noon

Chair: Alison M. Jaggar (University of Colorado)

Speakers: Sandra L. Bartky (University of Illinois–Chicago)  
 “Iris Young and the Gendering of Phenomenology”  
 Anne Phillips (London School of Economics)  
 “Rethinking Responsibility: From Personal to Political”

Tanika Sarkar (Jawaharlal Nehru University (New Delhi) and University of Chicago)

“Reconfiguring Indian Histories of Gender: Some Clues from Iris Marion Young”

Martha Nussbaum (University of Chicago)  
 “Iris Young’s Last Book”

*Beginning at 11:30 a.m., following the speakers’ presentations, there will be a reception in honor of Iris Marion Young, co-sponsored by the APA Committee on the Status of Women, the National Office of the American Philosophical Association, the University of Chicago, and the University of North Carolina–Charlotte.*

## II-N. Association for Symbolic Logic

9:00 a.m.-Noon

### Topic: Directions in Logic

Speakers: Yiannis Moschovakis (University of California–Los Angeles)  
 “(Mathematical and Philosophical) Logic from Computer Science”

Rohit Parikh (City University of New York)

“Sentences, Propositions, and Logical Omniscience: What Does Deduction Tell Us?”

Richmond Thomason (University of Michigan–Ann Arbor)

“Trends in Logic: Philosophy, Linguistics, and AI”

## PROGRAM FOR FRIDAY AFTERNOON/EVENING, APRIL 20

### GROUP AND COMMITTEE SESSIONS, FRIDAY AFTERNOON/EVENING

(See Group Meeting Program for details)

#### Session GIV: 7:00-10:00 p.m.

GIV-1: North American Kant Society

GIV-2: Concerned Philosophers for Peace

- GIV-3:* Philosophy of Religion Group  
*GIV-4:* Society for Ancient Greek Philosophy  
*GIV-5:* Society for the Metaphysics of Science  
*GIV-6:* Society for the Philosophy of History  
*GIV-7:* Society for the Philosophic Study of the Contemporary Visual Arts  
*GIV-8:* International Society of Chinese Philosophy  
*GIV-9:* Karl Jaspers Society of North America  
*GIV-10:* Society for Philosophy and Technology  
*GIV-11:* Radical Philosophy Association  
*GIV-12:* Association for the Development of Philosophy Teaching  
*GIV-13:* Society for the Philosophical Study of Education  
*GIV-14:* American Society for Value Inquiry

## **BUSINESS MEETING**

*12:15-1:30 p.m.*

### **III-A. Symposium: The Metaphysics of Absolute Generality**

*1:45-4:45 p.m.*

- Chair: Carolina Sartorio (University of Wisconsin–Madison)  
 Speakers: Matti Eklund (Cornell University)  
               “The Ontological Significance of Inscrutability”  
               Agustín Rayo (Massachusetts Institute of Technology)  
               *Title TBA*  
               Gabriel Uzquiano (Oxford University)  
               *Title TBA*

### **III-B. Symposium: Recent Work in Kant’s Philosophy of Mathematics**

*1:45-4:45 p.m.*

- Chair: Robert Howell (SUNY–University at Albany)  
 Speakers: Lisa Shabel (Ohio State University)  
               Daniel Sutherland (University of Illinois–Chicago)  
 Commentator: Charles Parsons (Harvard University)

### **III-C. Symposium: Emotion and Moral Judgment**

*1:45-4:45 p.m.*

- Chair: Anne Eaton (University of Illinois–Chicago)  
 Speakers: Jesse J. Prinz (University of North Carolina–Chapel Hill)  
               “Values As Sentiments”

Shaun Nichols (University of Arizona)  
 Ron Mallon (University of Utah)  
 “Moral Rules and Moral Judgments”

Commentator: Jonathan Haidt (University of Virginia)

### **III-D. Symposium: The Philosophy of Gilles Deleuze**

*1:45-4:45 p.m.*

Chair: Alan D. Schrift (Grinnell College)

Speakers: Daniel W. Smith (Purdue University)

“Deleuze and the Theory of Thought”

Claire Colebrook (University of Edinburgh)

“Mathematics, Vitalism, and Genesis”

Leonard Lawlor (University of Memphis)

“The Generation of the Incorruptibles: Deleuze and Derrida on Animality”

### **III-E. Symposium: The Value Turn in Epistemology**

*1:45-4:45 p.m.*

Chair: Jonathan Weinberg (Indiana University–Bloomington)

Speakers: Jonathan L. Kvanvig (Baylor University)

“Further Thoughts on the Swamping Problem”

Wayne D. Riggs (University of Oklahoma)

*Title TBA*

John Greco (Saint Louis University)

“The Nature of Ability and the Purpose of Knowledge”

### **III-F. Colloquium: Normative Ethics II**

*1:45-4:45 p.m.*

*1:45-2:45 p.m.*

Chair: Anthony S. Laden (University of Illinois–Chicago)

Speaker: Peter B. M. Vranas (University of Wisconsin–Madison)

“Three Objections to Ought Implies Can”

Commentator: Michael J. Zimmerman (University of North Carolina–Greensboro)

*2:45-3:45 p.m.*

Chair: Irwin Goldstein (Davidson College)

Speaker: Steven Sverdlik (Southern Methodist University)

“The Availability of Motives”

Commentator: David Sussman (University of Illinois–Urbana-Champaign)

3:45-4:45 p.m.

Chair: Jon Garthoff (Northwestern University)

Speaker: Sarah K. Paul (Stanford University)

“Narrative Understanding and Practical Knowledge”

**\*\*Graduate Student Travel Stipend Winner\*\***

Commentator: Douglas Lavin (Harvard University)

### III-G. Colloquium: Locke and Hume

1:45-4:45 p.m.

1:45-2:45 p.m.

Chair: Margaret Atherton (University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee)

Speaker: D. Kenneth Brown (University of California–Irvine)

“Locke on Memory, Reflection, and the Structure of Complex Ideas”

Commentator: Lex Newman (University of Utah)

2:45-3:45 p.m.

Chair: David R. Cuning (University of Iowa)

Speaker: Benjamin D. Hill (University of Western Ontario)

“Formal Signs in Locke: The Simple Ideas of Substratum and Reality”

Commentator: Laura Keating (Hunter College–CUNY)

3:45-4:45 p.m.

Chair: Michael Liston (University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee)

Speaker: Jennifer Smalligan (University of California–Berkeley)

“Does Hume Hold a Dispositional Account of Belief?”

**\*\*Graduate Student Travel Stipend Winner\*\***

Commentator: David Owen (University of Arizona)

### III-H. Colloquium: Philosophy of Science

1:45-4:45 p.m.

1:45-2:45 p.m.

Chair: Victoria Rogers (Indiana University–Purdue University Indianapolis)

Speaker: Ranpal Dosanjh (University of Toronto)

“Real Laws Don’t Have Demonstrative Content”

Commentator: Christopher Pincock (Purdue University)

2:45-3:45 p.m.

Chair: Stephen Leeds (University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee)

Speaker: Nicholaos Jones (The Ohio State University)

“Resolving the Bayesian Problem of Idealization”

**\*\*Graduate Student Travel Stipend Winner\*\***

Commentator: Susan Vineberg (Wayne State University)

*3:45-4:45 p.m.*

Chair: Nick Huggett (University of Illinois–Chicago)

Speaker: Bradford Skow (University of Massachusetts–Amherst)

“The Law of Inertia”

Commentator: Doreen Fraser (University of Waterloo)

### **III-I. Colloquium: Philosophy of Language II**

*1:45-4:45 p.m.*

*1:45-2:45 p.m.*

Chair: Michael Allers (University of Michigan–Ann Arbor)

Speaker: Berit Brogaard (University of Missouri–St. Louis)  
“Donkey Sentences and Quantifier Variability”

Commentator: Jessica Rett (Rutgers University)

*2:45-3:45 p.m.*

Chair: Barbara Abbott (Michigan State University)

Speaker: Mikhail Kissine (Université Libre de Bruxelles)  
“What Is a Locutionary Act?”

Commentator: Kent Bach (San Francisco State University)

### **III-J. Colloquium: Ancient Greek Philosophy**

*1:45-4:45 p.m.*

*1:45-2:45 p.m.*

Chair: Eric A. Brown (Washington University in St. Louis)

Speaker: Jeremy Kirby (Albion College)  
“Subterranean Epistemic Blues: The Role of the  
Forms in Everyday Discourse”

Commentator: Scott Berman (Saint Louis University)

*2:45-3:45 p.m.*

Chair: Robin Smith (Texas A&M University)

Speaker: Margaret E. Scharle (Reed College)  
“Aristotle’s Synchronic Justification of Prime Matter”

Commentator: Russell M. Dancy (Florida State University)

*3:45-4:45 p.m.*

Chair: Constance Meinwald (University of Illinois–Chicago)

Speaker: Casey Perin (University of Massachusetts)  
“Substantial Universals in Aristotle’s *Categories*”

Commentator: Allan Silverman (Ohio State University)

**III-K. Special Session Sponsored by the APA Committee on Philosophy in Two-Year Colleges: What Graduate Students Need to Know about the Community College Job and Job Market**

*1:45-4:45 p.m.*

- Speakers: Bill Hartmann (St. Louis Community College–Forest Park College)  
 Colleen Burns (Harper College)  
 Holly Graff (Oakton Community College)  
 David Zacker (Elgin Community College)

**III-L. Special Session Sponsored by the APA Committee on the Status of Asian and Asian-American Philosophers and Philosophies: Virtue in Traditional Chinese Thought**

*1:45-4:45 p.m.*

- Chair: Chang-Seong Hong (Minnesota State University–Moorhead)
- Speakers: Aaron Stalnaker (Indiana University)  
 “Virtue as Mastery in Early Chinese Thought”  
 Steve Coutinho (Muhlenberg College)  
 “Is Daoist Virtue without Humanity?”  
 Justin Tiwald (San Francisco State University)  
 “Virtue Ethics, Neo-Confucianism, and the Problem of Moralizing the Human Good”
- Commentator: Amy Olberding (University of Oklahoma)

**III-M. Special Session Sponsored by the APA Committee on Hispanics: Philosophy and Immigration**

*1:45-4:45 p.m.*

- Speaker: Ofelia Schuette (University of South Florida)  
 “Immigration and the Ethics of Care in a North/South Context”
- Commentator: Sheryl Ross (University of Wisconsin–La Crosse)
- Speaker: Peter Higgins (University of Colorado–Boulder)  
 “Open Borders and the Right to Immigration: The Moral and Political Salience of Social Location”
- Commentator: Steven Tammelleo (Lake Forest College)
- Speaker: Jorge Valadez (Our Lady of the Lake University)  
 “Immigration and the Global Labor Market”
- Commentator: Bernardo Cantens (Barry University)



### **III-N. Special Session Sponsored by the APA Committee on Public Philosophy: Public Scholarship and Civic Engagement across the Disciplines**

*1:45-4:45 p.m.*

Chair: Harry Brod (University of Northern Iowa)

Speakers: Michael Brintnall (Executive Director, American Political Science Association)

“Building a Public Presence—The American Political Science Association”

Gerald Graff (University of Illinois—Chicago)

“The University Is Popular Culture But Doesn’t Know It Yet—The Modern Language Association”

James Grossman (Vice President for Research and Education, The Newberry Library)

“Widening the Channel of History—The American Historical Association”

Lawrence R. Frey (University of Colorado—Boulder)

“Communication Activism as Engaged Scholarship—The National Communication Association”

Noelle McAfee (George Mason University)

“Notes from a Public Philosopher: The American Philosophical Association”

#### **PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS**

*5:00-6:00 p.m.*

Introduction: James P. Sterba (University of Notre Dame)

Speaker: Ted Cohen (University of Chicago)

“Stories”

#### **PRESIDENTIAL RECEPTION**

*9:00 p.m.-Midnight*

## **PROGRAM FOR SATURDAY, APRIL 21**

#### **REGISTRATION**

*9:00 a.m.-Noon*

#### **PLACEMENT INTERVIEW AREA**

*9:00 a.m.-3:00 p.m.*

#### **PLACEMENT SERVICE**

*9:00 a.m.-Noon*

**PLACEMENT QUIET INTERVIEW SPACE***9:00 a.m.-3:00 p.m.***BOOK EXHIBITS***9:00 a.m.-Noon***GROUP SESSIONS, SATURDAY MORNING**

(See Group Meeting Program for details)

**Session GV: 10:00 a.m.-3:00 p.m.***GV-14: Journal of the History of Philosophy***IV-A. Symposium: Group Intentions***9:00 a.m.-Noon*

Chair: Bennett W. Helm (Franklin &amp; Marshall College)

Speakers: Michael E. Bratman (Stanford University)

*Title TBA*

Deborah Tollefsen (University of Memphis)

"The Phenomenology of Joint Agency"

Abraham Roth (Ohio State University)

*Title TBA***IV-B. Symposium: Thinking with Models: Analogical Reasoning in Science***9:00 a.m.-Noon*

Chair: Laura Perini (Virginia Tech University)

Speakers: Nancy J. Nersessian (Georgia Institute of Technology)

"Representation-Building in Analogy"

Cameron Shelley (University of Waterloo)

*Title TBA*

Commentator: Andrea Woody (University of Washington)

**IV-C. Symposium: Philosophical Consequences of Dynamic Logic***9:00 a.m.-Noon*

Chair: Sam Cumming (Rutgers University)

Speakers: Jeroen Groenendijk (University of Amsterdam)

Martin Stokof (University of Amsterdam)

Anthony Gillies (University of Michigan–Ann Arbor)

Commentator: Christopher Gauker (University of Cincinnati)

**IV-D. Symposium: Feminist Meta-Ethics***9:00 a.m.-Noon*

Chair: Samantha Brennan (University of Western Ontario)

Speakers: Alison M. Jaggar (University of Colorado)

*Title TBA*

Anita Superson (University of Kentucky)

“Standards of Rationality and Moral Worth”

Chrisoula Andreou (University of Utah)

“Defective Desires”

**IV-E. Symposium: Imagination, Empathy, and the Arts***9:00 a.m.-Noon*

Chair: Jenefer Robinson (University of Cincinnati)

Speakers: Tamar Szabo Gendler (Yale University)

“Empathic Imagination and Imaginative Empathy”

Gregory Currie (University of Nottingham)

“Photography, Imagination, and a (New) Problem of Imaginative Resistance”

Kendall Walton (University of Michigan–Ann Arbor)

“Empathy and Imagination: Understanding the Alien and the Inanimate”

**IV-F. Colloquium: Nineteenth Century Philosophy***9:00 a.m.-Noon**9:00-10:00 a.m.*

Chair: Katie Terezakis (Rochester Institute of Technology)

Speaker: Dalia T. Nassar (Universität Tübingen)

“The Absolute and Politics: The Case of the German Romantics”

Commentator: Pauline Kleingeld (Leiden University, The Netherlands)

*10:00-11:00 a.m.*

Chair: Stephen Watson (University of Notre Dame)

Speaker: Joseph J. Westfall (University of Houston–Downtown)

“Barren of Wisdom: Kierkegaard’s Socratic Maieutic”

Commentator: David K. O’Connor (University of Notre Dame)

*11:00 a.m.-Noon*

Chair: Michael Depaul (University of Notre Dame)

Speakers: Ben Eggleston (University of Kansas)

Dale E. Miller (Old Dominion University)

“India House Utilitarianism”

Commentator: Wendy Donner (Carleton University)

#### **IV-G. Colloquium: Derrida**

*9:00 a.m.-Noon*

*9:00-10:00 a.m.*

Chair: Tina Chanter (DePaul University)

Speaker: Marie-Eve Morin (University of Winnipeg)  
 “The Community of Witnesses: Derrida Inheriting  
 Husserl and Blanchot”

Commentator: Ann V. Murphy (Fordham University)

*10:00-11:00 a.m.*

Chair: Penelope Deutscher (Northwestern University)

Speaker: Samir Haddad (Fordham University)  
 “Why Not ‘Fraternity to Come’? An Instability in  
 Derrida’s Politics of Friendship”

Commentator: Russell Ford (Elmhurst College)

*11:00 a.m.-Noon*

Chair: Richard A. Lee, Jr. (DePaul University)

Speaker: Maurice Hamington (University of Southern Indiana)  
 “An Ethic of Hospitality: Derrida and U.S. Immigration  
 Policy”

Commentator: Kenneth Itzkowitz (Marietta College)

#### **IV-H. Colloquium: Experimental Philosophy**

*9:00 a.m.-Noon*

*9:00-10:00 a.m.*

Chair: Joshua Knobe (University of North Carolina–Chapel  
 Hill)

Speakers: Mark T. Phelan (University of North Carolina–Chapel  
 Hill)

Hagop Sarkissian (Duke University)

“The Folk Strike Back; Or, Why You Didn’t Do It  
 Intentionally, Though It Was Bad and You Knew It”

*\*\*Graduate Student Travel Stipend Winner\*\**

Commentator: Thomas Nadelhoffer (Dickinson College)

*10:00-11:00 a.m.*

Chair: Joshua Knobe (University of North Carolina–Chapel  
 Hill)

Speaker: Eric Wiland (University of Missouri–St. Louis)  
 “Intentional Action and ‘in Order to’”

Commentator: Andrei A. Buckareff (Franklin & Marshall College)

11:00 a.m.-Noon

Chair: Joshua Knobe (University of North Carolina–Chapel Hill)

Speakers: Jennifer Lyn Wright (University of Wyoming)  
John T. Bengson (University of Texas–Austin)  
“Asymmetries in Folk Judgments of Moral Responsibility and Intentional Action”

**\*\*Graduate Student Travel Stipend Winner\*\***

Commentator: Liane Young (Harvard University)

#### **IV-I. Colloquium: Descartes and Spinoza**

9:00 a.m.-Noon

9:00-10:00 a.m.

Chair: Charles Hueneman (Utah State University)

Speaker: Andrew D. Youpa (Southern Illinois University–Carbondale)  
“Spinoza’s Modal Monism”

Commentator: Syliane Malinowski-Charles (Temple University)

10:00-11:00 a.m.

Chair: Laurence Carlin (University of Wisconsin–Oshkosh)

Speaker: Raffaella De Rosa (Rutgers University–Newark)  
“Descartes’s Causal Principle and Its Alleged Similarity Condition”

Commentator: Geoffrey A. Gorham (University of Wisconsin–Eau Claire)

11:00 a.m.-Noon

Chair: Clyde Ragland (Saint Louis University)

Speaker: Shoshana R. Smith (Colgate University)  
“A Critique of Gewirth on Clarity and Distinctness”

Commentator: Georges Dicker (State University of New York–Brockport)

#### **IV-J. Colloquium: Justification**

9:00 a.m.-Noon

9:00-10:00 a.m.

Chair: Joe R. Salerno (Saint Louis University)

Speaker: Marc A. Alspector-Kelly (Western Michigan University)

“Avoiding Accidents: Justification Internalism and Knowledge Externalism”

Commentator: Sanford Goldberg (University of Kentucky)

10:00-11:00 a.m.

Chair: Joshua Alexander (Indiana University)

Speaker: Joshua Thurow (University of Wisconsin–Madison)  
“The A Priori Defended: A Defense of the Generality Argument”

**\*\*Graduate Student Travel Stipend Winner\*\***

Commentator: David Henderson (University of Memphis)

11:00 a.m.-Noon

Chair: Gerald Vision (Temple University)

Speaker: Peter Murphy (University of Indianapolis)  
“The Justification Scale”

Commentator: Jared G. Bates (Hanover College)

#### **IV-K. Colloquium: Intrinsicity**

9:00 a.m.-Noon

9:00-10:00 a.m.

Chair: Joshua Filler (University of Wisconsin–Madison)

Speaker: Kelly Trogdon (University of Massachusetts)  
“Monism and Intrinsicity”

**\*\*Graduate Student Travel Stipend Winner\*\***

Commentator: Nick Treanor (Brown University and Trent University)

10:00-11:00 a.m.

Chair: James John (University of Toronto)

Speaker: Neil E. Williams (University at Buffalo)  
“Intrinsic Powers”

Commentator: Jennifer McKittrick (University of Nebraska–Lincoln)

#### **IV-L. Special Session Sponsored by the APA Committee on Philosophy and Computers: Improving the Control of Technology: Contributions of Philosophy and Social Science**

9:00 a.m.-Noon

Chair: Marvin Croy (University of North Carolina–Charlotte)

Speaker: Helen Nissenbaum (School of Law, New York  
University)

“Websearch Privacy in a Liberal Democracy: The  
Case of *TrackMeNot*”

Commentator: Michael Kelly (University of North Carolina–Charlotte)

Speaker: Ned Woodhouse (Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute)

“Toward a Political Philosophy of Information  
Technology”

Commentator: Andrew R. Light (University of Washington)

**IV-M. Special Session Sponsored by the APA Committee on the Status of Asian and Asian-American Philosophers and Philosophies: Mereology and Reduction**

*9:00 a.m.-Noon*

Chair: Amy Olberding (University of Oklahoma)

Speakers: Peter van Inwagen (University of Notre Dame)  
“The Self and Its Part”

Carl Gillett (Illinois Wesleyan University)

“Ontological Reduction in the Philosophy of Science and Buddhism”

Chang-Seong Hong (Minnesota State University–Moorhead)

“Reduction and the Buddhist Mereology”

Commentator: Mark Siderits (Illinois State University)

**IV-N. Special Session Sponsored by the APA Committee on Blacks in Philosophy: Philosophical Perspectives on the “War on Terror”**

*9:00 a.m.-Noon*

Chair: Charles Mills (University of Illinois–Chicago)

Speakers: J. Angelo Corlett (San Diego State University)  
“Terrorism as a Human Right”

Tomis Kapitan (Northern Illinois University)

“Reality and Rhetoric in the War on Terror”

Rodney C. Roberts (East Carolina University)

“The American Value of Fear and the Indefinite Detention of Terrorist Suspects”

Mohammed Abed (University of Wisconsin–Madison)

“Complicity, ‘Human Shields’, and the ‘War on Terror’”

**IV-O. Association for Symbolic Logic**

*9:01 a.m.-12:01 p.m.*

**Topic: Invited Speakers**

Speakers: John Baldwin (University of Illinois–Chicago)  
“Model Theory in Perspective”

Steffen Lempp (University of Wisconsin–Madison)

“ $\aleph_0$ -Categorical Theories: Model Completeness, Axiomatizations, and Computational Complexity”

## SATURDAY AFTERNOON, APRIL 21

### GROUP AND COMMITTEE SESSIONS, SATURDAY AFTERNOON

(See Group Meeting Program for details)

#### Session GV: 12:15-2:15 p.m.

- GV-1:* Association for the Advancement of Philosophy and Psychiatry
- GV-2:* American Society for Philosophy, Counseling, and Psychotherapy
- GV-3:* International Association for the Philosophy of Sport
- GV-4:* Society for Student Philosophers
- GV-5:* Society for the Philosophical Study of Education
- GV-6:* Joint Session: Society for Business Ethics and Adam Smith Society
- GV-7:* American Society for Value Inquiry
- GV-8:* Society for the Study of Indian and Tibetan Buddhist Philosophy
- GV-9:* North American Nietzsche Society
- GV-10:* Committee on Institutional Cooperation
- GV-11:* Joint Session: History of Early Analytic Philosophy Society and Bertrand Russell Society
- GV-12:* Society for the Philosophical Study of Marxism
- GV-13:* Association for Symbolic Logic

#### V-A. Symposium: Grice and Game Theory

2:30-5:30 p.m.

Chair: Peter Ludlow (University of Michigan–Ann Arbor)

Speakers: Patrick N. Grim (SUNY–Stony Brook University)

*Title TBA*

Prashant Parikh (University of Pennsylvania)

*Title TBA*

Brian Skyrms (University of California–Irvine)

“Evolution of Inference and Conversational Implicature”

Robert van Rooij (University of Amsterdam)

“Playing with Quantity”

Nicholas Asher (University of Texas–Austin)

*Title TBA*

#### V-B. Symposium: Picture Perception

2:30-5:30 p.m.

Chair: Susan L. Feagin (Temple University)

Speakers: Mark Rollins (Washington University in St. Louis)



“Knowing Art When You See It: How  
Representational Categories Are Recognized”

Barbara Tversky (Stanford University)

“How Graphics Communicate”

John Kulvicki (Dartmouth College)

*Title TBA*

Vilaynur Ramachandran (University of California–San  
Diego)

*Title TBA*

### **V-C. Symposium: Mental Health and Well-Being**

*2:30-5:30 p.m.*

Chair: John M. Doris (Washington University in St. Louis)

Speakers: Valerie Tiberius (University of Minnesota)

“What If Reflection Makes Us Miserable? Living Well  
and the Need for Compromise”

Daniel M. Haybron (Saint Louis University)

“Doubts about the Pursuit of Happiness”

Robert L. Woolfolk (Rutgers and Princeton  
Universities)

“Psychotherapy, Self-Knowledge, and the Pursuit of  
Happiness”

### **V-D. Symposium: Memorial Session for Robert Solomon**

*2:30-5:30 p.m.*

Speakers: Richard Schacht (University of Illinois–Urbana-  
Champaign)

Jesse J. Prinz (University of North Carolina–Chapel  
Hill)

David Sherman (University of Montana)

Joanna Ciulla (University of Richmond)

Frithjof Bergmann (University of Michigan–Ann  
Arbor)

### **V-E. Colloquium: Democracy**

*2:30-5:30 p.m.*

*2:30-3:30 p.m.*

Chair: Francis Beckwith (Baylor University)

Speaker: Christopher F. Zurn (University of Kentucky)

“Deliberative Majoritarianism and the Paternalism  
of Judicial Review: Assessing Waldron’s Formal  
Argument from Democracy”

Commentator: Bernard Jackson (Washington and Lee University)

3:30-4:30 p.m.

Chair: Steven W. Patterson (Marygrove College)

Speaker: Steven F. Geisz (University of Tampa)

“Deliberative, Democracy, Bargaining, and What Doesn’t Get Said”

Commentator: Michaela Mueller (University of Arizona)

4:30-5:30 p.m.

Chair: Jeremy Samuel Neill (Saint Louis University)

Speaker: Christopher King (Vanderbilt University)

“What Can Be Said for Democratic Obedience?  
Some Thoughts about Epistemic Proceduralism”

Commentator: Christopher A. Pynes (Western Illinois University)

## V-F. Colloquium: Spinoza

2:30-5:30 p.m.

2:30-3:30 p.m.

Chair: Debra Nails (Michigan State University)

Speaker: Christopher Martin (Purdue University)

“Spinoza’s Definition of the Essence of a Thing”

*\*\*Graduate Student Travel Stipend Winner\*\**

Commentator: Tammy Nyden-Bullock (Grinnell College)

3:30-4:30 p.m.

Chair: Edwin Curley (University of Michigan)

Speaker: Mary Krizan (University of Colorado–Boulder)

“Conception, Deception, and Reflection: Spinoza on  
Finite Modes”

Commentator: Eugene J. Marshall (University of Wisconsin–  
Madison)

4:30-5:30 p.m.

Chair: Martin T. Lin (University of Toronto)

Speaker: Thaddeus Robinson (Purdue University)

“Motion in the Whole: Spinoza’s Infinite Mode of  
Extension”

*\*\*Graduate Student Travel Stipend Winner\*\**

Commentator: Ronald L. Sandler (Northeastern University)

## V-G. Colloquium: Metaethics

2:30-5:30 p.m.

2:30-3:30 p.m.

Chair: David A. Merli (Franklin & Marshall College)

Speaker: Brad Majors (University of Wisconsin–Madison)

“New Foundations for Moral Particularism”

Commentator: Elizabeth Tropman (Colorado State University)

*3:30-4:30 p.m.*

Chair: Neil Delaney (Georgetown University)

Speaker: Allen Thompson (Clemson University)  
"Neurathian Ethical Naturalism"

Commentator: Mark LeBar (Ohio University)

*4:30-5:30 p.m.*

Chair: David Shoemaker (Bowling Green State University)

Speaker: Patricia A. Marino (University of Waterloo)  
"Why Unification? Michael Smith's Rationalism and  
the Normative Status of Coherence"

Commentator: Mark van Roojen (University of Nebraska–Lincoln)

### **V-H. Colloquium: Applied Ethics**

*2:30-5:30 p.m.*

*2:30-3:30 p.m.*

Chair: Eugene Heath (State University of New York–New Paltz)

Speaker: Paul Dunn (Brock University)  
"Gratitude, Ingratitude, and the Gifts of Tainted  
Donors"

Commentator: Anne Barnhill (New York University)

*3:30-4:30 p.m.*

Chair: Nicholas F. Stang (Princeton University)

Speaker: Robert F. Card (State University of New York–Oswego)  
"Moral Prescriptions: Conscientious Objection and  
Emergency Contraception"

Commentator: Kimberly J. Leighton (Tufts University)

*4:30-5:30 p.m.*

Chair: Mary Simmerling (MacLean Center for Clinical  
Medical Ethics, University of Chicago)

Speaker: Thomas D. Harter (University of Tennessee)  
"Overcoming the Organ Shortage: The Need for  
Radical Reform"

*\*\*Graduate Student Travel Stipend Winner\*\**

Commentator: Jason R. Kawall (Colgate University)

### **V-I. Colloquium: Politics and Identity**

*2:30-5:30 p.m.*

*2:30-3:30 p.m.*

Chair: John Brunero (University of Missouri–St. Louis)

Speaker: David Lefkowitz (University of North Carolina–  
Greensboro)

“Secession, Group Self-Determination, and the Right Not to Associate”

Commentator: Colleen Murphy (Texas A&M University)

*3:30-4:30 p.m.*

Chair: Michael Monahan (Marquette University)

Speaker: Kevin M. Graham (Creighton University)

“The Extraordinary Concept of Race: Hardimon on Race and Racialism”

Commentator: Michael Hardimon (University of California–San Diego)

*4:30-5:30 p.m.*

Chair: Kenneth E. Shockley (University at Buffalo)

Speaker: Melissa Yates (Northwestern University)

“Does Political Liberalism Require Citizens to Split Their Identities?”

*\*\*Graduate Student Travel Stipend Winner\*\**

Commentator: Johanna Meehan (Grinnell College)

## **V-J. Colloquium: Phenomenology, Meaning, and Ethics**

*2:30-5:30 p.m.*

*2:30-3:30 p.m.*

Chair: Gary M. Gutting (University of Notre Dame)

Speaker: Mark Gedney (Gordon College)

“Ricœur and the Ethical Shape of Remembering and Forgetting”

Commentator: Daniel M. Price (University of Houston, Honors College)

*3:30-4:30 p.m.*

Chair: David T. Vessey (University of Chicago)

Speaker: Pol Vandavelde (Marquette University)

“Articulation as the Condition for the Ideality of Meaning in Husserl”

Commentator: Sebastian Luft (Marquette University)

*4:30-5:30 p.m.*

Chair: Kirk Wolf (Delta College)

Speaker: Michael Feola (University of California–Berkeley)

“Hegel and Liberalism: Notes on the Dialectic of Right”

Commentator: Michael Morris (University of Notre Dame)

**V-K. Special Session Sponsored by the APA Committee on International Cooperation: Korea Today: Anticipating the 2008 World Congress**

*2:30-5:30 p.m.*

Chair: Arthur Falk (Western Michigan University)

Speakers: Wonsup Jung (Seoul National University and Visiting Scholar, Purdue University)

“Democratic Will Formation in Korea”

Julie H. Yoo (Lafayette College)

“Feminism in Korean Philosophy”

**V-L. Association for Symbolic Logic**

*2:30-5:30 p.m.*

**Topic: Contributed Papers (to be announced)**

**V-M. Special Session Sponsored by the APA Committee on Pre-College Instruction in Philosophy: Integrating Philosophy into the K-12 Curriculum**

*2:30-5:30 p.m., Cresthill Room (3rd Floor (M))*

Chair: Rafael Francisco Rondon (Resurrection Catholic School–Memphis)

Speakers: Carlos Rodriguez (Center for Talented Youth, Johns Hopkins University)

Steven Goldberg (Oak Park and River Forest High Schools, Chicago)

---

# GROUP MEETING PROGRAM

## GROUP SESSION GI: THURSDAY, APRIL 19, 9:00 A.M.-NOON

### GI-1. American Association of Philosophy Teachers

9:00 a.m.-Noon

**Topic: Open Forum: Supporting the Teaching of Philosophy in Two-Year and Four-Year Settings of Higher Education**

Panelists: Betsy Newell Decyk (California State University–Long Beach)  
Donna Engelmann (Alverno College)  
John Wager (Triton College)  
Nancy Slonneger Hancock (Northern Kentucky University)

*Everyone is welcome. Please come to share your ideas and suggestions about collaborations and communities of practice that will support and enhance the teaching of philosophy.*

### GI-2. Society for Analytical Feminism

9:00 a.m.-Noon

Chair: Jennifer Faust (California State University–Los Angeles)  
Speaker: Zahra Meghani (University of Rhode Island)  
“Using the Lens of Feminist Epistemology to Illuminate the Relationship between Technologies and Values”  
Commentator: Inmaculada De Melo-Martin (Weill Medical College of Cornell University)  
Speaker: Nancy Bauer (Tufts University)  
“What’s So Bad about Objectification?”  
Commentator: Anne Barnhill (New York University)  
Speaker: Gabrielle Benette Jackson (Harvard University)  
“Should Feminists Be Behaviorists?”  
Commentator: Evelyn Brister (Rochester Institute of Technology)

*A brief business meeting will follow the session.*

### GI-3. International Society for Environmental Ethics

9:00 a.m.-Noon

Speakers: Piers Stephens (Michigan State University)  
“William James and Environmental Philosophy: Transcending Dewey-Eyed Managerialism”

---

Zev Trachtenberg (University of Oklahoma)  
 “The View from Jean-Jacques’s Tree: What  
 Environmentalism Should Avoid in Rousseau”

#### **GI-4. North American Kant Society**

*9:00 a.m.-Noon*

- Chair: Sharon Anderson-Gold (Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute)
- Speaker: Andrew Janiak (Duke University)  
 “Nonsense and Things in Themselves”
- Commentator: Jennifer Uleman (State University of New York–Purchase College)
- Speaker: Konstantin Pollok (Stanford University and University of South Carolina)  
 “On the Common Ground of Kant’s Imperatives”
- Commentator: Timothy Rosenkoetter (New York University)

*There will be a short business meeting at the beginning of this session.*

#### **GI-5. Society for Asian and Comparative Philosophy**

*9:00 a.m.-Noon*

##### **Topic: Indian Philosophy and Buddhism: Questions, Assumptions, and Possibilities**

- Chair: J. N. Mohanty (Temple University)
- Speakers: Bina Gupta (University of Missouri–Columbia)  
 “How Is Indian Philosophy Different from Western Philosophy?”
- Gene G. James (University of Memphis)  
 “Can the Doctrine of Karma Provide an Adequate Answer to the Problem of Evil?”
- Nona R. Bolin (Memphis College of Art)  
 “Skillful Devices: Indirection and Upaya”
- Commentator: J. N. Mohanty (Temple University)

#### **GI-6. Society for Realist-Antirealist Discussion**

*9:00 a.m.-Noon*

##### **Topic: Saving the Differences: Moral Realism and the Quasi-Realist Challenge**

- Speakers: Raymond Anthony (University of Alaska)  
 “Quasi-Realism’s Convergence with Moral Realism”
- Brian Coleman (Central Michigan University)  
 “Quasi-Realism and Reductionism”
- Thomas Gardner (Muhlenberg College)  
 “Quasi-Realism and Truth as Coherence”

Shin Kim (Central Michigan University)  
 “Are Moral Facts Adequate to Explain Events in the World?”

Daniel E. Palmer (Kent State University–Trumbull)  
 “Deflating Quasi-Realism: Moral Explanation and Moral Realism”

### **GI-7. William James Society**

*9:00 a.m.-Noon*

#### **Topic: Revisiting “The Will to Believe”**

Chair: Robert Talisse (Vanderbilt University)

Speakers: Guy Axtell (University of Nevada–Reno)

“Jamesian Pluralism, Reconsidered”

Scott Aikin (Vanderbilt University)

“Evidentialism and James’s Argument from Friendship”

James Bednar (University of Alabama–Huntsville)

“Waiting Till Doomsday”

Commentator: Cheryl Misak (University of Toronto)

### **GI-8. Association for Symbolic Logic**

*9:00 a.m.-Noon*

#### **Topic: Contributed Papers (To be announced)**

### **GI-9. Society for Philosophy in the Contemporary World**

*9:00 a.m.-Noon*

#### **Topic: Enactivism versus Reductivism in Philosophy of Mind**

Chair: Ralph D. Ellis (Clark Atlanta University)

Speakers: Natika Newton (Nassau Community College)

“The Action Theory of Intentionality and Consciousness”

John Bickle (University of Cincinnati)

“Ruthless Reductivism and Extended Mind Arguments”

Nicholas Georgalis (East Carolina University)

“The Necessity and Irreducibility of First-Person Concepts for a Theory of Mind”

Ralph D. Ellis (Clark Atlanta University)

“Action, Self-organization, and the Compatibility of Nonreductive Physicalism with Causal Closure”



**GI-10. Karl Jaspers Society of North America***9:00 a.m.-Noon*

Chair: Michael Zank (Boston University)

Speakers: Hartwig Wiedebach (University of Zurich and  
Stuttgart Media University)

“Pure Will versus Causality in Hermann Cohen”

Lydia Patton (University of Chicago)

“Ideas in History, Ideas in Opposition: Hermann  
Cohen and Völkerpsychologie”**GI-11. Hegel Society of America***9:00 a.m.-Noon*

Chair: John McCumber (University of California–Los Angeles)

Speakers: Robert Bernasconi (University of Memphis)

*Title TBA*

Ardis Collins (Loyola University–Chicago)

“Religion, Nationality, and Diplomacy”

Robert R. Williams (University of Illinois–Chicago)

“Hegel’s True Infinite”

Andrew Buchwalter (University of North Florida)

“Hegel’s Conception of the State as an ‘Earthly-  
Divinity’”**GI-12. Association of Chinese Philosophers in America***9:00 a.m.-Noon*

Chair: Peimin Ni (Grand Valley State University)

Speakers: Jessie Jia Chen (University of Illinois–Urbana-  
Champaign)“Embodied Perception, Expression, and History: An  
Examination of Maurice Merleau-Ponty’s Aesthetic  
Theory of Painting”

Brian J. Bruya (Eastern Michigan University)

“On the Absence of an Anti-Confucian Polemic in the  
Guodian Laozi”

Haiming Wen (Renmin University of China)

“Meaning and Naming: Chinese Relational Creativity”

**GI-13. American Society for Aesthetics***9:00 a.m.-Noon***Topic: Topics in Portraiture**

Chair: Angela Curran (Carleton College)

Speakers: Cynthia Freeland (University of Houston)

“Can There Be Portraits of Animals?”

Peg Brand (Indiana University–Indianapolis)  
“Posing (in) Portraits”

Commentator: Diana Tietjens Meyers (University of Connecticut)

#### **GI-14. International Institute for Field-Being**

*9:00 a.m.–Noon*

Chair: Elizabeth F. Cooke (Creighton University)

Speakers: Marilyn Fischer (University of Dayton)  
“Addams and Mead on Fostering the International Mind”

Stanley M. Harrison (Marquette University)  
“Royce’s Community: A Field of Infinite Meaning”

Matthew Flamm (Rockford College)  
“Community as Belonging: The Moral Reach of Dewey’s Social Philosophy”

### **GROUP SESSION GII: THURSDAY, APRIL 19, 5:15-7:15 P.M.**

#### **GII-1. Society of Christian Philosophers**

*5:15-7:15 p.m.*

**Topic: The Kenneth Konyndyk Memorial Lecture**

Chair: James Swindal (Duquesne University)

Speaker: Lambert Zuidervaart (Institute for Christian Studies)  
“Truth and Interpretation: Science, Religion, and Culture”

Commentator: Lee Hardy (Calvin College)

*Reception following.*

#### **GII-2. Joint Session Sponsored by the Society for Lesbian and Gay Philosophy and the APA Committee on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender People in the Profession**

*5:15-7:15 p.m.*

**Topic: Recent Topics in LGBT Philosophy**

Chair: Richard Mohr (University of Illinois–Urbana-Champaign)

Speakers: Andy Wible (Muskegon Community College)  
“What Moral Obligations Does the LGBT Community Have to People with HIV/AIDS in 2007?”

Carol Quinn (Colorado State University)  
“Who Makes a Dance Queer?”

Gary Jaeger (University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee)  
“The Rationality of Coming Out”

**GII-3. Joint Session Sponsored by the International Society for Environmental Ethics and the Society for Philosophy and Technology**

5:15-7:15 p.m.

**Topic: Do GMOs Help Us Anticipate Issues in Nanotechnology? An Author Meets Critics Session on Paul B. Thompson's *Food Biotechnology in Ethical Perspective*, 2nd Edition**

Critics: Fritz Allhoff (Western Michigan University)  
Jennifer Kuzma (University of Minnesota)  
Ronald L. Sandler (Northeastern University)  
Vivian Weil (Illinois Institute of Technology)

Author: Paul B. Thompson (Michigan State University)

**GII-4. Society for the Advancement of American Philosophy**

5:15-7:15 p.m.

**Topic: Peace, Politics, and Pragmatism**

*Speakers TBA*

**GII-5. Conference of Philosophical Societies**

5:15-7:15 p.m.

Chair: G. John M. Abbarno (D'Youville College)

Speaker: G. John M. Abbarno (D'Youville College)  
"Philosophical Value of Philosophical Societies"

**GII-6. Association for Informal Logic and Critical Thinking**

5:15-7:15 p.m.

Chair: Peter D. Asquith (Michigan State University)

Speakers: Daniel Cohen (Colby College)  
"Virtue Epistemology and Critical Inquiry: Open-Mindedness and a Sense of Proportion As Critical Virtues"

Patrick Riesterer (McMaster University)

"Pragma-Dialectics: A Critique"

**GII-7. Hume Society**

5:15-7:15 p.m.

**Topic: Hume's Ethics**

Chair: Karánn Durland (Austin College)

Speakers: Charlotte Brown (Illinois Wesleyan University)  
William E. Morris (Illinois Wesleyan University)

**GII-8. Society for the Metaphysics of Science***5:15-7:15 p.m.***Topic: Mechanistic Understanding in the Sciences**

- Speakers: Ernan McMullin (University of Notre Dame)  
 “Inferring to Things Unobserved: Historical Notes”
- Jonathan Waskan (University of Illinois–Urbana-Champaign)  
 “Modeling Counterfactual Interventions”

**GII-9. Society for Student Philosophers***5:15-7:15 p.m.*

- Speakers: Kaplan Hasanoglu (University of Iowa)  
 “The Excluded Middle of Precision: A Critique of Epistemic Scientific Realism”
- Robby Newman (Ohio State University)  
 “How Hurka’s Theory of Attitudinal Worth Explains the Intrinsic Value of Rationality”
- Eric James Morelli (Emory University)  
 “The Relativity of Absolute Spirit: Nature, Spirit and Phenomenology in Husserl’s *Ideas*”
- Arsalan Memon (SUNY–Stony Brook University)  
 “Human Flesh Becoming-Animal Meat in Aristotle, Merleau-Ponty, and Deleuze”

**GII-10. North American Division of the Schopenhauer Society***5:15-7:15 p.m.*

- Chair: David E. Cartwright (University of Wisconsin–Whitewater)
- Speakers: David Netherton (University of Wales)  
 “Naturalism, Epistemology, Metaphysics: Naturalism and the Transcendental Turn in Schopenhauer and Husserl”
- Lucian Krukowski (Washington University in St. Louis)  
 “Dying after Eighty”

**GII-11. North American Spinoza Society***5:15-7:15 p.m.*

- Chair: Joe Van Zandt (Independent Scholar)
- Speaker: Gordon Hull (Iowa State University)  
 “Framing Spinoza’s Nominalism”
- Commentator: Richard N. Manning (Carleton University)

**GII-12. North American Nietzsche Society***5:15-7:15 p.m.*

Chair: Jacqueline Scott (Loyola University–Chicago)

Speakers: Morgan Rempel (University of Southern Mississippi)  
“Daybreak 72: Nietzsche, Epicurus, and the After Death”Bryan Finken (University of Colorado–Denver)  
“Nietzsche versus the Genetic Fallacy”**GROUP SESSION GIII: THURSDAY, APRIL 19, 7:30-10:30 P.M.****GIII-1. Joint Session Sponsored by the North American Society for Social Philosophy and the Society for Philosophy and Public Affairs***7:30-10:30 p.m.***Topic: Feminist Perspectives on Injustice**

Chair: Lisa H. Schwartzman (Michigan State University)

Speakers: Claudia Card (University of Wisconsin–Madison)  
“Injustices, Evils, and Oppression”Hye-Ryoung Kang (University of Nevada–Reno)  
“A Feminist Perspective on Non-Ideal Theory of Injustice in a Global Context”Eva Feder Kittay (SUNY–Stony Brook University)  
“Disability as Paradigm: Young’s Embracing Conception of Justice”Theresa Tobin (Marquette University)  
“Identity, Context and Power: Feminist Contributions to Moral Reasoning in a Global Context”**GIII-2. Concerned Philosophers for Peace***7:30-10:30 p.m.***Topic: Terrorism, Human Rights, and Nonviolence**

Chair: Mary Lenzi (University of Wisconsin–Platteville)

Speakers: Gail M. Presbey (University of Detroit Mercy)  
“Gandhi’s Debate with Aurobindo and Others about the Use of Terror Acts in India’s Independence Movement”Michael Brown (University of Minnesota)  
“Fighting Fire with Water: Democracy and Inclusion as a Response to Terrorism”Bart Gruzalski (Pacific Center for Sustainable Living)  
“A Nonviolent Solution to Terrorism”

Richard T. Peterson (Michigan State University)  
 “Human Rights and the Politics of Terrorism”

### **GIII-3. Society for Analytical Feminism**

7:30-10:30 p.m.

Chair: Anne Barnhill (New York University)

Speakers: Alice D. Dreger (Feinberg School of Medicine,  
 Northwestern University)

“Why Changing Sex Is Easier Than Changing  
 Medicine: An Insider’s View of the Intersex Rights  
 Movement”

Ellen K. Feder (American University)

“‘Love, Too, Has to Be Learned’: Recasting the  
 Ethical Questions in the Treatment of Disorders of  
 Sex Development”

Georgia Warnke (University of California–Riverside)

“Intersexuality and Identity”

### **GIII-4. Association for the Development of Philosophy Teaching**

7:30-10:30 p.m.

#### **Topic: Arguments for Intangibles**

Chair: Robert Lichtenbert (Editor, *The Meaning of Life*)

Speakers: Robert Lichtenbert (Editor, *The Meaning of Life*)

“Revised Platonic Arguments for Intangibles”

Michael M. Kazanjian (Triton College)

“Human Factors Engineering Supports Intangibles”

Eugene Muhammed (Triton College)

“Tangential Intangibles: Conversations and  
 Tergiversations on Paul’s Love and Derrida’s Death”

### **GIII-5. Philosophy of Time Society**

7:30-10:30 p.m.

Chair: Cheryl Fitzgerald (Western Michigan University)

Speakers: David Sanson (Ohio State University)

“The Essentially Unreal Past”

David P. Hunt (Whittier College)

“Against Chronogeometrical Fatalism”

David Schenk (Messiah College)

“A New Phenomenological Defense of the Static  
 Theory of Time”

**GIII-6. Joint Session: Society for the Philosophy of Creativity and Society for the Study of Process Philosophy**

7:30-10:30 p.m.

Chair: Stephen H. Bickham (Mansfield University)

Speaker: Douglas R. Anderson (Southern Illinois University–Carbondale)

“Fear and Loathing in Las Vegas: Creativity Americana”

Commentators: Crispin Sartwell (Dickinson College)  
John Cogan (Eckerd College)

**GIII-7. Society for the Philosophy of History**

7:30-10:30 p.m.

Speakers: Alejandro Vallega (California State University–Stanislaus)

“Unbounded History: Spirit Beyond and Towards Hegel”

David G. Stern (University of Iowa)

“The Messiah’s Task: Agamben on the State of Exception and ‘Perfect Messianism’”

Athena Coleman (Grand Valley State University)

“The Traumogenic Event: Freudian Views of History and Violence”

**GIII-8. Society for the Philosophic Study of the Contemporary Visual Arts**

7:30-10:30 p.m.

Chair: Sander H. Lee (Keene State College)

Speakers: Dan Flory (Montana State University)

“Race, Film Noir, and the Challenge to Reflect Philosophically”

Sander H. Lee (Keene State College)

“Faith and Reason in the TV Show *Lost*”

Phillip Seng (University of Maryland–Baltimore County)

“Dewey at the Movies: A Cautious Viewer”

Dan Shaw (Lock Haven University)

“Signs and the Problem of Evil”

**GIII-9. Society for Realist-Antirealist Discussion**

7:30-10:30 p.m.

**Topic: Realism and Anti-Realism in Quantum Mechanics**

Speakers: Otávio A. Bueno (University of Miami)

“Can a Nominalist about Quantum Mechanics Be a Realist about Quantum Objects?”

Peter J. Lewis (University of Miami)

“Realism and the Quantum Wavefunction”

James Henderson (University of Pittsburgh–Titusville)

“Locality and Non-Locality in the Many-Minds Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics”

### **GIII-10. Society for the Study of Ethics and Animals**

*7:30-10:30 p.m.*

Chair: Mylan Engel, Jr. (Northern Illinois University)

Speaker: Lisa Bortolotti (University of Birmingham)  
“Moral Rights and Human Culture”

Commentators: Bill Martin (DePaul University)

Peter Celello (Bowling Green State University)

Speaker: Anne M. Baril (University of Arizona)

“A Construction of the Predator Problem”

Commentators: Kathie Jenni (University of Redlands)

James A. Moran (Daemen College)

### **GIII-11. Radical Philosophy Association**

*7:30-10:30 p.m.*

**Topic: Utopia and the Geopolitics of Hope: Levinas, Dussel, Anarchy**

Chair: Sarah Hansen (Vanderbilt University)

Speakers: Michael R. Paradiso-Michau (Purdue University)  
“Without a Flag: An Ethico-Political Critique of Liberalism via Emmanuel Levinas”

Gregory Wolff (SUNY–Stony Brook University)

“Utopia in Anarchy: From Ethics to Politics, from Levinas to Dussel”

Sol Neely (Purdue University)

“Substitution, Not Institutions: Toward an Anarchic Pedagogy of Hope”

Jeffrey Jackson (University of Houston–Downtown)

“The Other or the Object? ‘Primacy’ in Levinas and Adorno”

### **GIII-12. Society for the Study of Indian and Tibetan Buddhist Philosophy**

*7:30-10:30 p.m.*

**Topic: Comparative Issues: The Nature of the Absolute**

Speakers: Douglas Duckworth (Florida State University)  
“Substance and Quality: Contours of a Buddhist ‘Absolute’”



Yaroslav Komarovski (University of Virginia)  
 “Do We Realize What We Experience?” Tibetan  
 Supporters of Alikakara Yogacara on Some  
 Problematic Issues of Self-Perception”

David Mellins (Rutgers University)  
 “Reckoning with the Ultimate: Presentations of  
 a Countable Absolute Truth in the Svatantrika  
 Madhyamika Tradition”

Philippe Turenne (McGill University)  
 “The Purpose of Bhavya’s Distinctions of the Ultimate”

### **GIII-13. Society for Empirical Ethics**

7:30-10:30 p.m.

#### **Topic: Experimental Ethics**

Chair: Robert Halliday (Utica College)

Speakers: Joshua Knobe (University of North Carolina–Chapel  
 Hill)

“The Doing/Allowing Distinction: Experimental  
 Studies”

Jennifer Lyn Wright (University of Wyoming)  
 “Moral Intuition in Philosophy and Psychology”

David Pizzaro (Cornell University)  
 “The Motivated Use of Moral Reasoning”

### **GIII-14. Personalist Discussion Group**

7:30-10:30 p.m.

#### **Topic: Author Meets Critics: Jan Olof Bengtsson, *The Worldview of Personalism***

Chair: Randall E. Auxier (Southern Illinois University–  
 Carbondale)

Critics: Claes Ryn (Catholic University of America)  
 Phillip Ferreira (Kutztown University)

Author: Jan Olof Bengtsson (University of Lund)

## **GROUP SESSION GIV: FRIDAY, APRIL 20, 7:00-10:00 P.M.**

### **GIV-1. North American Kant Society**

7:00-10:00 p.m.

#### **Topic: Kant in Brazil**

Chair: Frederick Rauscher (Michigan State University)

Speakers: Daniel Omar Perez (Pontifical Catholic University of  
 Parana)

“Development of Kant Studies in Brazil”

Darlei Dall'Agnol (Federal University of Santa Catarina)  
 “Kant and Contemporary Brazilian Philosophy”

Frederick Rauscher (Michigan State University)  
 “US-Brazil Cooperation in Kant Studies”

Zeljko Loparic (Unicamp (State University of  
 Campinas))

*The Mary Gregor Memorial Lecture: “Kant’s Semantic  
 Turn”*

Commentator: Robert Hanna (University of Colorado–Boulder)

## **GIV-2. Concerned Philosophers for Peace**

*7:00-10:00 p.m.*

### **Topic: Darfur, South Africa, and Peacekeeping**

Speakers: David Hoekema (Calvin College)

“The Inevitable War That Wasn’t: Violence and  
 Nonviolence in the New South Africa”

John W. Lango (Hunter College–CUNY)

“Armed UN Peacekeeping Missions and Generalized  
 Just War Principles”

Robert Hoag (Berea College)

“Intervening in Darfur? Rights, Wrongs, and Recourse  
 to War Principles”

## **GIV-3. Philosophy of Religion Group**

*7:00-10:00 p.m.*

Chair: Lea Schweitz (University of Chicago Divinity School)

Speakers: John M. DePoe (University of Iowa)

“How to Confirm a Miracle: A Bayesian Approach”

Thomas McCall (Trinity Evangelical Divinity School)

“Which Trinity, Whose Monotheism?”

Matthew Roberts (Wheaton College)

“Is Leibniz’s Best Possible World a Coherent  
 Concept?”

## **GIV-4. Society for Ancient Greek Philosophy**

*7:00-10:00 p.m.*

Speakers: Tiberiu M. Popa (Butler University)

“On the (In)consistency of Aristotle’s Philosophy of  
 Time”

Philip R. Corkum (University of Alberta)

“Aristotle on Mathematical Existence”

Jeremy Samuel Neill (Saint Louis University)  
 “The Tension between Altruistic Character and Self-Serving Possession in a Classical Socio-Political Ethic (Aristotle)”

#### **GIV-5. Society for the Metaphysics of Science**

7:00-10:00 p.m.

**Topic: The Investigation of Concepts: Getting Out of the Armchair?**

Speakers: Andrew Melnyk (University of Missouri–Columbia)  
 “Conceptual Analysis: A Two-Step Program”  
 Shaun Nichols (University of Arizona)  
 “Intuitions about Agency: Experimental Approaches”

#### **GIV-6. Society for the Philosophy of History**

7:00-10:00 p.m.

Speakers: Daniela Vallega-Neu (California State University–Stanislaus)  
 “Rhythmic Delimitations of History in Heidegger and Gadamer”  
 Robert Vallier (DePaul University)  
 “Institution, Genealogy, History: On Merleau-Ponty and Foucault”

#### **GIV-7. Society for the Philosophic Study of the Contemporary Visual Arts**

7:00-10:00 p.m.

Chair: Dan Flory (Montana State University)  
 Speakers: Eva M. Dadlez (University of Central Oklahoma)  
 “Paradox and Transcendence in *Alien 3*: Ripley Through the Eyes of Simone de Beauvoir”  
 Sean McAleer (University of Wisconsin–Eau Claire)  
 “If Sound Recordings Are Transparent, So Are Photographs”  
 J. W. Mock (University of Central Oklahoma)  
 “‘Realism’, War, and the Viewer”  
 Roger Paden (George Mason University)  
 “Architecture and Ethics in Wittgenstein’s Works”

#### **GIV-8. International Society of Chinese Philosophy**

7:00-10:00 p.m.

Chair: Peimin Ni (Grand Valley State University)  
 Speakers: Kelly Clark (Calvin College)  
 “Three Kinds of Confucian Scholarship”

Derong Chen (Wuhan University)

“‘Dao’ in *Daodejing* and the *Analects*: A Comparative Study”

Peimin Ni (Grand Valley State University)

“Life as Aesthetic Creativity: Confucian Aim of Learning Examined”

Commentator: Haiming Wen (Renmin University of China)

#### **GIV-9. Karl Jaspers Society of North America**

7:00-10:00 p.m.

Chair: Michael Zank (Boston University)

Speakers: James Barham (University of Notre Dame)

“Ernst Cassirer’s Metaphysics of Life”

Timothy Gordon (Bakersfield College)

“The 19th Century and Jesus Christ: Non-Normative Absolutism”

Armin Wildermuth (University of St. Gallen)

“Karl Jaspers’s Philosophic Faith and the Clash of Civilizations”

#### **GIV-10. Society for Philosophy and Technology**

7:00-10:00 p.m.

**Topic: Ordinary Objects: Metaphysics Meets Philosophy of Technology**

Chairs: Wybo Houkes (Technical University of Eindhoven)

Pieter E. Vermaas (Delft University of Technology)

Speakers: Lynn Rudder Baker (University of Massachusetts)

“The Shrinking Difference between Artifacts and Natural Objects”

Crawford L. Elder (University of Connecticut)

“Capitalist Tools”

Wybo Houkes (Technical University of Eindhoven)

Pieter E. Vermaas (Delft University of Technology)

“Artifacts as Action-Dependent Objects”

Peter Kroes (Delft University of Technology)

“Theories of Technical Function Ascription and Artifact Kinds”

Amie L. Thomasson (University of Miami)

“Artifacts and their Natures”

**GIV-11. Radical Philosophy Association***7:00-10:00 p.m.***Topic: Psychoanalysis and Politics**

Chair: Patrick Ahern (Vanderbilt University)

Speakers: Kathleen Eamon (Evergreen State College)

"Morality, Politics, and the Unconscious"

James Manos (DePaul University)

"American Psychosis: Torture and the Disavowal of Slavery"

Scott Zeman (Vanderbilt University)

"Warmly Repressing the Gestapo: On Terror, Education, and the Possibility of Psychoanalytic Social Praxis"

**GIV-12. Association for the Development of Philosophy Teaching***7:00-10:00 p.m.***Topic: Teaching Values**

Speakers: Pat Flynn (Benedictine University)

"The Pedagogy of Teaching Values and Natural Law"

Jacqui Lynch (Mainline Information Systems)

"Teaching Values Using *The Lord of the Rings*"

Bernard Toussaint (Benedictine University)

"Plato and the Search for the Good"

**GIV-13. Society for the Philosophical Study of Education***7:00-10:00 p.m.***Topic: Is There a Place for Philosophy in the Accreditation and Certification of Educational Programs for Teachers? (Session I)**

Speakers: Pradeep Dhillon (University of Illinois–Urbana-Champaign)

"Kant, Disciplinary Content, and Critical Thinking"

Joseph S. Freedman (Alabama State University)

"Educational Philosophy as a Conceptual Framework"

Connie Goddard (Education Writer/Independent Scholar)

"Ella Flagg Young and Dewey on Growth and Change in Teacher Education"

Olivet Jagusah (Walden University)

"Is There a Place for Philosophy in the Accreditation and Certification of Educational Programs for Teachers—An Examination of the Implicit Assumptions in the Question!"

Chris Keegan (State University of New York–Oneonta)  
 “The Philosophy of Race and Teacher Preparation”

Maya Levanon (Montclair State University)  
 “Philosophical-Spirituality: New Paradigm in  
 Educational Knowledge and Pedagogy”

Alexander Makedon (Chicago State University)  
 “Reading Between the Lines: How Ethically Desirable  
 Are NCATE’s Accreditation Ethics?”

Christine McCarthy (University of Iowa)  
 “The Value of Philosophy in the Education of  
 Teachers: Instrumental, Constitutive, or Both?”

Marjorie O’Loughlin (University of Sydney)  
 “An Australian Perspective”

Linda O’Neill (Northern Illinois University)  
 “Dangerous Liaisons: Foucault and the National  
 Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education  
 (NCATE)”

Alexandra Perry-Polise (Montclair State University)  
 “The Role of Logic in Teacher Education: Changing  
 Dynamics of the Classroom”

James E. Roper (Michigan State University)  
 “The Importance of Courses in ‘Education Ethics’  
 in Assessing the Accreditation and Certification of  
 Educational Programs for Teachers”

James Stillwaggon (Iona College)  
 “NCATE Standards as a Form of Techne”

Ron Swartz (Oakland University)  
 “The Possible Impact of Democracy on the  
 Certification of Programs to Educate Educators”

Commentators: Gustavo Albear (Eastern Illinois University)  
 Sven Mueller (Indiana University)

#### **GIV-14. American Society for Value Inquiry**

*7:00-10:00 p.m.*

**Topic: Race Values**

Chair: Thomas Magnell (Drew University)

Speakers: George Schedler (Southern Illinois University–  
 Carbondale)

“Can White Americans Apologize for Slavery?”

Charles Watson (Earlham College)

“Conserving a Concept of Race”

## GROUP SESSION GV: SATURDAY, APRIL 21, 12:15-2:15 P.M.

### GV-1. Association for the Advancement of Philosophy and Psychiatry

*12:15-2:15 p.m.*

**Topic: Psychiatry and the Moral Emotions**

Speakers: Nancy Potter (University of Louisville)

“Inappropriate or Intense Anger as Pathology or Vice:  
Women and Borderline Personality Disorder”

Marilyn Nissim-Sabat (Lewis University)

“The Metaphysics of Compassion”

### GV-2. American Society for Philosophy, Counseling, and Psychotherapy

*12:15-2:15 p.m.*

**Topic: Philosophical Counseling and Psychodynamic Therapy**

Chair: Kevin Kliver (Purdue University Calumet)

Speaker: Jack Montgomery (St. Xavier University–Chicago)

“Some Reflections on the Space of Psychoanalytic  
Reason(s)”

Commentator: Samuel Zinaich (The Institute for Critical Thinking)

Speaker: Thomas Thorp (St. Xavier University–Chicago)

“The Logic of Representation in Freud’s ‘Organic and  
Hysterical Motor Paralyses’ (1893)”

Commentator: David Turpin (Purdue University Calumet)

Speaker: Susan West (St. Xavier University–Chicago)

“The ‘Task of Incorporating Knowledge and Making  
It Instinctive’: Reflections on Nietzschean and  
Psychoanalytic Practices”

Commentator: David Detmer (Purdue University–Calumet)

### GV-3. International Association for the Philosophy of Sport

*12:15-2:15 p.m.*

**Topic: Sports and Ethics**

Chair: Jan Boxill (University of North Carolina–Chapel Hill)

Speakers: Seth Bordner (University of North Carolina–Chapel Hill)

“Technology and Sport: Ethics, Instant Replay and the  
Electronic Eye”

Joan Grassbaugh Forry (Temple University)

“Gender Equity in Sport: Philosophical Merits and  
Shortcomings of Radical Feminist Approaches”

Michael W. Austin (Eastern Kentucky University)

“Do Children Have a Right to Play?”

Jeffrey P. Fry (Ball State University)  
 “On the Supposed Duty to Try One’s Hardest in Sports”

#### **GV-4. Society for Student Philosophers**

*12:15-2:15 p.m.*

- Speakers: Matthew C. Braddock (Texas Tech University)  
 “L. W. Sumner and the Perfectionist Value Requirement for Well-Being”
- Sean P. Walsh (University of Notre Dame)  
 “The ‘What Would Jesus Do?’ Objection to the Aristotelian Virtue Theory of Morally Right Action”
- Matthew Pianalto (University of Arkansas)  
 “A Non-Cognitive Realism? Hume on Moral Feeling”
- Levent Szentkirályi (Bowling Green State University)  
 “Reconciling Libertarianism With Restricted Self-Ownership”

#### **GV-5. Society for the Philosophical Study of Education**

*12:15-2:15 p.m.*

##### **Topic: Is There a Place for Philosophy in the Accreditation and Certification of Educational Programs for Teachers? (Session II)**

- Speakers: Lucille L. T. Eckrich (Illinois State University)  
 “The Value of Philosophy and a Philosophy of Value in Teacher Education”
- Sheron Fraser-Burgess Fraser (Ball State University)  
 “The Place of Reconstructed Philosophy in Pre-service Teacher Education”
- Jason Helfer (Knox College)  
 “The Deleterious Effects of Dispositions Upon the Act of Instruction: How to Ensure Impotent Teachers”
- Don Hufford (Newman University)  
 “Philosophy of Education and the Prophetic Voice”
- Liz Jackson (University of Illinois–Urbana-Champaign)  
 “Education’s Philosophical Aims and the Goals of Teacher Certification”
- Pamela J. Konkol (Concordia University)  
 “The Quandary of a Professional Ethos for Educators: Professional Ethics or Disposition Development?”
- Madonna Murphy (University of St. Francis)  
 “Role of Philosophy in Helping to Meet the ITASC Standards”



Matthew Sanger (Idaho State University)  
 “The Place of Theorizing in Programs of Teacher Education”

Philip L. Smith (Ohio State University)  
 “On the Tension between Professional Education and Academic Study”

Joseph Watras (University of Dayton)  
 “The Philosophy of Education, Teacher Tests, and NCATE”

Commentators: Chris Higgins (University of Illinois–Urbana-Champaign)  
 Christine deNeveu (National-Louis University)

**GV-6. Joint Session Sponsored by Society for Business Ethics and the Adam Smith Society**

*12:15-2:15 p.m.*

**Topic: Author Meets Critics: Deirdre McCloskey, *The Bourgeois Virtues: Ethics for an Age of Commerce***

Chair: Robert Audi (University of Notre Dame)

Critics: Eugene Heath (State University of New York–New Paltz)

Earl W. Spurgin (John Carroll University)

Lester H. Hunt (University of Wisconsin–Madison)

Author: Deirdre McCloskey (University of Illinois–Chicago)

**GV-7. American Society for Value Inquiry**

*12:15-2:15 p.m.*

**Topic: Life and Values**

Chair: G. John M. Abbarno (D’Youville College)

Speakers: Martin Henn (Auburn University)

“Of Inherent Natural Value of All Life”

Margaret Holland (University of Northern Iowa)

“Murdoch on Having No Choice”

**GV-8. Society for the Study of Indian and Tibetan Buddhist Philosophy**

*12:15-2:15 p.m.*

**Topic: Issues in Buddhist Philosophy**

Speakers: Marie Friquegnon (William Paterson University)  
 “Buddhist Ethics and Ethical Theory”

Toy Tung (City University of New York–John Jay College)

“The Philosophical Poetry of Longchenpa”

Alan Pope (University of West Georgia)  
 “Logic of the Heart: Integrating Developmental  
 Psychology with the Diamond Sutra”

**GV-9. North American Nietzsche Society**

12:15-2:15 p.m.

Chair: Robert Gooding-Williams (University of Chicago)  
 Speakers: Mark P. Jenkins (Johns Hopkins University)  
 “Williams, Nietzsche, and Pessimism”  
 Anthony K. Jensen (Xavier University)  
 “The Centrality and Development of *Anschauung* in  
 Nietzsche’s Early Work”

**GV-10. Committee on Institutional Cooperation**

12:15-2:15 p.m.

**GV-11. Joint Session Sponsored by the History of Early Analytic  
 Philosophy Society and the Bertrand Russell Society**

12:15-2:15 p.m.

Chair: Rosalind Carey (Lehman College–CUNY)  
 Speakers: James Connelly (York University)  
 “Wittgenstein, Deflationism, and ‘The Status of  
 Content’”  
 Joongol Kim (Western Illinois University)  
 “Frege v. Wittgenstein on the Concept ‘Object’”  
 Tuomas Manninen (University of Iowa)  
 “Towards a Bipartisan Interpretation of the *Tractatus*”  
 Sandra Lapointe (Concordia University)  
 “Bolzano, Justification, and the Burden of Proofs”

**GV-12. Society for the Philosophical Study of Marxism**

12:15-2:15 p.m.

**Topic: Marx, Technology, and Value**

Chair: William Roberts (Washington and Jefferson College)  
 Speakers: Patrick Murray (Creighton University)  
 “A Defense of Marx’s Theory of Value”  
 Amy E. Wendling (Creighton University)  
 “Capitalist Embodiment: Machines and the  
 Transformation of Work”  
 Commentators: William Roberts (Washington and Jefferson College)  
 Thomas Jeannot (Gonzaga University)

**GV-13. Association for Symbolic Logic***12:15-2:15 p.m.***Topic: Categorical Logic**

Speakers: Stephen Awodey (Carnegie Mellon University)  
"A Survey of Some Recent Results in Categorical Logic"  
Jean-Pierre Marquis (University of Montreal)  
"From Spaces to Logic via Algebra: The Genesis of  
Categorical Logic"

Commentator: Colin McLarty (Case Western Reserve University)

**GV-14. Journal of the History of Philosophy***10:00 a.m.-3:00 p.m.***Topic: Meeting of the Board of Directors**

---

# MAIN AND GROUP MEETING PARTICIPANTS

## A

ABBARNO, G. John M. (D'Youville College) ..... GII-5 Thu PM, GV-7 Sat PM  
ABBEY, Ruth (University of Notre Dame) ..... II-F Fri AM  
ABBOTT, Barbara (Michigan State University)..... III-I Fri PM  
ABED, Mohammed (University of Wisconsin–Madison) .....IV-N Sat AM  
ADAMS, Noel S. (Marquette University) ..... I-F Thu PM  
AHERN, Patrick (Vanderbilt University) ..... GIV-11 Fri PM  
AIKIN, Scott (Vanderbilt University) ..... GI-7 Thu AM  
ALBEAR, Gustavo (Eastern Illinois University) ..... GIV-13 Fri PM  
ALEXANDER, Joshua (Indiana University) .....IV-J Sat AM  
ALLERS, Michael (University of Michigan–Ann Arbor) ..... III-I Fri PM  
ALLHOFF, Fritz (Western Michigan University) ..... GII-3 Thu PM  
ALMOG, Joseph (University of California–Los Angeles) ..... II-E Fri AM  
ALSPECTOR-KELLY, Marc A. (Western Michigan University) .....IV-J Sat AM  
AMERIKS, Karl (University of Notre Dame)..... I-E Thu PM  
ANDERSON, Douglas R. (Southern Illinois University–  
Carbondale) ..... GIII-6 Thu PM  
ANDERSON, Joel (Utrecht University (The Netherlands)) ..... II-K Fri AM  
ANDERSON-GOLD, Sharon (Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute) ... GI-4 Thu AM  
ANDREOU, Chrisoula (University of Utah) .....IV-D Sat AM  
ANTHONY, Raymond (University of Alaska) ..... GI-6 Thu AM  
ARMOUR-GARB, Bradley (SUNY–University at Albany)..... I-I Thu PM  
ASHER, Nicholas (University of Texas–Austin) ..... V-A Sat PM  
ASQUITH, Peter D. (Michigan State University) ..... GII-6 Thu PM  
ATHERTON, Margaret (University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee)..... III-G Fri PM  
AUDI, Robert (University of Notre Dame) .....GV-6 Sat PM  
AUSTIN, Michael W. (Eastern Kentucky University).....GV-3 Sat PM  
AUXIER, Randall E. (Southern Illinois University–Carbondale)  
..... GIII-14 Thu PM  
AWODEY, Stephen (Carnegie Mellon University).....GV-13 Sat PM  
AXTELL, Guy (University of Nevada–Reno) ..... GI-7 Thu AM

## B

BACH, Kent (San Francisco State University) ..... III-I Fri PM

---

BAIASU, Sorin (University of Manchester, Centre for Political Theory) .....	II-I Fri AM
BALDWIN, John (University of Illinois–Chicago).....	IV-O Sat AM
BARHAM, James (University of Notre Dame) .....	GIV-9 Fri PM
BARIL, Anne M. (University of Arizona).....	GIII-10 Thu PM
BARNEY, Rachel (University of Toronto) .....	I-C Thu PM
BARNHILL, Anne (New York University) .....	V-H Sat PM, GI-2 Thu AM, GIII-3 Thu PM
BARRY, Peter Brian (Saginaw Valley State University) .....	II-K Fri AM
BARTKY, Sandra L. (University of Illinois–Chicago) .....	II-M Fri AM
BATES, Jared G. (Hanover College) .....	IV-J Sat AM
BAUER, Nancy (Tufts University) .....	GI-2 Thu AM
BAYER, Benjamin (University of Illinois–Urbana-Champaign) .....	II-H Fri AM
BECKWITH, Francis (Baylor University) .....	V-E Sat PM
BEDNAR, James (University of Alabama–Huntsville) .....	GI-7 Thu AM
BENGSON, John T. (University of Texas–Austin) .....	IV-H Sat AM
BENGTSSON, Jan Olof (University of Lund) .....	GIII-14 Thu PM
BERENDZEN, Joseph C. (Loyola University–New Orleans) .....	II-H Fri AM
BERGMANN, Frithjof (University of Michigan–Ann Arbor) .....	V-D Sat PM
BERMAN, Scott (Saint Louis University) .....	III-J Fri PM
BERNASCONI, Robert (University of Memphis) .....	GI-11 Thu AM
BICKHAM, Stephen H. (Mansfield University) .....	GIII-6 Thu PM
BICKLE, John (University of Cincinnati).....	I-A Thu PM, GI-9 Thu AM
BIRONDO, Noell (Pomona College) .....	II-K Fri AM
BLOM, Andrew (University of Illinois–Chicago) .....	I-F Thu PM
BOLIN, Nona R. (Memphis College of Art) .....	GI-5 Thu AM
BOLTUC, Peter (University of Illinois–Springfield) .....	II-L Fri AM
BORAN, Idil (York University) .....	II-F Fri AM
BORDNER, Seth (University of North Carolina–Chapel Hill).....	GV-3 Sat PM
BORTOLOTTI, Lisa (University of Birmingham) .....	GIII-10 Thu PM
BOXILL, Jan (University of North Carolina–Chapel Hill) .....	GV-3 Sat PM
BRADDOCK, Matthew C. (Texas Tech University).....	GV-4 Sat PM
BRAND, Peg (Indiana University–Indianapolis) .....	GI-13 Thu AM
BRANDOM, Robert (University of Pittsburgh) .....	II-E Fri AM
BRATMAN, Michael E. (Stanford University) .....	IV-A Sat AM
BRENNAN, Samantha (University of Western Ontario).....	IV-D Sat AM
BRENNAN, Tad (Northwestern University) .....	I-C Thu PM
BRIDGES, Jason (University of Chicago).....	I-K Thu PM
BRINTNALL, Michael (Executive Director, American Political Science Association).....	III-N Fri PM
BRISTER, Evelyn (Rochester Institute of Technology) .....	GI-2 Thu AM

---

BROD, Harry (University of Northern Iowa) .....	III-N Fri PM
BRODY, Howard (University of Texas Medical Branch).....	I-L Thu PM
BROGAARD, Berit (University of Missouri–St. Louis).....	III-I Fri PM
BROWN, Charlotte (Illinois Wesleyan University).....	GII-7 Thu PM
BROWN, D. Kenneth (University of California–Irvine) .....	III-G Fri PM
BROWN, Eric A. (Washington University in St. Louis).....	III-J Fri PM
BROWN, Josh (University of Michigan–Ann Arbor) .....	II-G Fri AM
BROWN, Michael (University of Minnesota).....	GIII-2 Thu PM
BRUNERO, John (University of Missouri–St. Louis) .....	V-I Sat PM
BRUYA, Brian J. (Eastern Michigan University) .....	GI-12 Thu AM
BUCHWALTER, Andrew (University of North Florida).....	GI-11 Thu AM
BUCK, Richard (Mount Saint Mary’s University) .....	II-F Fri AM
BUCKAREFF, Andrei A. (Franklin & Marshall College) .....	IV-H Sat AM
BUCKNER, Randy (Harvard University).....	I-A Thu PM
BUENO, Otávio A. (University of Miami) .....	I-G Thu PM, GIII-9 Thu PM
BURNS, Colleen (Harper College) .....	III-K Fri PM

## C

CANTENS, Bernardo (Barry University).....	III-M Fri PM
CARD, Claudia (University of Wisconsin–Madison).....	GIII-1 Thu PM
CARD, Robert F. (State University of New York–Oswego).....	V-H Sat PM
CAREY, Rosalind (Lehman College–CUNY).....	GV-11 Sat PM
CARLIN, Laurence (University of Wisconsin–Oshkosh) .....	IV-I Sat AM
CARSON, Emily (McGill University).....	II-I Fri AM
CARSON, Thomas L. (Loyola University–Chicago) .....	I-F Thu PM
CARTWRIGHT, David E. (University of Wisconsin–Whitewater) .....	GII-10 Thu PM
CASELDINE-BRACHT, Jennifer (Indiana University–Purdue University Fort Wayne).....	II-K Fri AM
CELELLO, Peter (Bowling Green State University) .....	GIII-10 Thu PM
CHANTER, Tina (DePaul University) .....	IV-G Sat AM
CHATTIN, Scott (Southeastern Community College (NC)).....	II-L Fri AM
CHEN, Derong (Wuhan University).....	GIV-8 Fri PM
CHEN, Jessie Jia (University of Illinois–Urbana-Champaign) ...	GI-12 Thu AM
CHURCHLAND, Patricia Smith (University of California–San Diego) .....	I-A Thu PM
CIULLA, Joanna (University of Richmond).....	V-D Sat PM
CLARK, Kelly (Calvin College).....	GIV-8 Fri PM
COFFEY, Kevin (University of Michigan–Ann Arbor).....	I-I Thu PM
COFFMAN, E. J. (University of Notre Dame).....	I-G Thu PM
COGAN, John (Eckerd College) .....	GIII-6 Thu PM
COHEN, Daniel (Colby College).....	GII-6 Thu PM

---

COHEN, Marc A. (George Washington University).....	II-F Fri AM
COHEN, Ted (University of Chicago) .....	Presidential Address Fri PM
COKELET, Bradford (Northwestern University).....	II-K Fri AM
COLEBROOK, Claire (University of Edinburgh) .....	III-D Fri PM
COLEMAN, Athena (Grand Valley State University) .....	GIII-7 Thu PM
COLEMAN, Brian (Central Michigan University) .....	GI-6 Thu AM
COLLINS, Ardis (Loyola University–Chicago).....	GI-11 Thu AM
COLLINS, John M. (East Carolina University) .....	I-I Thu PM
COMESANA, Juan M. (University of Wisconsin–Madison) .....	II-G Fri AM
CONNELLY, James (York University) .....	GV-11 Sat PM
COOKE, Elizabeth F. (Creighton University) .....	GI-14 Thu AM
CORKUM, Philip R. (University of Alberta).....	GIV-4 Fri PM
CORLETT, J. Angelo (San Diego State University).....	IV-N Sat AM
COUTINHO, Steve (Muhlenberg College).....	III-L Fri PM
CRASNOW, Sharon (Riverside Community College–Norco Campus) .....	I-N Thu PM
CRAVER, Carl F. (Washington University in St. Louis).....	I-A Thu PM
CRILEY, Mark (Illinois Wesleyan University) .....	I-G Thu PM
CROY, Marvin (University of North Carolina–Charlotte) .....	II-L Fri AM, IV-L Sat AM
CUDD, Ann E. (University of Kansas).....	II-A Fri AM
CUMMING, Sam (Rutgers University) .....	IV-C Sat AM
CUNNING, David R. (University of Iowa) .....	III-G Fri PM
CURLEY, Edwin (University of Michigan) .....	V-F Sat PM
CURRAN, Angela (Carleton College) .....	GI-13 Thu AM
CURRIE, Gregory (University of Nottingham).....	IV-E Sat AM

## **D**

DADLEZ, Eva M. (University of Central Oklahoma) .....	GIV-7 Fri PM
DALL'AGNOL, Darlei (Federal University of Santa Catarina).....	GIV-1 Fri PM
DANCY, Russell M. (Florida State University) .....	III-J Fri PM
DAVIDSON, Scott C. (Oklahoma City University).....	II-H Fri AM
DE MELO-MARTIN, Inmaculada (Weill Medical College of Cornell University).....	GI-2 Thu AM
DE ROSA, Raffaella (Rutgers University–Newark).....	IV-I Sat AM
DEAN, Jeff (Blackwell Publishing) .....	I-J Thu PM
DECYK, Betsy Newell (California State University–Long Beach) .....	GI-1 Thu AM
DELANEY, Cornelius (University of Notre Dame).....	II-F Fri AM
DELANEY, Neil (Georgetown University) .....	V-G Sat PM
DENEVEU, Chrstine (National Louis University) .....	GV-5 Sat PM
DEPAUL, Michael (University of Notre Dame).....	IV-F Sat AM

---

DEPOE, John M. (University of Iowa) .....	GIV-3 Fri PM
DETMER, David (Purdue University–Calumet) .....	GV-2 Sat PM
DEUTSCHER, Penelope (Northwestern University) .....	IV-G Sat AM
DHILLON, Pradeep (University of Illinois–Urbana-Champaign) .....	GIV-13 Fri PM
DIAGNE, Souleymane Bachir (Northwestern University).....	II-B Fri AM
DICKER, Georges (State University of New York–Brockport) .....	IV-I Sat AM
DIEHL, Nicholas (University of California–Davis).....	I-J Thu PM
DONNER, Wendy (Carleton University) .....	IV-F Sat AM
DORIS, John M. (Washington University in St. Louis) .....	V-C Sat PM
DOSANJH, Ranpal (University of Toronto) .....	III-H Fri PM
DOWNING, Lisa (Ohio State University) .....	I-D Thu PM
DREGER, Alice D. (Feinberg School of Medicine, Northwestern University) .....	GIII-3 Thu PM
DREIER, James (Brown University) .....	II-D Fri AM
DUCKWORTH, Douglas (Florida State University).....	GIII-12 Thu PM
DUNLOP, Katherine (Stanford University).....	II-I Fri AM
DUNN, Paul (Brock University).....	V-H Sat PM
DURLAND, Karann (Austin College).....	GII-7 Thu PM
DYCK, Corey (University of British Columbia) .....	II-I Fri AM

**E**

EAMON, Kathleen (Evergreen State College).....	GIV-11 Fri PM
EATON, Anne (University of Illinois–Chicago) .....	III-C Fri PM
EBELS DUGGAN, Kyla (Northwestern University).....	II-F Fri AM
ECKRICH, Lucille L. T. (Illinois State University) .....	GV-5 Sat PM
EGGLESTON, Ben (University of Kansas) .....	IV-F Sat AM
EKLUND, Matti (Cornell University) .....	III-A Fri PM
ELDER, Crawford L. (University of Connecticut) .....	GIV-10 Fri PM
ELLIS, Ralph D. (Clark Atlanta University) .....	GI-9 Thu AM
ENGEL, Jr., Mylan (Northern Illinois University) .....	GIII-10 Thu PM
ENGELMANN, Donna (Alverno College) .....	GI-1 Thu AM
ENNIS, Robert H. (University of Illinois–Urbana-Champaign) ....	I-M Thu PM

**F**

FALK, Arthur (Western Michigan University) .....	V-K Sat PM
FAUST, Jennifer (California State University–Los Angeles) .....	GI-2 Thu AM
FEAGIN, Susan L. (Temple University) .....	V-B Sat PM
FEDER, Ellen K. (American University) .....	GIII-3 Thu PM
FENNELL, John (Grinnell College).....	II-H Fri AM
FEOLA, Michael (University of California–Berkeley) .....	V-J Sat PM
FERREIRA, Phillip (Kutztown University) .....	GIII-14 Thu PM

---



FILLER, Joshua (University of Wisconsin–Madison) .....	IV-K Sat AM
FINKEN, Bryan (University of Colorado–Denver).....	GII-12 Thu PM
FISCHER, Marilyn (University of Dayton).....	GI-14 Thu AM
FITZGERALD, Cheryl (Western Michigan University) .....	GIII-5 Thu PM
FLAMM, Matthew (Rockford College).....	GI-14 Thu AM
FLORIO, Salvatore (The Ohio State University).....	I-I Thu PM
FLORY, Dan (Montana State University) .....	GIII-8 Thu PM, GIV-7 Fri PM
FLYNN, Pat (Benedictine University) .....	GIV-12 Fri PM
FORD, Russell (Elmhurst College) .....	IV-G Sat AM
FORRY, Joan Grassbaugh (Temple University).....	GV-3 Sat PM
FORSTER, Michael (University of Chicago) .....	I-E Thu PM
FRANKS, Paul (University of Toronto).....	I-E Thu PM
FRASER, Doreen (University of Waterloo) .....	III-H Fri PM
FRASER, Sheron Fraser-Burgess (Ball State University) .....	GV-5 Sat PM
FREEDMAN, Joseph S. (Alabama State University).....	GIV-13 Fri PM
FREELAND, Cynthia (University of Houston).....	GI-13 Thu AM
FREY, Lawrence R. (University of Colorado–Boulder) .....	III-N Fri PM
FRIEDMAN, Marilyn (Washington University in St. Louis) .....	II-A Fri AM
FRIQUEGNON, Marie (William Paterson University) .....	GV-8 Sat PM
FRY, Jeffrey P. (Ball State University).....	GV-3 Sat PM

## G

GARDNER, Thomas (Muhlenberg College) .....	GI-6 Thu AM
GARTHOFF, Jon (Northwestern University).....	III-F Fri PM
GAUKER, Christopher (University of Cincinnati).....	IV-C Sat AM
GEDNEY, Mark (Gordon College).....	V-J Sat PM
GEISZ, Steven F. (University of Tampa) .....	V-E Sat PM
GENDLER, Tamar Szabo (Yale University) .....	IV-E Sat AM
GEORGALIS, Nicholas (East Carolina University) .....	GI-9 Thu AM
GERTLER, Brie (University of Virginia) .....	II-G Fri AM
GILLETT, Carl (Illinois Wesleyan University) .....	IV-M Sat AM
GILLIES, Anthony (University of Michigan–Ann Arbor) .....	IV-C Sat AM
GILMORE, Cody S. (University of California–Davis).....	I-H Thu PM
GODDARD, Connie (Education Writer/Independent Scholar)....	GIV-13 Fri PM
GOLDBERG, Nathaniel J. (Ohio University).....	I-H Thu PM
GOLDBERG, Sanford (University of Kentucky).....	IV-J Sat AM
GOLDBERG, Steven (Oak Park and River Forest High Schools, Chicago) .....	V-M Sat PM
GOLDSTEIN, Irwin (Davidson College).....	III-F Fri PM
GOODING-WILLIAMS, Robert (University of Chicago) .....	II-B Fri AM, GV-9 Sat PM
GORDON, Timothy (Bakersfield College).....	GIV-9 Fri PM

---

GORHAM, Geoffrey A. (University of Wisconsin–Eau Claire) .....	IV-I Sat AM
GOSWICK, Dana Lynne (University of California–Davis) .....	I-H Thu PM
GRAFF, Gerald (University of Illinois–Chicago) .....	III-N Fri PM
GRAFF, Holly (Oakton Community College) .....	III-K Fri PM
GRAHAM, Kevin M. (Creighton University) .....	V-I Sat PM
GRECO, John (University of St. Louis) .....	III-E Fri PM
GREEN, Mitchell S. (University of Virginia) .....	I-I Thu PM
GRENBERG, Jeanine M. (St. Olaf College) .....	II-I Fri AM
GRIM, Patrick N. (SUNY–Stony Brook University) .....	V-A Sat PM
GROARKE, Leo (Wilfrid Laurier University) .....	I-M Thu PM
GROENENDIJK, Jeroen (University of Amsterdam) .....	IV-C Sat AM
GROSSMAN, James (Vice President for Research and Education, The Newberry Library) .....	III-N Fri PM
GRUZALSKI, Bart (Pacific Center for Sustainable Living) .....	GIII-2 Thu PM
GUPTA, Bina (University of Missouri–Columbia) .....	GI-5 Thu AM
GUTTING, Gary M. (University of Notre Dame) .....	V-J Sat PM

## H

HADDAD, Samir (Fordham University) .....	IV-G Sat AM
HAIDT, Jonathan (University of Virginia) .....	III-C Fri PM
HALLIDAY, Robert (Utica College) .....	GIII-13 Thu PM
HAMINGTON, Maurice (University of Southern Indiana) .....	IV-G Sat AM
HANCOCK, Nancy Slonneger (Northern Kentucky University) ...	GI-1 Thu AM
HANNA, Robert (University of Colorado–Boulder) .....	GIV-1 Fri PM
HANSEN, Sarah (Vanderbilt University) .....	GIII-11 Thu PM
HARDIMON, Michael (University of California–San Diego) .....	V-I Sat PM
HARDY, Lee (Calvin College) .....	GII-1 Thu PM
HARE, Caspar (Massachusetts Institute of Technology) .....	I-F Thu PM
HARMAN, Elizabeth (Princeton University) .....	I-H Thu PM
HARRIS, Steven (Luther College) .....	I-K Thu PM
HARRISON, Stanley M. (Marquette University) .....	GI-14 Thu AM
HARTER, Thomas D. (University of Tennessee) .....	V-H Sat PM
HARTMANN, Bill (St. Louis Community College–Forest Park College) .....	III-K Fri PM
HASANOGLU, Kaplan (University of Iowa) .....	GII-9 Thu PM
HASLANGER, Sally (Massachusetts Institute of Technology) .....	I-N Thu PM
HATCHER, Don (Baker University) .....	I-M Thu PM
HAYBRON, Daniel M. (Saint Louis University) .....	V-C Sat PM
HEATH, Eugene (State University of New York–New Paltz) .....	V-H Sat PM, GV-6 Sat PM
HELPER, Jason (Knox College) .....	GV-5 Sat PM
HELM, Bennett W. (Franklin & Marshall College) .....	IV-A Sat AM

---

HENDERSON, David (University of Memphis) .....	IV-J Sat AM
HENDERSON, James (University of Pittsburgh–Titusville) .....	GIII-9 Thu PM
HENDRICKS, Scott C. (Clark University) .....	I-G Thu PM
HENN, Martin (Auburn University) .....	GV-7 Sat PM
HIGGINS, Chris (University of Illinois–Urbana-Champaign) .....	GV-5 Sat PM
HIGGINS, Peter (University of Colorado–Boulder) .....	III-M Fri PM
HILBERT, David (University of Illinois–Chicago) .....	I-K Thu PM
HILL, Benjamin D. (University of Western Ontario) .....	III-G Fri PM
HINCHMAN, Edward S. (University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee) .....	I-G Thu PM
HOAG, Robert (Berea College) .....	GIV-2 Fri PM
HOEKEMA, David (Calvin College) .....	GIV-2 Fri PM
HOFFMAN, Glen A. (Ryerson University) .....	I-I Thu PM
HOLLAND, Margaret (University of Northern Iowa) .....	GV-7 Sat PM
HONG, Chang-Seong (Minnesota State University–Moorhead) .....	III-L Fri PM, IV-M Sat AM
HONIG, Bonnie (Northwestern University) .....	I-B Thu PM
HOUKES, Wybo (Technical University of Eindhoven) .....	GIV-10 Fri PM
HOWELL, Robert (SUNY–University at Albany) .....	III-B Fri PM
HOWELL, Robert J. (Southern Methodist University) .....	I-K Thu PM
HUBIN, Donald (Ohio State University) .....	II-D Fri AM
HUENEMAN, Charles (Utah State University) .....	IV-I Sat AM
HUFFORD, Don (Newman University) .....	GV-5 Sat PM
HUGGETT, Nick (University of Illinois–Chicago) .....	III-H Fri PM
HULL, Gordon (Iowa State University) .....	GII-11 Thu PM
HUNT, David P. (Whittier College) .....	GIII-5 Thu PM
HUNT, Lester H. (University of Wisconsin–Madison) .....	GV-6 Sat PM
HUNTER, David (Ryerson University) .....	I-M Thu PM

**I**

ITZKOWITZ, Kenneth (Marietta College) .....	IV-G Sat AM
---	-------------

**J**

JACKMAN, Henry (York University) .....	I-G Thu PM
JACKSON, Bernard (Washington and Lee University) .....	V-E Sat PM
JACKSON, Gabrielle Benette (Harvard University) .....	GI-2 Thu AM
JACKSON, Jeffrey (University of Houston–Downtown) .....	GIII-11 Thu PM
JACKSON, Liz (University of Illinois–Urbana-Champaign) .....	GV-5 Sat PM
JACOBS, Jonathan D. (University of Saint Thomas) .....	I-K Thu PM
JAEGER, Gary (University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee) .....	GII-2 Thu PM
JAGGAR, Alison M. (University of Colorado) .....	II-M Fri AM, IV-D Sat AM
JAGUSAH, Olivet (Walden University) .....	GIV-13 Fri PM
JAMES, Gene G. (University of Memphis) .....	GI-5 Thu AM

---

JAMES, Scott M. (University of Kentucky) .....	II-J Fri AM
JANIAK, Andrew (Duke University).....	GI-4 Thu AM
JEANNOT, Thomas (Gonzaga University) .....	GV-12 Sat PM
JECH, Alexander (University of Notre Dame).....	I-F Thu PM
JENKINS, Mark P. (Johns Hopkins University).....	GV-9 Sat PM
JENNI, Kathie (University of Redlands) .....	GIII-10 Thu PM
JENSEN, Anthony K. (Xavier University).....	GV-9 Sat PM
JOHN, James (University of Toronto) .....	IV-K Sat AM
JONES, Nicholaos (The Ohio State University).....	III-H Fri PM
JONES, Sarah Black (Northern Michigan University).....	I-I Thu PM
JUNG, Wonsup (Seoul National University and Visiting Scholar, Purdue University).....	V-K Sat PM

**K**

KAMTEKAR, Rachana (University of Arizona) .....	I-C Thu PM
KANG, Hye-Ryoung (University of Nevada–Reno) .....	GIII-1 Thu PM
KANIA, Andrew (Trinity University).....	I-J Thu PM
KANTIN, Holly (University of Wisconsin–Madison) .....	I-H Thu PM
KAPITAN, Tomis (Northern Illinois University) .....	IV-N Sat AM
KAPUS, Jerry (University of Wisconsin–Stout) .....	II-L Fri AM
KAWALL, Jason R. (Colgate University) .....	V-H Sat PM
KAZANJIAN, Michael M. (Triton College) .....	GIII-4 Thu PM
KEATING, Laura (Hunter College–CUNY) .....	III-G Fri PM
KEEGAN, Chris (State University of New York–Oneonta).....	GIV-13 Fri PM
KELLY, Michael (University of North Carolina–Charlotte) .....	IV-L Sat AM
KIM, Joongol (Western Illinois University) .....	GV-11 Sat PM
KIM, Shin (Central Michigan University).....	GI-6 Thu AM
KIND, Amy (Claremont McKenna College).....	II-J Fri AM
KING, Christopher (Vanderbilt University) .....	V-E Sat PM
KIRBY, Jeremy (Albion College) .....	III-J Fri PM
KIRSCH, Julie (Marymount University).....	II-J Fri AM
KISSINE, Mikhail (Université Libre de Bruxelles) .....	III-I Fri PM
KITTAY, Eva Feder (SUNY–Stony Brook University) .....	GIII-1 Thu PM
KLEIN, Colin (University of Illinois–Chicago).....	I-F Thu PM
KLEINGELD, Pauline (Leiden University, The Netherlands) .....	IV-F Sat AM
KLEINSCHMIDT, Shieva (Rutgers University).....	I-H Thu PM
KLIVER, Kevin (Purdue University Calumet) .....	GV-2 Sat PM
KNOBE, Joshua (University of North Carolina–Chapel Hill) .....	IV-H Sat AM, GIII-13 Thu PM
KOMAROVSKI, Yaroslav (University of Virginia) .....	GIII-12 Thu PM
KONKOL, Pamela J. (Concordia University) .....	GV-5 Sat PM
KORSMEYER, Carolyn W. (University at Buffalo).....	I-J Thu PM

---

KRIZAN, Mary (University of Colorado–Boulder) .....	V-F Sat PM
KROES, Peter (Delft University of Technology).....	GIV-10 Fri PM
KRUKOWSKI, Lucian (Washington University in St. Louis) ...	GII-10 Thu PM
KULVICKI, John (Dartmouth College) .....	V-B Sat PM
KUZMA, Jennifer (University of Minnesota).....	GII-3 Thu PM
KVANVIG, Jonathan L. (Baylor University).....	III-E Fri PM

**L**

LACKEY, Jennifer (Northern Illinois University).....	I-G Thu PM
LADEN, Anthony S. (University of Illinois–Chicago) .....	III-F Fri PM
LAFONT, Cristina (Northwestern University).....	II-H Fri AM
LANDRETH, Anthony (University of Cincinnati).....	II-J Fri AM
LANGO, John W. (Hunter College–CUNY).....	GIV-2 Fri PM
LAPOINTE, Sandra (Concordia University).....	GV-11 Sat PM
LAVIN, Douglas (Harvard University).....	III-F Fri PM
LAWLOR, Leonard (University of Memphis).....	III-D Fri PM
LAYWINE, Alison (McGill University).....	II-I Fri AM
LEBAR, Mark (Ohio University) .....	V-G Sat PM
LEE Jr., Richard A. (DePaul University).....	IV-G Sat AM
LEE, Sander H. (Keene State College).....	GIII-8 Thu PM
LEEDS, Stephen (University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee) .....	III-H Fri PM
LEFKOWITZ, David (University of North Carolina–Greensboro)....	V-I Sat PM
LEIGHTON, Kimberly J. (Tufts University).....	V-H Sat PM
LEMPPE, Steffen (University of Wisconsin–Madison) .....	IV-O Sat AM
LENZI, Mary (University of Wisconsin–Platteville).....	GIII-2 Thu PM
LEVANON, Maya (Montclair State University).....	GIV-13 Fri PM
LEWIS, Peter J. (University of Miami) .....	GIII-9 Thu PM
LICHTENBERT, Robert (Editor, <i>The Meaning of Life</i> ) .....	GIII-4 Thu PM
LIGHT, Andrew R. (University of Washington) .....	IV-L Sat AM
LIN, Martin T. (University of Toronto).....	V-F Sat PM
LISTON, Michael (University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee).....	III-G Fri PM
LOEFFLER, Ronald (Grand Valley State University).....	I-G Thu PM
LOOK, Brandon C. (University of Kentucky) .....	II-I Fri AM
LOPARIC, Zeljko (Unicamp (State University of Campinas)) ....	GIV-1 Fri PM
LUDLOW, Peter (University of Michigan–Ann Arbor).....	V-A Sat PM
LUFT, Sebastian (Marquette University).....	V-J Sat PM
LYNCH, Jacqui (Mainline Information Systems) .....	GIV-12 Fri PM

**M**

MAGNELL, Thomas (Drew University) .....	GIV-14 Fri PM
MAJORS, Brad (University of Wisconsin–Madison) .....	V-G Sat PM
MAKEDON, Alexander (Chicago State University).....	GIV-13 Fri PM

---

MALINOWSKI-CHARLES, Syliane (Temple University).....	IV-I Sat AM
MALLON, Ron (University of Utah) .....	III-C Fri PM
MANIS, R. Zachary (Southwest Baptist University) .....	I-F Thu PM
MANNINEN, Tuomas (University of Iowa).....	GV-11 Sat PM
MANNING, Richard N. (Carleton University).....	GII-11 Thu PM
MANOS, James (DePaul University).....	GIV-11 Fri PM
MARINO, Patricia A. (University of Waterloo).....	V-G Sat PM
MARQUIS, Jean-Pierre (University of Montreal) .....	GV-13 Sat PM
MARSHALL, Eugene J. (University of Wisconsin–Madison).....	V-F Sat PM
MARTIN, Barbara (University of Illinois–Chicago).....	I-F Thu PM
MARTIN, Bill (DePaul University).....	GIII-10 Thu PM
MARTIN, Christopher (Purdue University) .....	V-F Sat PM
MARTIN, Rex (University of Kansas).....	II-A Fri AM
MAY, Larry (Washington University in St. Louis) .....	II-A Fri AM
MAY, Todd (Clemson University) .....	I-B Thu PM
MCAFEE, Noelle (George Mason University) .....	III-N Fri PM
MCALEER, Sean (University of Wisconsin–Eau Claire) .....	GIV-7 Fri PM
MCBRIDE, William (Purdue University).....	I-B Thu PM
MCCALL, Thomas (Trinity Evangelical Divinity School) .....	GIV-3 Fri PM
MCCARTHY, Christine (University of Iowa).....	GIV-13 Fri PM
MCCLOSKEY, Deirdre (University of Illinois–Chicago) .....	GV-6 Sat PM
MCCUMBER, John (University of California–Los Angeles) .....	GI-11 Thu AM
MCKENNA, Erin (Pacific Luthern University).....	I-N Thu PM
MCKITRICK, Jennifer (University of Nebraska–Lincoln) .....	IV-K Sat AM
MCLARTY, Colin (Case Western Reserve University) .....	GV-13 Sat PM
MCMULLIN, Ernán (University of Notre Dame).....	GII-8 Thu PM
MCPHERSON, Tristram (Princeton University) .....	I-F Thu PM
MEEHAN, Johanna (Grinnell College) .....	V-I Sat PM
MEGHANI, Zahra (University of Rhode Island).....	GI-2 Thu AM
MEINWALD, Constance (University of Illinois–Chicago).....	III-J Fri PM
MELAMED, Yitzhak (University of Chicago) .....	I-D Thu PM
MELLINS, David (Rutgers University).....	GIII-12 Thu PM
MELNYK, Andrew (University of Missouri–Columbia).....	GIV-5 Fri PM
MEMON, Arsalan (SUNY–Stony Brook University) .....	GII-9 Thu PM
MERLI, David A. (Franklin & Marshall College) .....	V-G Sat PM
MEYERS, Diana Tietjens (University of Connecticut).....	GI-13 Thu AM
MILLER, Dale E. (Old Dominion University) .....	IV-F Sat AM
MILLER, Jon (Queens University) .....	II-C Fri AM
MILLS, Charles (University of Illinois–Chicago).....	IV-N Sat AM
MINNICH, Elizabeth (Association of American Colleges and Universities) .....	I-N Thu PM

---

MISAK, Cheryl (University of Toronto).....	GI-7 Thu AM
MOCK, J. W. (University of Central Oklahoma).....	GIV-7 Fri PM
MOHANTY, J. N. (Temple University).....	GI-5 Thu AM
MOHR, Richard (University of Illinois–Urbana-Champaign)....	GII-2 Thu PM
MONAHAN, Michael (Marquette University).....	V-I Sat PM
MONTERO, Barbara G. (City University of New York) .....	I-J Thu PM
MONTGOMERY, Jack (St. Xavier University–Chicago).....	GV-2 Sat PM
MOORE, Joseph (Amherst College).....	II-K Fri AM
MORAN, James A. (Daemen College).....	GIII-10 Thu PM
MORELLI, Eric James (Emory University).....	GII-9 Thu PM
MORIN, Marie-Eve (University of Winnipeg) .....	IV-G Sat AM
MORRIS, Michael (University of Notre Dame).....	V-J Sat PM
MORRIS, William E. (Illinois Wesleyan University) .....	GII-7 Thu PM
MOSCHOVAKIS, Yiannis (University of California–Los Angeles)....	II-N Fri AM
MUELLER, Michaela (University of Arizona).....	V-E Sat PM
MUELLER, Sven (Indiana University).....	GIV-13 Fri PM
MUHAMMED, Eugene (Triton College).....	GIII-4 Thu PM
MULLIN, Amy (University of Toronto–Mississauga) .....	I-J Thu PM
MURDAY, Brendan (Ithaca College).....	I-K Thu PM
MURPHY, Ann V. (Fordham University).....	IV-G Sat AM
MURPHY, Colleen (Texas A&M University).....	V-I Sat PM
MURPHY, Madonna (University of St. Francis).....	GV-5 Sat PM
MURPHY, Peter (University of Indianapolis).....	IV-J Sat AM
MURRAY, Patrick (Creighton University).....	GV-12 Sat PM

## N

NADELHOFFER, Thomas (Dickinson College).....	IV-H Sat AM
NADLER, Steven (University of Wisconsin) .....	II-C Fri AM
NAGEL, Jennifer (University of Toronto) .....	II-G Fri AM
NAILS, Debra (Michigan State University).....	V-F Sat PM
NASSAR, Dalia T. (Universität Tübingen) .....	IV-F Sat AM
NEELY, Sol (Purdue University).....	GIII-11 Thu PM
NEILL, Jeremy Samuel (Saint Louis University).....	V-E Sat PM, GIV-4 Fri PM
NEILSON, Jennifer (University of Texas–Austin) .....	I-J Thu PM
NEISSER, Joseph (Sam Houston State University) .....	II-H Fri AM
NELSON, Alan (University of North Carolina–Chapel Hill) .....	I-D Thu PM
NERSESSIAN, Nancy J. (Georgia Institute of Technology).....	IV-B Sat AM
NETHERTON, David (University of Wales) .....	GII-10 Thu PM
NEWMAN, Lex (University of Utah) .....	III-G Fri PM
NEWMAN, Robby (Ohio State University).....	GII-9 Thu PM
NEWTON, Natika (Nassau Community College) .....	GI-9 Thu AM

NEY, Alyssa (University of Rochester).....I-K Thu PM  
 NI, Peimin (Grand Valley State University) ..... GI-12 Thu AM, GIV-8 Fri PM  
 NICHOLS, Peter (University of Wisconsin–Madison).....I-H Thu PM  
 NICHOLS, Shaun (University of Arizona) .....III-C Fri PM, GIV-5 Fri PM  
 NISSENBAUM, Helen (School of Law, New York University) ..... IV-L Sat AM  
 NISSIM-SABAT, Marilyn (Lewis University).....GV-1 Sat PM  
 NORRIS, Stephen (University of Alberta) ..... I-M Thu PM  
 NUSSBAUM, Martha (University of Chicago) ..... II-M Fri AM  
 NYDEN-BULLOCK, Tammy (Grinnell College) ..... V-F Sat PM

**O**

O’CONNOR, David K. (University of Notre Dame)..... IV-F Sat AM  
 O’LOUGHLIN, Marjorie (University of Sydney)..... GIV-13 Fri PM  
 O’NEILL, Linda (Northern Illinois University) ..... GIV-13 Fri PM  
 OBRZALEK, Suzanne (Claremont McKenna College) .....I-C Thu PM  
 OKAPAL, James M. (Missouri Western University) ..... II-K Fri AM  
 OLBERDING, Amy (University of Oklahoma) ..... III-L Fri PM, IV-M Sat AM  
 OWEN, David (University of Arizona) .....III-G Fri PM

**P**

PADEN, Roger (George Mason University).....GIV-7 Fri PM  
 PALMER, Daniel E. (Kent State University–Trumbull) ..... GI-6 Thu AM  
 PANAGOPOULOS, Anastasia (University of Minnesota).....II-J Fri AM  
 PARADISO-MICHAU, Michael R. (Purdue University)..... GIII-11 Thu PM  
 PARIKH, Prashant (University of Pennsylvania) ..... V-A Sat PM  
 PARIKH, Rohit (City University of New York) .....II-N Fri AM  
 PARSONS, Charles (Harvard University) ..... III-B Fri PM  
 PATRONE, Tatiana (Montclair State University) ..... II-I Fri AM  
 PATTERSON, Steven W. (Marygrove College)..... V-E Sat PM  
 PATTON, Lydia (University of Chicago) ..... GI-10 Thu AM  
 PAUL, Sarah K. (Stanford University) ..... III-F Fri PM  
 PEREZ, Daniel Omar (Pontifical Catholic University of Parana)  
 .....GIV-1 Fri PM  
 PERIN, Casey (University of Massachusetts) ..... III-J Fri PM  
 PERINI, Laura (Virginia Tech University).....IV-B Sat AM  
 PERRY-POLISE, Alexandra (Montclair State University) ..... GIV-13 Fri PM  
 PETERSON, Richard T. (Michigan State University) ..... GIII-2 Thu PM  
 PHELAN, Mark T. (University of North Carolina–Chapel Hill) .... IV-H Sat AM  
 PHILLIPS, Anne (London School of Economics) ..... II-M Fri AM  
 PIANALTO, Matthew (University of Arkansas).....GV-4 Sat PM  
 PINCOCK, Christopher (Purdue University).....III-H Fri PM  
 PIZZARO, David (Cornell University) ..... GIII-13 Thu PM



PLAKIAS, Alexandra A. (University of Michigan–Ann Arbor).....	II-J Fri AM
POLGER, Thomas W. (University of Cincinnati).....	I-A Thu PM
POLLOK, Konstantin (Stanford University and University of South Carolina).....	GI-4 Thu AM
POPA, Tiberiu M. (Butler University).....	GIV-4 Fri PM
POPE, Alan (University of West Georgia).....	GV-8 Sat PM
POTTER, Nancy (University of Louisville).....	GV-1 Sat PM
PRESBEY, Gail M. (University of Detroit Mercy).....	GIII-2 Thu PM
PRICE, Daniel M. (University of Houston, Honors College).....	V-J Sat PM
PRINZ, Jesse J. (University of North Carolina–Chapel Hill) .....	III-C Fri PM, V-D Sat PM
PROOPS, Ian (University of Michigan–Ann Arbor).....	II-I Fri AM
PYLE, Andrew (University of Bristol).....	I-D Thu PM
PYNES, Christopher A. (Western Illinois University).....	V-E Sat PM

**Q**

QUINN, Carol (Colorado State University).....	GII-2 Thu PM
---	--------------

**R**

RAGLAND, Clyde (Saint Louis University).....	IV-I Sat AM
RAILTON, Peter (University of Michigan).....	II-D Fri AM
RAMACHANDRAN, Vilaynur (University of California–San Diego) .....	V-B Sat PM
RATTAN, Gurpreet (University of Toronto).....	II-G Fri AM
RAUSCHER, Frederick (Michigan State University).....	GIV-1 Fri PM
RAYO, Agustín (Massachusetts Institute of Technology).....	III-A Fri PM
REED, Baron (Northern Illinois University).....	II-G Fri AM
REMPEL, Morgan (University of Southern Mississippi).....	GII-12 Thu PM
RETT, Jessica (Rutgers University).....	III-I Fri PM
RICHARD, Mark (Tufts University).....	II-E Fri AM
RIESTERER, Patrick (McMaster University).....	GII-6 Thu PM
RIGGS, Wayne D. (University of Oklahoma).....	III-E Fri PM
ROBB, David (Davidson College).....	I-K Thu PM
ROBERTS, Matthew (Wheaton College).....	GIV-3 Fri PM
ROBERTS, Rodney C. (East Carolina University).....	IV-N Sat AM
ROBERTS, Tyler (Grinnell College).....	II-H Fri AM
ROBERTS, William (Washington and Jefferson College).....	GV-12 Sat PM
ROBINSON, Jenefer (University of Cincinnati).....	IV-E Sat AM
ROBINSON, Thaddeus (Purdue University).....	V-F Sat PM
RODRIGUEZ, Carlos (Center for Talented Youth, Johns Hopkins University).....	V-M Sat PM
RÖDL, Sebastian (Universität Basel).....	I-E Thu PM

---

ROELOFS, Monique (Hampshire College).....	II-B Fri AM
ROGERS, Victoria (Indiana University–Purdue University Indianapolis) .....	III-H Fri PM
ROLLINS, Mark (Washington University in St. Louis) .....	V-B Sat PM
RONDON, Rafael Francisco (Resurrection Catholic School– Memphis) .....	V-M Sat PM
ROPER, James E. (Michigan State University) .....	GIV-13 Fri PM
ROSENKOETTER, Timothy (New York University) .....	GI-4 Thu AM
ROSS, Sheryl (University of Wisconsin–La Crosse) .....	III-M Fri PM
ROTH, Abraham (Ohio State University).....	IV-A Sat AM
RUDDER BAKER, Lynn (University of Massachusetts).....	GIV-10 Fri PM
RUTHERFORD, Donald (University of California–San Diego).....	II-C Fri AM
RYN, Claes (Catholic University of America) .....	GIII-14 Thu PM

**S**

SALERNO, Joe R. (Saint Louis University).....	IV-J Sat AM
SANDLER, Ronald L. (Northeastern University) ....	V-F Sat PM, GII-3 Thu PM
SANGER, Matthew (Idaho State University) .....	GV-5 Sat PM
SANSON, David (Ohio State University).....	GIII-5 Thu PM
SARKAR, Tanika (Jawaharlal Nehru University (New Delhi) and University of Chicago).....	II-M Fri AM
SARKISSIAN, Hagop (Duke University).....	IV-H Sat AM
SARTORIO, Carolina (University of Wisconsin–Madison) .....	III-A Fri PM
SARTWELL, Crispin (Dickinson College) .....	GIII-6 Thu PM
SATTIG, Thomas (Tulane University) .....	I-H Thu PM
SAX, Greg (University of Michigan–Ann Arbor) .....	I-G Thu PM
SCHACHT, Richard (University of Illinois–Urbana-Champaign) ....	V-D Sat PM
SCHARLE, Margaret E. (Reed College).....	III-J Fri PM
SCHEAR, Joseph K. (California Polytechnic State University–San Luis Obispo) .....	II-H Fri AM
SCHEDLER, George (Southern Illinois University–Carbondale) .....	GIV-14 Fri PM
SHELLENBERG, Ingra (University of Kansas) .....	II-K Fri AM
SCHENK, David (Messiah College) .....	GIII-5 Thu PM
SCHRIFT, Alan D. (Grinnell College) .....	III-D Fri PM
SCHROEDER, Timothy (Ohio State University) .....	II-J Fri AM
SCHUETTE, Ofelia (University of South Florida) .....	III-M Fri PM
SCHWARTZ, Robert (University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee).....	II-E Fri AM
SCHWARTZMAN, Lisa H. (Michigan State University) .....	GIII-1 Thu PM
SCHWEITZ, Lea (University of Chicago Divinity School) .....	GIV-3 Fri PM
SCOTT, Jacqueline (Loyola University–Chicago).....	GII-12 Thu PM
SEELEY, William P. (Franklin & Marshall College).....	I-J Thu PM

---

SENG, Phillip (University of Maryland–Baltimore County).....	GIII-8 Thu PM
SHABEL, Lisa (Ohio State University).....	III-B Fri PM
SHAPIRO, Lisa (Simon Fraser University).....	II-C Fri AM
SHARPE, Kevin (Purdue University).....	I-K Thu PM
SHAW, Dan (Lock Haven University).....	GIII-8 Thu PM
SHAW, Joshua (Penn State Erie, The Behrend College).....	II-H Fri AM
SHELDON, Mark (Northwestern University).....	I-L Thu PM
SHELLEY, Cameron (University of Waterloo).....	IV-B Sat AM
SHERMAN, David (University of Richmond).....	V-D Sat PM
SHOCKLEY, Kenneth E. (University at Buffalo).....	V-I Sat PM
SHOEMAKER, David (Bowling Green State University).....	V-G Sat PM
SHUSTERMAN, Richard (Florida Atlantic University).....	II-B Fri AM
SIDERITS, Mark (Illinois State University).....	IV-M Sat AM
SILVA, Alcino (University of California–Los Angeles and National Institute of Mental Health).....	I-A Thu PM
SILVERMAN, Allan (Ohio State University).....	III-J Fri PM
SIMMERLING, Mary (MacLean Center for Clinical Medical Ethics, University of Chicago).....	V-H Sat PM
SINNOTT-ARMSTRONG, Walter (Dartmouth College).....	II-G Fri AM
SKOW, Bradford (University of Massachusetts–Amherst).....	III-H Fri PM
SKYRMS, Brian (University of California–Irvine).....	V-A Sat PM
SMALLIGAN, Jennifer (University of California–Berkeley).....	III-G Fri PM
SMITH, Daniel W. (Purdue University).....	III-D Fri PM
SMITH, Philip L. (Ohio State University).....	GV-5 Sat PM
SMITH, Renée (Coastal Carolina University).....	II-L Fri AM
SMITH, Robin (Texas A&M University).....	III-J Fri PM
SMITH, Shoshana R. (Colgate University).....	IV-I Sat AM
SOBEL, David (Bowling Green State University).....	II-D Fri AM
SPURGIN, Earl W. (John Carroll University).....	GV-6 Sat PM
STALNAKER, Aaron (Indiana University).....	III-L Fri PM
STANG, Nicholas F. (Princeton University).....	V-H Sat PM
STANLEY, Jason (Rutgers University).....	II-G Fri AM
STELL, Lance (Davidson College).....	I-L Thu PM
STEPHENS, Piers (Michigan State University).....	GI-3 Thu AM
STERBA, James P. (University of Notre Dame) .....	Presidential Address Introduction
STERN, David G. (University of Iowa).....	GIII-7 Thu PM
STEWART, Abigail (University of Michigan).....	I-N Thu PM
STILLWAGGON, James (Iona College).....	GIV-13 Fri PM
STOKOF, Martin (University of Amsterdam).....	IV-C Sat AM
SUPERSON, Anita (University of Kentucky).....	IV-D Sat AM

SUSSMAN, David (University of Illinois–Urbana-Champaign) ..... III-F Fri PM  
 SUTHERLAND, Daniel (University of Illinois–Chicago)..... III-B Fri PM  
 SVEINSDÓTTIR, Ásta (San Francisco State University) .....I-H Thu PM  
 SVERDLIK, Steven (Southern Methodist University) ..... III-F Fri PM  
 SWARTZ, Ron (Oakland University) ..... GIV-13 Fri PM  
 SWINDAL, James (Duquesne University) ..... GII-1 Thu PM  
 SZENTKIRÁLYI, Levent (Bowling Green State University).....GV-4 Sat PM

**T**

TALISSE, Robert (Vanderbilt University) ..... II-F Fri AM, GI-7 Thu AM  
 TAMMELLEO, Steven (Lake Forest College) ..... III-M Fri PM  
 TAYLOR, Paul C. (Temple University) ..... II-B Fri AM  
 TEREZAKIS, Katie (Rochester Institute of Technology) ..... IV-F Sat AM  
 THOMASON, Richmond (University of Michigan–Ann Arbor) ..... II-N Fri AM  
 THOMASSON, Amie L. (University of Miami) ..... I-J Thu PM, GIV-10 Fri PM  
 THOMPSON, Allen (Clemson University) ..... V-G Sat PM  
 THOMPSON, Paul B. (Michigan State University) ..... GII-3 Thu PM  
 THORP, Thomas (St. Xavier University–Chicago) ..... GV-2 Sat PM  
 THUROW, Joshua (University of Wisconsin–Madison) ..... IV-J Sat AM  
 TIBERIUS, Valerie (University of Minnesota) ..... V-C Sat PM  
 TILLMAN, Christopher J. (University of Manitoba) ..... I-I Thu PM  
 TIWALD, Justin (San Francisco State University) ..... III-L Fri PM  
 TOBIN, Theresa (Marquette University) ..... GIII-1 Thu PM  
 TOLLEFSEN, Deborah (University of Memphis) ..... IV-A Sat AM  
 TOUSSAINT, Bernard (Benedictine University) ..... GIV-12 Fri PM  
 TRACHTENBERG, Zev (University of Oklahoma) ..... GI-3 Thu AM  
 TREATOR, Nick (Brown University and Trent University) ..... IV-K Sat AM  
 TROGDON, Kelly (University of Massachusetts) ..... IV-K Sat AM  
 TROPMAN, Elizabeth (Colorado State University) ..... V-G Sat PM  
 TUNG, Toy (City University of New York–John Jay College) ..... GV-8 Sat PM  
 TURENNE, Philippe (McGill University) ..... GIII-12 Thu PM  
 TURPIN, David (Purdue University Calumet) ..... GV-2 Sat PM  
 TVERSKY, Barbara (Stanford University) ..... V-B Sat PM

**U**

ULEMAN, Jennifer (State University of New York–Purchase College)  
 ..... GI-4 Thu AM  
 UZQUIANO, Gabriel (Oxford University) ..... III-A Fri PM

**V**

VALADEZ, Jorge (Our Lady of the Lake University) ..... III-M Fri PM  
 VALLEGA, Alejandro (California State University–Stanislaus)  
 ..... GIII-7 Thu PM

VALLEGA-NEU, Daniela (California State University–Stanislaus)	GIV-6 Fri PM
VALLIER, Robert (DePaul University)	GIV-6 Fri PM
VAN DER LINDEN, Harry (Butler University)	GIV-2 Fri PM
VAN INWAGEN, Peter (University of Notre Dame)	IV-M Sat AM
VAN ROOIJ, Robert (University of Amsterdam)	V-A Sat PM
VAN ROOJEN, Mark (University of Nebraska–Lincoln)	V-G Sat PM
VAN ZANDT, Joe (Independent Scholar)	GII-11 Thu PM
VANDEVELDE, Pol (Marquette University)	V-J Sat PM
VARDEN, Helga (University of Illinois–Urbana-Champaign)	II-F Fri AM
VERMAAS, Pieter E. (Delft University of Technology)	GIV-10 Fri PM
VESSEY, David T. (University of Chicago)	V-J Sat PM
VINEBERG, Susan (Wayne State University)	III-H Fri PM
VINER, Steven E. (Washington University in St. Louis)	II-J Fri AM
VISION, Gerald (Temple University)	IV-J Sat AM
VRANAS, Peter B. M. (University of Wisconsin–Madison)	III-F Fri PM

## W

WAGER, John (Triton College)	GI-1 Thu AM
WALSH, Sean P. (University of Notre Dame)	GV-4 Sat PM
WALTON, Kendall (University of Michigan–Ann Arbor)	IV-E Sat AM
WARFIELD, Ted A. (University of Notre Dame)	II-G Fri AM
WARNKE, Georgia (University of California–Riverside)	GIII-3 Thu PM
WASKAN, Jonathan (University of Illinois–Urbana-Champaign)	GII-8 Thu PM
WATRAS, Joseph (University of Dayton)	GV-5 Sat PM
WATSON, Charles (Earlham College)	GIV-14 Fri PM
WATSON, Stephen (University of Notre Dame)	IV-F Sat AM
WEBER, Leonard J. (University of Detroit Mercy)	I-L Thu PM
WEIL, Vivian (Illinois Institute of Technology)	GII-3 Thu PM
WEINBERG, Jonathan (Indiana University–Bloomington)	III-E Fri PM
WEN, Haiming (Renmin University of China)	GI-12 Thu AM, GIV-8 Fri PM
WENDLING, Amy E. (Creighton University)	GV-12 Sat PM
WEST, Susan (St. Xavier University–Chicago)	GV-2 Sat PM
WESTFALL, Joseph J. (University of Houston–Downtown)	IV-F Sat AM
WESTLUND, Andrea (University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee)	II-K Fri AM
WIBLE, Andy (Muskegon Community College)	GII-2 Thu PM
WIEDEBACH, Hartwig (University of Zurich, Stuttgart Media University)	GI-10 Thu AM
WILAND, Eric (University of Missouri–St. Louis)	IV-H Sat AM
WILDERMUTH, Armin (University of St. Gallen)	GIV-9 Fri PM
WILLIAMS, Neil E. (University at Buffalo)	IV-K Sat AM

WILLIAMS, Robert R. (University of Illinois–Chicago)..... GI-11 Thu AM  
 WILSON, Mark (University of Pittsburgh)..... II-E Fri AM  
 WOLF, Kirk (Delta College) ..... V-J Sat PM  
 WOLFF, Gregory (SUNY–Stony Brook University)..... GIII-11 Thu PM  
 WOODBRIDGE, James A. (University of Nevada–Las Vegas) ..... I-I Thu PM  
 WOODHOUSE, Ned (Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute)..... IV-L Sat AM  
 WOODY, Andrea (University of Washington)..... IV-B Sat AM  
 WOOLFOLK, Robert L. (Rutgers and Princeton Universities) ..... V-C Sat PM  
 WRIGHT, Jennifer Lyn (University of Wyoming)  
 ..... IV-H Sat AM, GIII-13 Thu PM

**Y**

YATES, Melissa (Northwestern University)..... V-I Sat PM  
 YOO, Julie H. (Lafayette College) ..... V-K Sat PM  
 YOUNG, Liane (Harvard University) ..... IV-H Sat AM  
 YOUPA, Andrew D. (Southern Illinois University–Carbondale) ... IV-I Sat AM

**Z**

ZACKER, David (Elgin Community College)..... III-K Fri PM  
 ZAKIN, Emily (Miami University)..... I-B Thu PM  
 ZANK, Michael (Boston University)..... GI-10 Thu AM, GIV-9 Fri PM  
 ZAWIDZKI, Tadeusz W. (George Washington University) ..... II-J Fri AM  
 ZEMAN, Scott (Vanderbilt University) ..... GIV-11 Fri PM  
 ZIMMERMAN, Michael J. (University of North Carolina–Greensboro)  
 ..... III-F Fri PM  
 ZINAICH, Samuel (The Institute for Critical Thinking).....GV-2 Sat PM  
 ZUIDERVAART, Lambert (Institute for Christian Studies)..... GII-1 Thu PM  
 ZURN, Christopher F. (University of Kentucky) ..... V-E Sat PM  
 ZWOLINSKI, Matthew (University of San Diego) ..... II-F Fri AM

---

# ABSTRACTS OF COLLOQUIUM PAPERS

## AVOIDING ACCIDENTS: JUSTIFICATION INTERNALISM AND KNOWLEDGE EXTERNALISM (IV-J)

MARC A. ALSPECTOR-KELLY (WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY)

According to tradition, justification is a conceptual constituent of knowledge. Call this doctrine “constitutivism.” Constitutivism remains widely accepted, even among externalists. An effect of that tradition is that internalist/externalist debates concerning knowledge and justification are typically run together. This ignores the virtues of a position that combines an internalist theory of justification with an externalist theory of knowledge (which position requires rejection of constitutivism). I present three arguments for such a position. First, the most widely appealed-to intuition offered against externalism leaves such a combination untouched. Second, the distinction between accidentally true belief and knowledge often cited in support of the inclusion of justification as a conceptual component of knowledge in fact favors its exclusion. And third, excluding justification from the constituents of knowledge better positions us to explain both the internalism of justification and its role in the pursuit of knowledge.

## AUTONOMY GAPS: REFRAMING THE PROBLEM OF TOO MUCH CHOICE (II-K)

JOEL ANDERSON (UTRECHT UNIVERSITY (THE NETHERLANDS))

Supported by behavioral economists, cognitive psychologists, and overwhelmed consumers, social criticism of “too much choice” has been on the rise. In this paper, I propose a framework for analyzing the problematic phenomena fueling these concerns, in terms of a discrepancy between the *capacities for choice that are presupposed by various institutions and public policies* and the *reality of people’s actual set of autonomy competencies*. This phenomenon is what I propose to label an “autonomy gap.” On the basis of an analysis of what it means for a policy or practice to presuppose autonomy-competencies, I argue that this model has several advantages over standard approaches. Recent proposals to privatize Social Security offer an illustration of how autonomy gaps can arise and why they can be objectionable, both intrinsically (as a contradiction in the will) and conditionally (given prevalent circumstances).

## IS KANT’S MORAL LAW PRIOR TO THE GOOD? (II-I)

SORIN BAIASU (UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER, CENTRE FOR POLITICAL THEORY)

According to the standard interpretation, for Kant the concept of the good must be derived from the moral law. The paper critically examines this claim, not, however, primarily in order to challenge the standard interpretation: the

---

standard interpretation will be assumed as an accurate construal of Kant's position, and the argument will show that, on the standard interpretation, Kant's position is ultimately unjustified. If the moral law is not necessarily prior to the good, then an account of unconditional obligation in terms of principles is not necessarily better than one in terms of values.

### TAKING SELLARSIAN HOLISM SERIOUSLY (II-H)

*BENJAMIN BAYER (UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS—URBANA—CHAMPAIGN)*

This paper examines Daniel Bonevac's arguments against Wilfrid Sellars's critique of the "Myth of the Given." Bonevac argues that while Sellars's arguments do not generalize in a way that refutes "entire framework of givenness," rather than simply the sense data theorists Sellars originally targeted. Bonevac takes special issue with Sellars's arguments from holism, which he thinks result in absurdities. I argue that Sellars does not intend to establish the absurd conclusions Bonevac thinks he wishes to establish. Bonevac also thinks that even if Sellars's arguments for holism are correct, they do not imply a rejection of the Myth. I argue, however, that Sellars's holism, understood in the proper way, does in fact bear on the truth of the Myth. If one wishes to de-mythologize the myth, one must come to terms with Sellars's holism.

### IS COPING NONCONCEPTUAL? ON MERLEAU-PONTY, DREYFUS, AND McDOWELL (II-H)

*JOSEPH C. BERENDZEN (LOYOLA UNIVERSITY—NEW ORLEANS)*

Does Maurice Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology matter to the recent debates concerning nonconceptual content? For some this debate provides fertile ground for combining phenomenology and analytic philosophy. For example, Hubert Dreyfus has invoked Merleau-Ponty when attacking John McDowell for falling into a "Myth of the Mental" by assuming that all experience is conceptually articulated. While I think Dreyfus is right to inject Merleau-Ponty's thought into current debates, he is wrong to put Merleau-Ponty with the supporters of nonconceptual content. While there are important differences between Merleau-Ponty and McDowell, I want to argue that Merleau-Ponty would agree with the spirit of McDowell's views. To develop this argument, I will first discuss ways *Phenomenology of Perception* is used to support the nonconceptualism, and then show how it might plausibly be aligned with McDowell's work. In the end, I think we would do well to see Merleau-Ponty and McDowell as broadly Hegelian allies.

### CHALLENGING GLOBAL DISTRIBUTIVE JUSTICE ON COSMOPOLITAN GROUNDS (II-F)

*IDIL BORAN (YORK UNIVERSITY)*

This paper examines cosmopolitan conceptions of distributive justice by backing up normative analysis with principles of international economics. Cosmopolitan distributive justice, which rests on the ideal of equality of persons, holds that a global scheme of distributive justice is needed to compensate for the inequalities caused by international trade and capital flows.



The paper raises three objections against cosmopolitan distributive justice without rejecting the cosmopolitan ideal. The first objection focuses on the purported causes of global inequalities. The second one urges to address the injustices arising from the global market directly rather than by a transfer of funds. The third objection challenges the institutional assumptions of cosmopolitan distributive justice. These objections show that there is a basis to seek alternative conceptions of cosmopolitan justice that promise to be more compatible than global distributive justice with the facts and principles of international economics.

### DONKEY SENTENCES AND QUANTIFIER VARIABILITY (III-I)

*BERIT BROGAARD (UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI—ST. LOUIS)*

This paper proposes an account of conditional donkey sentences, such as ‘if a farmer buys a donkey, he usually vaccinates it’, which accommodates the fact that adverb of quantification seems to affect the interpretation of pronouns that are not within its syntactic scope. The analysis defended takes donkey pronouns to go proxy for partitive constructions with varying quantificational force. The variation in the interpretation of donkey pronouns, it is argued, is determined by the linguistic environment in which the pronouns occur.

### LOCKE ON MEMORY, REFLECTION AND THE STRUCTURE OF COMPLEX IDEAS (III-G)

*D. KENNETH BROWN (UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA—IRVINE)*

Scholars have explored many aspects of John Locke’s discussions of memory concerning specific problems such as personal identity, innate knowledge, and the nature and grounds of habitual knowledge and belief. These studies typically concern how memories are experienced, but ignore more fundamental issues about how memory functions in Locke’s theory of ideas. To fill this most basic gap in our grasp of Locke’s *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, this paper examines the case of memory as an operation of the mind to show that there is a simple, reflective idea distinctive of memory that functions in the production of a complex idea by a process of annexation to other ideas. Showing how Locke extends these structural features of memory to all the sorts of reflection establishes a point of entry into the development of a thoroughly compositionalist account of Locke’s theory of ideas.

### MORAL PRESCRIPTIONS: CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTION AND EMERGENCY CONTRACEPTION (V-H)

*ROBERT F. CARD (STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK—OSWEGO)*

This paper argues that practitioners have a professional ethical obligation to write or fill prescriptions for emergency contraception, despite their moral objections. This recent controversy affects all medical professionals, including physicians as well as pharmacists.

This paper begins by criticizing the option of referring the patient to another willing provider. Objecting professionals may conscientiously

refuse because they consider emergency contraception to be equivalent to abortion, or because they believe contraception itself is immoral. This paper critically evaluates these reasons and concludes that they do not successfully support conscientious objection in this context. Contrary to the views of other thinkers, it is not possible to easily strike a respectful balance between the interests of objecting providers and patients in this case. As medical professionals with an obligation to give primacy to their patients' interests, providers have an ethical duty to write or fill valid prescriptions for emergency contraception.

#### ASSERTION, KNOWLEDGE, AND JUSTIFICATION (I-G)

*E. J. COFFMAN (UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME)*

In important recent work, Jonathan Sutton presents numerous interesting arguments for the unorthodox thesis that epistemic justification is identical with knowledge ('J=K'). In this paper, I defend epistemological orthodoxy by providing a thorough critical evaluation of what strikes me as Sutton's best argument for J=K—the 'Assertion Argument'. After explaining the Assertion Argument, I describe a case that casts serious doubt on its key premise—viz., the thesis that proper assertion requires knowledge (call this the 'Knowledge Requirement', hereafter 'KR'). In brief, certain amplified "Gettier-type" examples seem to involve subjects who properly assert propositions they don't know. I then present a likely reply to my objection, one stemming from the pro-KR argument Timothy Williamson develops in his influential *Knowledge and its Limits*. I overcome the reply by exploring an alternative epistemic requirement on proper assertion, one that—unlike KR—nicely explains *all* the previously gathered data about assertion.

#### A RAWLSIAN (POLITICAL) CONCEPTION OF EXPLOITATION FOR BUSINESS ETHICS (II-F)

*MARC A. COHEN (GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY)*

Intuitions about exploitation underlie much thought about business ethics, and thought about the moral dimension of the marketplace, even if those intuitions are not made explicit.

But definitions of exploitation in terms of the economic benefit to participants and consent—specification of the conditions in which exploitation occurs in these terms—are problematic.

And so in this paper I offer an account of economic exploitation in political terms, relying on Rawls's account of political society.

According to this account, economic transactions are exploitative when they negatively affect the value of a person's political liberties and social opportunities. More specifically, a transaction will be exploitative when it creates, perpetuates, or exacerbates a situation in which a person's primary goods lack value, or fair value, or when the transaction depends on background conditions in which this is the case.

## NEO-PYRRHONISM, CONTRASTIVISM AND NORMATIVITY (II-G)

*JUAN M. COMESANA (UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN–MADISON)*

Neo-Pyrrhonists have an ambivalent attitude towards everyday knowledge (and justification) attributions. On the one hand, they claim that there is nothing wrong with saying, under the appropriate circumstances, that Mary knows that there is a zebra in the cage. On the other hand, they think that every attribution of knowledge carries with it theoretical commitments that no good Pyrrhonist will accept. Recently, Walter Sinnott-Armstrong has argued that epistemic contrastivism (the thesis that knowledge attributions are tacitly relativized to a contrast class) can help the Neo-Pyrrhonian by highlighting two propositions associated with each attribution of justification: one which carries a substantial normative commitment and another one which carries no such commitment. In this paper I argue against this contrastivist resolution of the tension within Neo-Pyrrhonism by showing that the propositions that Sinnott-Armstrong claims to be free from substantive normative commitments actually aren't.

## THE SCANDAL OF PHILOSOPHY: CAVELL AND LEVINAS ON THE PROBLEM OF SKEPTICISM (II-H)

*SCOTT C. DAVIDSON (OKLAHOMA CITY UNIVERSITY)*

This paper examines Stanley Cavell's recent engagement of the work of Emmanuel Levinas. Instead of either attempting to refute skepticism or to demonstrate its incoherence, Cavell's thought is unique in that it regards the denial of skepticism itself as something scandalous. Just as Cavell maintains that the truth of skepticism is an inescapable feature of ordinary life, in his later work Levinas, likewise, claims that "philosophy is not separate from skepticism." Although Levinas's use of skepticism has been taken up in the secondary literature, its ethical significance tends to be overlooked. Cavell helps us to appreciate the ethical significance of Levinas's use of skepticism by highlighting the fact that the scandal of skepticism is me.

## DESCARTES'S CAUSAL PRINCIPLE AND ITS ALLEGED SIMILARITY CONDITION (IV-I)

*RAFFAELLA DE ROSA (RUTGERS UNIVERSITY–NEWARK)*

It is a common view that Descartes's causal principle is to be understood in light of a similarity condition according to which  $x$  is the efficient cause of  $y$  only if  $x$  is similar to  $y$  (in some way that remains to be specified). In this paper, I challenge this common view. I argue that any attempt to understand Descartes's causal principle in light of a similarity condition is a mistake. After clarifying how the similarity condition ought to be understood in light of Descartes's notions of formal and eminent containment (sections 1-3), I conclude that the similarity condition is either trivial, false, or too strong.

## FICTIONAL NARRATION AND THE ONTOLOGICAL GAP DEBATE (I-J)

NICHOLAS DIEHL (UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA–DAVIS)

There is a growing debate in the aesthetics literature about the existence of fictional narrators in narrative works of art. One front of that debate concerns the ‘ontological gap argument’, first presented by Jerrold Levinson and recently criticized by Andrew Kania. I argue that Levinson and Kania have mistakenly assumed that the ontological gap must—if it is to be bridged at all—be bridged by an act of storytelling, overlooking the possibility that it may be bridged by an act of imagining by the reader or viewer. I argue that the ontological gap cannot be bridged by either the actual storyteller or the narrator. Then I take a first step towards refashioning the ontological gap argument, suggesting that by attending more carefully to the place of imagining, we may find that we revive the role of narrators in a broad range of literary works.

## REAL LAWS DON’T HAVE DEMONSTRATIVE CONTENT (III-H)

RANPAL DOSANJH (UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO)

A biological species is often treated as an individual. If this is so, it has been argued, generalizations about species cannot describe natural laws, since the law statements would have to contain local predicates. Marc Lange argues that, despite local predication, there can be laws about species. This paper argues, on the contrary, that generalizations about individuals cannot describe laws—not because of local predication, but because they have demonstrative content. By ‘demonstrative content’ I mean that the class of objects that the generalization is about has membership criteria that cannot be given in purely descriptive terms. I rely on the principle that qualitatively identical systems under one set of laws evolve the same way. If generalizations with demonstrative content described laws, nothing would guarantee that the principle is satisfied. My argument is illustrated by a thought experiment inspired by Strawson’s massive reduplication argument.

## KANT ON THE CONTENT OF GEOMETRICAL CONCEPTS (II-I)

KATHERINE DUNLOP (STANFORD UNIVERSITY)

Kant’s view of intuition’s role in geometry can be understood as a theory of how geometrical concepts acquire meaning. I show how this approach, pioneered by P. F. Strawson, can stay closer to Kant’s texts and make his position more attractive. Commentators underestimate Kant’s ability to explain how the sensible content of concepts can be cognized *a priori* because they overlook intuition’s role in the formation of concepts. I draw on Kant’s logic lectures to illuminate his view of the formation and expression of mathematical concepts. Kant claims that mathematical concepts are “factitious” rather than “given.” This means that they are coeval with, rather than preceding, the explicit representation of criteria (marks) by which their instances are recognized. Intuition conditions the inclusion of marks. A concept’s definition proves, by expressing its marks,

that an object corresponding to it can be represented in intuition, and thus evinces the concept's sensible content.

### GRATITUDE, INGRATITUDE, AND THE GIFTS OF TAINTED DONORS (V-H)

PAUL DUNN (BROCK UNIVERSITY)

Not-for-profits often express their gratitude to generous benefactors by naming a building or program after the donor. If, at a later date, the donor becomes tainted because of a social or legal scandal, is the not-for-profit ethically justified in removing the donor's name while keeping the donation? This paper outlines six characteristics that are necessary and sufficient conditions for people and organizations to feel gratitude for a gift: the gift must be voluntary, intentional, non-exploitive, and costly to the benefactor, while being appropriate and beyond what is deserved by the beneficiary. I then apply these conditions to the ethical problem of how a not-for-profit should react when it learns that one of its donors, whom it has publicly honored, has become tainted.

### KANT'S ACCOUNT OF SENSIBILITY IN THE EARLY 1770s (II-I)

COREY DYCK (UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA)

Though Kant is often thought to introduce the essentials of his mature account of sensibility with the *Inaugural Dissertation* of 1770, I argue in this presentation that Kant there understands intuitions not as representations distinguished in kind from concepts, but instead as *singular* concepts which only require reflection on the part of the understanding to be made general, if not purely rational, concepts. As such, Kant's account of the deliverances of sensibility at this time is closer to Lambert's account of "simple concepts." Having demonstrated this, I proceed to show that Kant does not arrive at the critical account of intuitions as distinct in kind from concepts until *after* 1772. It is only then that Kant ceases to conceive of intuitions as themselves singular concepts, or representations of singular objects, and consequently begins to see a use for the understanding not in reflecting but in *determining* intuitions.

### INDIA HOUSE UTILITARIANISM (IV-F)

BEN EGGLESTON (UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS)

DALE E. MILLER (OLD DOMINION UNIVERSITY)

Among the most thoroughly debated interpretive questions about the moral philosophy of John Stuart Mill is whether he should be understood as an act utilitarian or as an ideal-code rule utilitarian. We argue that neither of these interpretations fits the textual evidence as well as does a novel view we call 'India House utilitarianism'. On this view, an act is right if and only if it is not forbidden by the code of rules the agent is justified in believing to be the one, of those she can reasonably be expected to be aware of, whose general acceptance would produce the most happiness.

## HEGEL AND LIBERALISM: NOTES ON THE DIALECTIC OF RIGHT (V-J)

MICHAEL FEOLA (UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA—BERKELEY)

My essay follows recent trends in Hegel scholarship in order to contest widespread suspicions that his political philosophy is straightforwardly hostile toward liberal ideals for social life. To tackle such a broad topic within this space, I focus on the ostensible shortcomings of rights-based individualism within the *Philosophy of Right*. Where Hegel's developmental narrative seems to privilege a thick, communal solidarity that would undermine what we consider inalienable rights of the individual, I maintain that this reading distorts what it *means* to conduct a dialectical argument on Hegel's terms. More specifically, I argue that what has been read as an 'anti-liberal' regression into some collectivist state in fact undertakes a genealogical strategy to disinter the suppressed social conditions of those rights (and the freedom they protect) that are often misrecognized as foundational by liberal theorists.

## KNOWABILITY AND CARTESIAN PROPOSITIONS (I-I)

SALVATORE FLORIO (THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY)

Some anti-realists have responded to Fitch's paradox of knowability by appealing to syntactic restrictions on the principle of knowability. One such restriction, proposed by Neil Tennant in *The Taming of the True*, confines the principle to true *Cartesian propositions*. This is the minimal restriction required to block Fitch's paradox. There has been debate over whether or not it is a viable option for the anti-realist and Tennant has recently suggested a new formulation of his restriction, which improves on the initial one. In this paper I shall present some arguments based on modest assumptions and conclude that this restricted principle of knowability, even in its improved version, is still subject to paradoxes similar to the original one. What this seems to indicate is the need for a more dramatic restriction. However, this would raise the question of whether or not a principle of knowability with a narrower application can serve the purposes of the anti-realist.

## RICŒUR AND THE ETHICAL SHAPE OF REMEMBERING AND FORGETTING (V-J)

MARK GEDNEY (GORDON COLLEGE)

In his final major work, *History, Memory, Forgetting*, Ricœur, I argue, came to a final accounting with Heidegger through an investigation of the intersection of temporality, subjectivity, memory, and forgiveness. On the one hand, Ricœur follows Heidegger in his rejection of the autonomous subject who possesses her memories in the bright light of the eternal presence of consciousness. On the other hand, Ricœur argues against the tendency in Heidegger and some of his followers to limit the power of subjectivity to a generic openness to the past and in favor of an ethical limit essential to an adequate account of personal identity and memory.

---

 DELIBERATIVE, DEMOCRACY, BARGAINING, AND WHAT DOESN'T GET SAID (V-E)

STEVEN F. GEISZ (UNIVERSITY OF TAMPA)

I argue that bargaining provides a legitimate alternative to deliberation for resolving morally weighted disagreements in democratic contexts, because of various facts about what can and must be left inexplicit in certain communicative interactions. This position challenges the influential deliberative democratic account of Gutmann and Thompson (1996), according to which moral disagreements must be resolved via a process of deliberation that involves making one's reasons explicit. I argue that this deliberative democratic demand to avoid bargaining misunderstands the nature of bargaining, and that bargaining—once properly understood—provides a legitimate and preferable means for resolving certain morally weighted conflicts. I introduce a *shotgun approach* to bargaining that involves offering moral and prudential considerations simultaneously, leaving the relative weighting of such considerations implicit. I introduce three cases to motivate the claim that various communicative situations demand that reasons remain implicit, and I examine the connection between these cases and the deliberation/bargaining trade-off.

## RESPONSE-DEPENDENCE, NOUMENALISM, AND ONTOLOGICAL MYSTERY (I-H)

NATHANIEL J. GOLDBERG (OHIO UNIVERSITY)

Response-dependent terms are defined by reference to psychological responses of normal observers in normal conditions. Pettit champions a global response-dependence theory according to which every term is, or is definable by terms that are, response-dependent. Smith and Stoljar, however, insist that this theory entails noumenalism, the view that reality possesses an intrinsic nature that is unknowable to us. Surprisingly, Pettit concedes his commitment to noumenalism, arguing instead that noumenalism is less problematic than suggested. In this paper I show that even if what Pettit says is correct about noumenalism per se, noumenalism coupled with his other views leads to an ineliminable form of ontological mystery. Members of different communities respond to either the same or different properties in the world, and there is no way to resolve the issue one way or the other. Moreover, such mystery is as problematic as Smith and Stoljar claimed noumenalism itself to be.

## THE EXTRAORDINARY CONCEPT OF RACE: HARDIMON ON RACE AND RACIALISM (V-I)

KEVIN M. GRAHAM (CREIGHTON UNIVERSITY)

In his recent article "The Ordinary Concept of Race," Michael O. Hardimon argues that our habitual thinking about race can be divided into a morally neutral logical core of claims, which he calls the ordinary concept of race, and a morally pernicious, racialists logical development of that logical core of claims, which he calls the ordinary conception of race. I argue that (A) it is not as easy as Hardimon claims to separate a morally neutral concept of race from the racist conception of race; (B) Hardimon's analysis is not transhistorical, as he claims, but historically and socially specific; and (C)

---

Hardimon's lack of sensitivity to the historical evolution of the concept of race tends to obscure the features of racial identity that form the basis of white privilege.

#### WHY NOT "FRATERNITY TO COME"? AN INSTABILITY IN DERRIDA'S POLITICS OF FRIENDSHIP (IV-G)

SAMIR HADDAD (*FORDHAM UNIVERSITY*)

A central claim of Derrida's *Politics of Friendship* is that one should be highly suspicious of political discourse that invokes or relies on a rhetoric of fraternity. In this paper I critique Derrida's justification for this claim. First, I examine Derrida's reading of Montaigne in order to articulate the justification for resisting fraternity. This justification relies, I argue, on a very particular understanding of birth, namely that birth connotes necessity. Against this, I point to other passages in Derrida's writings where birth is used in precisely the opposite sense, as a figure for contingency. This demonstrates a fundamental instability at work in *Politics of Friendship*, one that must be ignored for its claims concerning fraternity to be advanced.

#### AN ETHIC OF HOSPITALITY: DERRIDA AND U.S. IMMIGRATION POLICY (IV-G)

MAURICE HAMINGTON (*UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN INDIANA*)

Historically, philosophy has largely ignored the notion of hospitality, but there are a few exceptions including Immanuel Kant's "To Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch" as well as an intriguing series of articles and interviews by Jacques Derrida late in his life. This paper will review Kant's notion of hospitality and then interrogate Derrida's development of a hospitality paradox, an aporia, given the tension between conditional and unconditional hospitality. It will be suggested that Derrida gestures toward an ethic of hospitality that is much more demanding than common definitions of hospitality. Derrida's understanding of hospitality addresses the nature of social and political inclusion, materialism, and what constitutes an interpersonal moral ideal. Taken seriously, this hospitality ethic challenges the character of the current debate over immigration policy in the United States.

#### RATIONALITY AND THE DISTANT NEEDY (I-F)

CASPAR HARE (*MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, PHILOSOPHY SECTION*)

Here is an attitude you might have towards needy strangers:

- i) When a small sacrifice on your part will bring great benefits to a needy stranger, whether or not you make the sacrifice depends upon the details of your relation to him. Is he (e.g.) drowning before your eyes, or (e.g.) *starving* in some distant slum?
- ii) When it is a matter of absolutely no material consequence to you whether the needy stranger suffers more or less, you would rather that he suffer less.



If you have this attitude then your preferences between global states of affairs are *intransitive*. This observation makes serious trouble for the view that morality applauds, but does not demand, aid to the distant needy.

### OVERCOMING THE ORGAN SHORTAGE: THE NEED FOR RADICAL REFORM (V-H)

THOMAS D. HARTER (UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE)

According to the United Network of Organ Sharing, the current number of people in the United States needing organ transplants is just over 92,000, while the total number of donors, both living and cadaver, from January to June 2006 is just under 4,000. It appears that with approximately 88,000 people still needing organ transplants, addressing this shortage requires moving beyond voluntary measures. I argue for the introduction of mandatory cadaver organ procurement (MCOP); a program that does not allow potential donor patients the right to opt-out. In arguing for MCOP I highlight both its advantages and address its concerns including, overriding the autonomy and consent of patients and surrogates, worries about prematurely killing patients, creating a surplus of organs, failure to consider alternative treatments, and moral repugnance. I conclude both that MCOP would likely eliminate this organ shortage and that it may be the most ethical means of organ procurement.

### FORMAL SIGNS IN LOCKE: THE SIMPLE IDEAS OF SUBSTRATUM AND REALITY (III-G)

BENJAMIN D. HILL (UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN ONTARIO)

Walter Ott has recently offered a new interpretation of Locke's account of signification. The basis for his interpretation is that Locke adhered to the "Augustinian" semiotic tradition rather than the Scholastic one. The hallmark of the "Augustinian" tradition is the rejection of formal signs—all signs, they maintain, are instrumental signs. In this paper it is argued that this is false, Locke did accept some formal signs. Indeed, it is argued, two of the mental signs most important for the development and coherence of the epistemology defended in Book IV of the *Essay*—the simple ideas of substratum and reality or real existence—fit to a tee the criteria for formal signs (developed in section II of the current paper). Thus Locke could not have been a semiotic "Augustinian" and the so-called Ashworth thesis, which connects Locke's account of signification to the Scholastic tradition, is the better hermeneutic.

### ASSERTION, JUDGMENT, AND KNOWLEDGE (I-G)

EDWARD S. HINCHMAN (UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN—MILWAUKEE)

Lottery propositions and Moore's paradox appear to support the knowledge account of assertion, according to which one should assert only what one knows. I reject that diagnosis of the oddity in such cases. The oddity derives instead, I argue, from a respect in which the assertions appear insincere: though the speaker is not aiming to deceive, it's hard to see how her assertion could express any judgment she has made. The insincerity has the ring not of fraudulence but of a distinctive confusion: the speaker

judges that *p* while *quite transparently* lacking epistemic authority to inform anyone whether *p*. This diagnosis yields a knowledge account not of assertion but of judgment. And it supports a relativistic account of the semantics of knowledge ascriptions, since the epistemic norm governing judgment is sensitive to the context not of the subject or of ascribers but of interlocutors who might rely on the judgment.

#### THE SEMANTIC THEORY OF TRUTH: FIELD'S INCOMPLETENESS OBJECTION (I-I)

GLEN A. HOFFMAN (RYERSON UNIVERSITY)

According to Field's influential incompleteness objection, Tarski's semantic theory of truth is unsatisfactory since the definition that forms its basis is incomplete in two distinct senses: 1) it is physicalistically inadequate, and for this reason, 2) it is conceptually deficient. In this paper, I defend the semantic theory of truth against the incompleteness objection by conceding 1) but rejecting 2). After arguing that Davidson and McDowell's reply to the incompleteness objection fails to pass muster, I argue that, within the constraints of a non-reductive physicalism and a holism concerning the concepts of truth, reference and meaning, conceding Field's physicalistic inadequacy conclusion while rejecting his conceptual deficiency conclusion is a promising reply to the incompleteness objection.

#### THE TWO-DIMENSIONALIST REDUCTIO (I-K)

ROBERT J. HOWELL (SOUTHERN METHODIST UNIVERSITY)

In recent years two-dimensional semantic s has become one of the most serious alternatives to Millianism for the proper interpretation of modal discourse. It has origins in the works of a diverse group of philosophers, and it has proven popular as an interpretation of both language and thought. It has probably received most of its attention, however, because its use by David Chalmers in his arguments against materialism. It is this more metaphysical application of two-dimensionalism that is the concern in this paper. For though there is probably something salvageable from two-dimensionalism as a way to explain the content of thought, as a metaphysical tool it should be abandoned. In this paper I aim to establish this point by *reductio*: if "metaphysical" two-dimensionalism is assumed, it can be shown to be false.

#### THE CAVEMAN'S CONSCIENCE: EVOLUTION AND MORAL REALISM (II-J)

SCOTT M. JAMES (UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY)

A popular moral argument has it that the story of human evolution shows that we can explain the disposition to make moral judgments without relying on moral facts. But this argument is a threat to moral realism only if there is no realist position that can explain, in the context of human evolution, the relationship between our moral sense and moral facts. I sketch a story that illuminates this relationship: The adaptive pressures facing early humans would have produced individuals who made judgments about what others could *reasonably disapprove* of. According to objectivist versions of *moral*

*constructivism*, moral facts just are facts about how others, ideally situated, would respond to one's conduct. Thus if any objectivist constructivism story is true, then we can intelligibly assert that a) our capacity for moral judgment is the product of adaptive pressures acting on early humans and b) some moral judgments are objectively true.

## OPEN DUTIES (I-F)

ALEXANDER JECH (*UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME*)

The purpose of this paper is to illuminate a kind of duty that I will call "open duties" or "duties for some." Such duties fall upon groups or aggregates of individuals but require that only *some* of those in the specified class actually perform the act: a duty falls upon a group of individuals but it is either possible or necessary that the duty be performed by a proper subset of the group. I will investigate the structure of these duties, consider their relation to imperfect duties and provide some speculation on their wider implications for ethics and political affairs.

## RESOLVING THE BAYESIAN PROBLEM OF IDEALIZATION (III-H)

NICHOLAOS JONES (*THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY*)

Michael Shaffer has challenged Bayesian confirmation theorists to show how at least some idealized hypotheses have at least some degree of confirmation. He argues that in order to accomplish this task, one must either develop a coherent proposal for how to assign prior probabilities to counterfactual conditionals or abandon Bayesianism. This paper develops a Bayesian reply to Shaffer's challenge that avoids the issue of how to assign prior probabilities to counterfactuals by treating idealized hypotheses as abstract descriptions. The reply allows Bayesians to assign non-zero degrees of confirmation to idealized hypotheses and to capture the intuition that less idealized hypotheses tend to be better confirmed than their more idealized counterparts.

## WHAT CAN BE SAID FOR DEMOCRATIC OBEDIENCE? SOME THOUGHTS ABOUT EPISTEMIC PROCEDURALISM (V-E)

CHRISTOPHER KING (*VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY*)

The conclusion of this essay is simple, though admittedly a little bizarre. The minority voter in a democracy is not *obliged* to obey democratic outcomes. In support of this claim two standard justifications for obedience, one procedural and one moral, are criticized. Neither account adequately addresses democratic authority, thus, neither account justifies political obedience. An epistemic interpretation of authority succeeds in making explicit the reliability hypothesis underlying democratic procedures. Though the reliability hypothesis outlines what democratic justification requires, it does not in-itself provide that justification. It does, however, reveal the implicit commitment of citizens to a project of political justification, thus establishing the conditions under which it can occur. Disobedience is a consequence of democracy, but is shaped by the requirements of justification.

## SUBTERRANEAN EPISTEMIC BLUES: THE ROLE OF THE FORMS IN EVERYDAY DISCOURSE (III-J)

JEREMY KIRBY (ALBION COLLEGE)

In the following essay I discuss a debate concerning the extent to which Plato's *Eide* are thought to influence everyday cognitive states. My thesis is that the case has not been made for the interpretation that requires agents to have epistemic access to the Forms in forming everyday, mundane cognitive states.

## WHAT IS A LOCUTIONARY ACT? (III-I)

MIKHAIL KISSINE (UNIVERSITÉ LIBRE DE BRUXELLES)

This paper is directed against Bach's sub-propositional conception of *what is said* or of the *locutionary* level of meaning conceived as a logical form where every pure indexical is saturated. It is shown that there is no empirical or theoretical justification for the introduction of such a supplementary level of saying.

## MULTILOCATION AND MOTION (I-H)

SHIEVA KLEINSCHMIDT (RUTGERS UNIVERSITY)

According to Russell's At-At account of motion, necessarily, something moves iff it's at one place at one time, and at a distinct place at a distinct time. Though some have used spinning disk cases to argue the account is sometimes too restrictive, I reject the account on independent grounds. I present a fairly ordinary case of time travel, and argue that the At-At account is too liberal in that case. The problem arises from the possibility of an object's persisting while being multilocated (which is plausible to claim occurs in some time travel cases). If this is possible, the At-At account is extensionally incorrect. But even rejecting this possibility, the At-At account cannot be accepted as a genuine *reduction* of motion (and thus an account of what it means to move) if we think my case is even conceivable.

## CONCEPTION, DECEPTION, AND REFLECTION: SPINOZA ON FINITE MODES (V-F)

MARY KRIZAN (UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO—BOULDER)

In this paper, I suggest that Spinoza is committed to the extreme view that there is only one, partless substance. Spinoza's necessitarianism leaves an opening for this sort of monism, and a conceptual distinction needed to resolve divergent textual evidence reveals our inability to conceive finite modes adequately. The result of this distinction has serious metaphysical consequences for Spinoza: given his parallelism, as well as repeated statements that substance is partless, he is committed to the nonexistence of particular parts. Although we are able to conceive of extended substance as a series of finite, bounded, singular entities, this conception of substance is nonsense—it fails to capture the infinite and eternal nature of substance, properly understood.

---

 WHY RELIABLE TESTIMONY IS NECESSARY FOR TESTIMONIAL KNOWLEDGE (I-G)

JENNIFER LACKEY (NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY)

A thesis dominating discussions in the current epistemology of testimony is that speaker-knowledge is a necessary condition for testimonially based knowledge. More precisely:

For every speaker, S, and hearer, H, H knows that  $p$  on the basis of S's testimony that  $p$  only if S knows that  $p$ .

In place of this thesis, I have elsewhere argued on behalf of the following weaker condition:

For every speaker, S, and hearer, H, H knows that  $p$  on the basis of S's testimony that  $p$  only if S's statement that  $p$  is reliable or otherwise truth-conducive.

Recently, it has been argued that there are reasons to think that even my weaker condition is too strong for testimonially based knowledge. In this paper, I show, not only that the particular kinds of cases purporting to establish this conclusion fail, but also that there are reasons to conclude that all such counterexamples are destined to fail.

## SECESSION, GROUP SELF-DETERMINATION, AND THE RIGHT NOT TO ASSOCIATE (V-I)

DAVID LEFKOWITZ (UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA—GREENSBORO)

Christopher Wellman argues that denial of a group's right to secession wrongfully disrespects the individuals who compose it, even if it neither violates their autonomy nor undermines their equality. I critique both of the arguments Wellman offers to support this claim, namely, that agents are owed respect in virtue of their accomplishments or because of the roles they occupy. Instead, I contend that denial of a group's right to secession wrongs the group's members individually because it conflicts with their rights to freedom of association; specifically, their right not to associate with others. I argue that this account is compatible with the right to secession being held by a group; that appeal to the negative aspect of freedom of association does not entail that state legitimacy requires consent; and that secession may not be conditional on democratic governance nor confer on the new state a justified claim to political authority.

## NEW FOUNDATIONS FOR MORAL PARTICULARISM (V-G)

BRAD MAJORS (UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN—MADISON)

Orthodox methods for grounding moral particularism appeal to examples, to holism, or to both. Yet it is widely recognized that serious problems attend each of these approaches. After briefly setting out these problems, I argue for a new way of arguing for particularism. It is maintained that moral particularism falls out of a general thesis concerning the relation between lower- and higher-level properties and facts generally. I call the thesis 'universal anti-individualism'. It is the contention that there are, quite generally, no lower-level sufficient conditions for the instantiation of higher-level properties. After indicating the sources of support for the thesis, I apply it to the debate over moral particularism.

---

## KIERKEGAARD AND DIVINE COMMAND THEORY: A REPLY TO EVANS (I-F)

R. ZACHARY MANIS (SOUTHWEST BAPTIST UNIVERSITY)

One of the most important developments in the contemporary discussion of Kierkegaard's ethic is a reading defended by Quinn and Evans, who argue that a divine command theory of moral obligation (DCT) is to be found in *Works of Love*. I offer a critique aimed at showing that the case Evans makes for the divine command reading of Kierkegaard in his recent book, *Kierkegaard's Ethic of Love*, is not compelling. Despite significant overlap between DCT and the view of moral obligation found in Kierkegaard's writings, there is at least one essential difference between the two: the former, but not the latter, is committed to the claim that, necessarily,  $p$  is morally obligatory only if God commands that  $p$ . I try to demonstrate that the argument Evans gives to show that Kierkegaard endorses this claim is invalid, and the prospects for reconstructing the argument to make it sound are not promising.

## WHY UNIFICATION? MICHAEL SMITH'S RATIONALISM AND THE NORMATIVE STATUS OF COHERENCE (V-G)

PATRICIA A. MARINO (UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO)

On Michael Smith's rationalist view, you have "normative reason" to do whatever your fully rational self would want you to do—that is, whatever you\* would want yourself to do if you\* had full information and a maximally coherent, unified set of desires. On the resultant "anti-Humean" view, normative reasons, and thus moral reasons, are not "desire-dependent." As various critics have noted, for this to be the case, the normative status of coherence of desires must be special: coherence can't simply be something else we desire. In reply, Smith has given new arguments, that rely on an analogy between coherence in desires and coherence in *a priori* beliefs and logical reasoning, that consistency of desires is part of rationality. But I'll argue, partly based on reflections about mathematics, that these arguments fail. If this is right, Smith's "anti-Humean" theory of reasons is quite Humean after all.

## SPINOZA'S DEFINITION OF THE ESSENCE OF A THING (V-F)

CHRISTOPHER MARTIN (PURDUE UNIVERSITY)

In the literature on modal essences most scholars understand Spinoza's view to be that the essence of each mode is unique to it, while a few others think that a single essence is recurrent in each mode of a kind. Folks of the former sort claim that 2d2 is the definition of a modal essence and that Spinoza there evinces a clear commitment to their (the 'individualist') conception of modal essences. I argue that in addition to there being other texts which support the latter specieist interpretation, 2d2 is ambiguous between two readings, and that only one of these entails the individualist conception of modal essences. The upshot is that 2d2 does not provide definitive evidence for the individualist view, and therefore cannot be used to reject the alternative specieist interpretation. Rather, we should look to

---

marrying the individualist and specieist views under a single conception of modal essences.

#### THE COMMUNITY OF WITNESSES: DERRIDA INHERITING HUSSERL AND BLANCHOT (IV-G)

*MARIE-EVE MORIN (UNIVERSITY OF WINNIPEG)*

In this paper, I argue that the community of witnesses represents for Jacques Derrida the essential structure of the social bond. First, I show how the necessity of testimony for Derrida is the result of the radicalization of what he takes to be the crucial insight of Husserl in his *Cartesian Meditations*, namely the fact that the *alter ego* can never be given to me in an original way or in person. Then, I show how this radicalization is best understood when one turns to the thought of Maurice Blanchot, which emphasizes speech instead of perception as the fundamental way of reaching the other. After sketching Husserl's and Blanchot's views, we will be in a better position to understand how the witness is always singular and can yet, by promising to tell the truth, share her singular experience of the world with other singularities without losing her otherness.

#### THE JUSTIFICATION SCALE (IV-J)

*PETER MURPHY (UNIVERSITY OF INDIANAPOLIS)*

Standard theories of epistemic justification imply that there is a ceiling on the degree to which a belief can be justified. This ceiling is hit when the relevant justifier entails the truth of what is believed. But this is a mistake: a belief for which there is a truth-entailing justifier can be yet further justified. I propose an alternative view of the justification scale.

#### PRACTICAL INTERESTS AND NEED FOR CLOSURE IN BELIEF FORMATION (II-G)

*JENNIFER NAGEL (UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO)*

Why do our intuitive knowledge ascriptions shift when a subject's practical interests are mentioned? In trying to answer this question, many epistemologists have focused on empirical linguistic evidence for context sensitivity in knowledge claims, and relatively few have examined the empirical psychology of belief formation and attribution. The present paper examines one psychological factor (called "need for closure") relevant to knowledge ascriptions involving practical interests. Awareness of need for closure effects should make us more careful in developing cases to be used as evidence for positions like contextualism and interest-relative invariantism: for example, these effects taint the Bank cases developed by Keith DeRose and adapted by Jason Stanley. If we take need for closure effects into account, we cannot assume that high- and low-stakes subjects given the same initial evidence are intuitively perceived to enjoy belief formation that is the same as far as truth-conducive factors are concerned.

---

## THE ABSOLUTE AND POLITICS: THE CASE OF THE GERMAN ROMANTICS (IV-F)

*DALIA T. NASSAR (UNIVERSITÄT TÜBINGEN)*

Contending interpretations of the German romantics as either conservative or revolutionary are the outcome of divergent understandings of the role and significance of the absolute in romantic thought. The romantics are depicted either as “drunk” with an absolute that presents a divine order in the world—and hence conservative—or as striving after an absolute that, by remaining elusive to human consciousness, functions as a source for continual progress toward a regulative ideal. This paper argues that, for the romantics, the absolute is neither immediately present, nor beyond consciousness, but, rather, the product of human activity. As such, the romantics understand every individual to be responsible for, on the one hand, presenting the absolute in the world, and, on the other, discerning between true and false presentations of the absolute. Romantic political thought is therefore not conservatism, insofar as it allows for the critique of, and change in, the status quo.

## CAN MORAL FLAWS COUNT AS AESTHETIC VIRTUES? (I-J)

*JENNIFER NEILSON (UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS–AUSTIN)*

Art works ask us to imagine truths about the way that a fictional world is—its laws of nature, aesthetic principles, and moral truths. Whether a work is virtuous or morally flawed depends on which moral truths it prescribes that its audience imagine. I assess theories of how moral and aesthetic value are related, discrediting autonomism because of imaginative resistance, and two versions of immoralism because of an overbroad definition of moral flaw. Moral flaws can count as aesthetic flaws if they cause the audience to imaginatively disengage. However, works that prescribe imagining certain moral falsehoods may tempt us to disengage, but reward our perseverance by deepening our moral understanding. If such works exist, then their moral flaws can sometimes count as virtues, but only insofar as they enhance moral understanding. Such virtues can be counted as aesthetic only if we gain aesthetic value from such works.

## PARSIMONY, PARITY, AND THE EXTENDED MIND THESIS (I-K)

*ALYSSA NEY (UNIVERSITY OF ROCHESTER)*

Although content externalism is standard philosophical fare, some philosophers have recently argued for the more radically externalist extended mind thesis—that the *vehicles* of content, beliefs, and other mental states are not in the head, extending the mind out into the rest of the body and further into the world. In this paper, I consider Clark and Chalmers’s (1998) arguments for this thesis: the arguments from explanatory parsimony and from parity, demonstrating that both are unsound. Positing beliefs outside of the head saddles rational agents with systematic cognitive redundancy, and so considerations of parsimony do not favor them in action explanations. Moreover, the thesis cannot be motivated by parity considerations due to violation of what I call the ‘Occurrence Condition’. I stop short of rejecting the tenability of extended cognition tout court briefly

---



suggesting why the program, though not Clark and Chalmers's version of it, can avoid my criticisms.

### COMPARATIVE CHOICE WITHOUT COMPREHENSIVE FACTORS (II-K)

JAMES M. OKAPAL (MISSOURI WESTERN UNIVERSITY)

A comparativist says that if a comparison is possible, then the comparison must take place in terms of properties borne by the items in question. I will call these properties factors. According to Ruth Chang, the rational choice in each situation is determined by a single, comprehensive factor. She defends this view by arguing that rival approaches fail to meet certain meta-level criteria. I offer a distinct version of a sophisticated orthodox approach that eschews comprehensive factors and meets her criteria, thus showing that her argument by elimination is unconvincing. The heart of this alternative view utilizes factors, normative-level criteria, and interaction principles. Together, these elements supply content beyond the factors, provide determinate weightings of factors, and leave room for reasonable disagreement. Finally, I address the extent to which a sophisticated orthodox approach can avoid the criticism that it results in a fractured account of rational choice.

### NARRATIVE UNDERSTANDING AND PRACTICAL KNOWLEDGE (III-F)

SARAH K. PAUL (STANFORD UNIVERSITY)

David Velleman's theory of action was originally put forth in *Practical Reflection* as an effort to explain an agent's specially non-observational knowledge of his own intentional actions. The theory has since developed further in a number of ways, including recent elaborations on the kind of self-intelligibility Velleman claims is the aim of intentional action. His view now seems to be that at least one form of the self-understanding agents desire is what he calls 'narrative' understanding. This paper explores the impact this turn in the view has had on the ability of Velleman's theory to explain practical knowledge, in Elizabeth Anscombe's original sense.

### SUBSTANTIAL UNIVERSALS IN ARISTOTLE'S *CATEGORIES* (III-J)

CASEY PERIN (UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS)

Aristotle in the *Categories*, but not elsewhere, presents the distinction between individual substances like Socrates or Bucephalus and their species and genera is the distinction between *primary* and *secondary substances*. This distinction, in turn, is a distinction between substances that are *particulars* and substances that are *universals*. I try to explain here why, according to Aristotle in the *Categories*, some universals—the species and genera of primary substances—are *substances*. I argue that for Aristotle in the *Categories* the general notion of a substance is the notion of a subject for inherence. A substance, primary or secondary, is something in which other things inhere. On Aristotle's view in the *Categories* the genus or species of a primary substance is a subject for inherence, and so a substance, because it is what the primary substance is essentially.

## THE FOLK STRIKE BACK; OR, WHY YOU DIDN'T DO IT INTENTIONALLY, THOUGH IT WAS BAD AND YOU KNEW IT (IV-H)

MARK T. PHELAN (UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA—CHAPEL HILL)

HAGOP SARKISSIAN (DUKE UNIVERSITY)

Recent and puzzling experimental results suggest that people's judgments as to whether or not an action was performed intentionally are sensitive to moral considerations. Two theories have arisen to explain these data. One theory focuses on the moral status of the actions and asserts a strong conceptual tie between moral concepts and the concept of intentionality. Another suggests that a desire to blame the agent explains the relevant data and denies a conceptual tie between moral judgments and judgments of intentionality. In this paper, we describe a recent experiment that purports to vindicate one of these accounts, and present our own findings to show that it fails to do so. Finally, we present additional data suggesting no such vindication could be in the offing.

## SELF-KNOWLEDGE AND RATIONALITY (II-G)

BARON REED (NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY)

There have been several recent attempts to account for the special authority of self-knowledge by grounding it in a constitutive relation between an agent's beliefs and her judgments about those beliefs. This constitutive relation holds in virtue of the transparency of the self-knowledge judgments: the agent determines whether she believes that  $p$  by answering the factual question whether  $p$ . I argue, however, that there are two ways in which we are rationally required to violate the transparency condition and that recognition of this fact poses a serious challenge to the rational agency view.

## MOTION IN THE WHOLE: SPINOZA'S INFINITE MODE OF EXTENSION (V-F)

THADDEUS ROBINSON (PURDUE UNIVERSITY)

Spinoza distinguishes two kinds of mode: finite and infinite. While the infinite modes occupy a crucial position in Spinoza's ontology, their nature is anything but clear. In this paper I offer a new account of the immediate infinite mode of extension. I begin by presenting a number of criteria any account of the infinite mode of extension must meet. I then turn to a neglected passage from the *Short Treatise* and argue that the immediate infinite mode of extension consists in the motion of extension's regions relative to one another. I close by explaining how my account meets the aforementioned criteria and by responding to the most counter-intuitive aspect of my thesis.

---

## IDENTITY IN 4D (I-H)

THOMAS SATTIG (TULANE UNIVERSITY)

Four-dimensionalists offer a unified picture of various puzzles about identity over time, including the puzzle of fission and the puzzle of constitution. What unifies the four-dimensionalist approaches to these puzzles is the possibility of temporal overlap—the possibility for distinct continuants to share a common temporal part, or stage. I claim that the unified picture is inconsistent, if there are informative criteria of identity over time. I will show that while temporal overlap is compatible with four-dimensionalist criteria of diachronic composition, temporal overlap is incompatible with any four-dimensionalist criteria of diachronic identity.

## ARISTOTLE'S SYNCHRONIC JUSTIFICATION OF PRIME MATTER (III-J)

MARGARET E. SCHARLE (REED COLLEGE)

Although early debates concerning Aristotle's conception of prime matter centered on the interpretation of particular passages in which Aristotle supposedly refers to prime matter, the disputants now are agreed that the question hangs on Aristotle's philosophical requirements. The current debate is centered on the part of Aristotle's philosophy that seems most to demand prime matter—his theory of substantial change. I argue that an appeal to Aristotle's theory of substantial change is not required in order to establish his commitment to the existence of prime matter. Instead, I draw on *Physics* II.1's conception of what it is for an element to have a nature—that is, to have an inner source of movement and rest—to introduce a new justification for the existence of prime matter.

## THE NEUROSCIENCE OF MORAL MOTIVATION (II-J)

TIMOTHY SCHROEDER (OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY)

People often do what is right, and do it *because* it is right. How does this happen? The question has received attention in moral psychology and meta-ethics, but in principle neuroscience also has information to contribute. Carefully tracing the possible causal pathways through the brain to behavior reveals answers: the evidence strongly supports the conclusion that, unless one acts out of something like a deeply ingrained habit, or on the basis of something like a Tourette tic, then to be morally motivated one must be influenced by what neuroscience characterizes as one's appreciation of possible *rewards and punishments*.

## CAN NEUROAESTHETICS EARN ITS KEEP (I-J)

WILLIAM P. SEELEY (FRANKLIN & MARSHALL COLLEGE)

Semir Zeki has coined the term *neuroaesthetics* to refer to a broad range of recent research in the cognitive neuroscience of visual aesthetics. Whereas it is acknowledged that this research is interesting to the study of vision science, philosophers have been generally skeptical about the role it can play in philosophical discussions of art. In what follows, I explain the general model underlying this research, briefly summarize a representative

case study from the literature, and then evaluate the potential contribution of neuroaesthetics to our understanding of art.

### TROPES AND THE ZOMBIE ARGUMENT (I-K)

KEVIN SHARPE (*PURDUE UNIVERSITY*)

John Heil and David Robb have recently proposed a trope solution to the zombie argument that promises to preclude their possibility on purely ontological grounds. The possibility of zombies, they argue, relies on a dubious theory of properties, one that holds (i) properties are universals and (ii) every property is either categorical or dispositional but never both. This possibility vanishes once both assumptions are rejected in favor of an independently plausible trope ontology. In my paper I argue that Heil and Robb's trope ontology does not, by itself, preclude the possibility of zombies. Specifically, I argue that Heil and Robb's solution founders on a trope reformulation of the argument. I show that it is their physicalism and not their trope ontology that does the work of precluding the possibility of zombies. I conclude by arguing that the trope theory has no distinctive advantage over its ontological rivals.

### THE LAW OF INERTIA (III-H)

BRADFORD SKOW (*UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS-AMHERST*)

The law of inertia says that free bodies continue to move in straight lines at constant speed. Why is this law true? Why don't free bodies move in circles, or immediately come to rest?

Facts about the geometry of spacetime help explain why the law of inertia, rather than some other law governing the behavior of free bodies, is true. The explanation takes the form of a symmetry argument. I present the argument and give a reason to believe that the argument is, indeed, an explanation.

### DOES HUME HOLD A DISPOSITIONAL ACCOUNT OF BELIEF? (III-G)

JENNIFER SMALLIGAN (*UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA-BERKELEY*)

Most readers of David Hume's *Treatise* take it for granted that Hume holds an occurrence theory of belief. Yet Louis Loeb argues that Hume, while claiming explicitly that beliefs are vivid ideas, implicitly treats beliefs as dispositions. I consider this argument and defend what Loeb calls the "traditional interpretation," according to which Hume holds that beliefs are occurrent mental states. I argue that beliefs play an explanatory role in Hume's science of man, which could not be played by dispositions. Passages from the Appendix in particular suggest that Hume holds that phenomenological features of occurrent beliefs explain the influence of belief on the imagination, the passions, and our behavior. Finally, I claim that this explanation offers a key to understanding the variety of terms—including vivacity, solidity, firmness, and steadiness—which Hume uses to describe the feeling of belief.

---

## A CRITIQUE OF GEWIRTH ON CLARITY AND DISTINCTNESS (IV-I)

*SHOSHANA R. SMITH (COLGATE UNIVERSITY)*

In this paper I offer a critique of Alan Gewirth's account of clarity and distinctness in his article "Clearness and Distinctness in Descartes." I argue that Gewirth's distinction between interpretive and direct content is not useful. In most cases, either the direct and the interpretive content are not importantly different, or the interpretive content is an empty label and not playing any important role in the clarity and distinctness of the idea. I go on to articulate several aspects of clear and distinct perception that I think Gewirth does get right. Finally, I introduce my own account of clear and distinct perception: a perception is clear when we are paying attention to it and are aware of what it essentially contains. A perception is distinct when it includes nothing that is not essentially or necessarily connected.

## THE AVAILABILITY OF MOTIVES (III-F)

*STEVEN SVERDLIK (SOUTHERN METHODIST UNIVERSITY)*

I consider the degree to which various motives are 'available' to agents. This is an issue raised especially by some of Kant's arguments about the motive of duty. I distinguish three types of availability: epistemic, affirmative, and operative. I argue that the contrast that Kant in effect draws between the sense of duty and motives like sympathy is mistaken. I reach these conclusions:

- 1) All motives have epistemic preconditions.
- 2) For every motive, if it is epistemically available it is affirmatively available.
- 3) For 'higher' motives like sympathy and the sense of duty their affirmative availability does not guarantee complete operative availability.
- 4) Emotional motives have a propositional core.
- 5) This propositional core is affirmatively available if it is epistemically available.
- 6) Presumably the propositional core of higher emotions like sympathy is not completely available operatively when it is affirmatively available.

## NEURATHIAN ETHICAL NATURALISM (V-G)

*ALLEN THOMPSON (CLEMSON UNIVERSITY)*

Hursthouse develops Foot's recent ethical naturalism but offers a serious objection. I provide two responses to Hursthouse's objection. First, I argue that there is a plausible, non-normative description of characteristically human behavior, particularly regarding the proper social functioning of human beings: acting to reap the benefits of mutual cooperation in collective action problems. Second, I suggest that the *development* of practical reason as an acquired second nature is a teleological and species-typical characteristic of human beings, suitable for grounding ethical evaluations of the human rational will. My response to Hursthouse is important because, if successful, it enables us to envision a neo-Aristotelian view that attempts

to *integrate* two central themes in Aristotle's ethical thought: the human *ergon* and a developed ethical perspective. I conclude by claiming that the teleological process of developing our human capacity for autonomous, rational judgment supplies the kind of natural teleology required by Foot's Teleological Naturalism.

#### THE A PRIORI DEFENDED: A DEFENSE OF THE GENERALITY ARGUMENT (IV-J)

JOSHUA THUROW (UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN—MADISON)

One of Laurence Bonjour's main arguments for the existence of the a priori is an argument that a priori justification is indispensable for making inferences from experience to conclusions that go beyond experience. This argument has recently come under heavy fire from Albert Casullo, who has dubbed Bonjour's argument, "The Generality Argument." In this paper I (i) defend the Generality Argument against Casullo's criticisms, (ii) show that the argument fails for a quite different reason, namely, that it fails to take into account the distinction between being justified in believing an inference is good and being justified in making the inference, and (iii) present a repaired version of the argument that avoids the problem I present for the original argument.

#### SEMANTIC STIPULATION AND KNOWLEDGE DE RE (I-I)

CHRISTOPHER J. TILLMAN (UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA)

In *Naming and Necessity* Kripke famously argued that names may be introduced via descriptions that fix the reference of the name without providing its meaning. It appears as if one could use semantic stipulation to gain knowledge that is otherwise unavailable. So let *L* refer to the precise present location of Osama, if any. Kripke's discussion suggests I can now know Osama's location. My goal in this paper is to present and evaluate this puzzle of semantic stipulation. Commentators have variously replied that either (i) *L* is not a name, *L* is a name but the proposition encoded by *Osama is at L* cannot be believed when *L* is introduced this way, or (iii) that the proposition may be believed but is not a priori. I will argue that we should reject these replies; familiar Millian resources allow us to address this problem with out accepting (i), (ii), or (iii).

#### MONISM AND INTRINSICALITY (IV-K)

KELLY TROGDON (UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS)

According to priority pluralism (PP), the sparse ground for the world's abundance of mereological structure is the world's proper parts at some level(s) of decomposition, while according to priority monism (PM), the sparse ground for this structure is the world itself rather than its proper parts. In this paper I consider what I call the objection from intrinsicality to PM posed by Ted Sider (forthcoming), the claim that, since PM is incompatible with the correct account of intrinsicality, PM is false. First, I consider various accounts of intrinsicality and argue that PM is indeed incompatible with each of them. Then, I propose an account of intrinsicality

that is consistent with both PP and PM. Hence, I conclude that the objection from intrinsicity doesn't undermine PM.

### ARTICULATION AS THE CONDITION FOR THE IDEALITY OF MEANING IN HUSSERL (V-J)

*POL VANDEVELDE (MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY)*

"The Origin of Geometry" significantly reformulates the notion of ideal meaning as presented in the *Logical Investigations*. An investigation of the two features Husserl gives of ideal meaning: repeatability and accessibility to all, shows that meaning is such only when correlated to consciousness, as is the case in *Ideas*; and this correlation itself takes the form of an articulation, as is the case in "The Origin of Geometry," language being the most common articulation, although not the exclusive one. Because ideality is linked to an articulation, there is, according to "The Origin of Geometry," no radical difference any longer between logical meanings and cultural meanings. This leads Husserl to accept the view that an ideal meaning is neither merely discovered nor fabricated, but "invented," in the sense that it is the articulation found for it that stabilizes the meaning and allows it to be then ideal.

### THE FAILURE OF NOZICK'S BILATERAL VOLUNTARISM (II-F)

*HELGA VARDEN (UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA-CHAMPAIGN)*

Two arguments central to Nozick's libertarianism are a defense of capitalist markets as a solution to the problem of rightful acquisition of private property and a defense of the legitimacy of the minimal state's use of coercion. I challenge the consistency of both of these claims. In the first place, I argue that Nozick cannot appeal to a capitalist system to justify rightful acquisition of private property without also violating other crucial commitments. In the second place, I argue that the minimal state's use of coercion is inconsistent with Nozick's own understanding of individual rights. The result is that any libertarian account that utilizes either of these aspects of Nozick's theory also incorporates these inconsistencies.

### THREE OBJECTIONS TO OUGHT IMPLIES CAN (III-F)

*PETER B. M. VRANAS (UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON)*

Elsewhere I have given an argument for the following version of the ought-implies-can principle (OIC): by virtue of conceptual necessity, an agent at a given time has an (objective, pro tanto) obligation to do only what the agent at that time has the ability and opportunity to do. In this paper I defend OIC against three objections based on arguments to the effect that OIC conflicts with the is/ought thesis, with the possibility of hard determinism, and with the denial of the Principle of Alternate Possibilities.

## BARREN OF WISDOM: KIERKEGAARD'S SOCRATIC MAIEUTIC (IV-F)

JOSEPH J. WESTFALL (UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON–DOWNTOWN)

In this paper, I show that there is good reason to read Kierkegaard as a sort of Socratic midwife, and this, not only in his pseudonymous, “aesthetic” writings, but also in his signed, religious works. By way of comments on maieutics and Socratic irony, Kierkegaard re-defines the midwife as any author who remains ambiguous about his or her personal commitment to the truth. To avoid being thought a maieutic author in his own name, then, as Kierkegaard tries to do, he must prevent readers from misunderstanding his character in his writings. This, Kierkegaard cannot do, as I show through an ambiguity between two of Kierkegaard's later works signed in his own name. Readers thus are left as much in the dark about Kierkegaard as they are about his pseudonyms—or, for that matter, about Socrates. This ambiguity is itself the centerpiece of Kierkegaard's maieutic.

## RETHINKING RELATIONAL AUTONOMY (II-K)

ANDREA WESTLUND (UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN–MILWAUKEE)

In recent years the concept of “relational autonomy” has gained considerable currency among feminist philosophers and other parties to the autonomy debates. Many relational theorists take social factors to play a crucial *causal* role in the development of autonomy. Some argue that social factors are, in addition, partly *constitutive* of autonomy. John Christman has recently argued that constitutively relational accounts of autonomy are problematic insofar as they imply a suspect perfectionism about the human good. I argue that autonomy *is* constitutively relational, but not in a way that implies perfectionism. Autonomy relies (in part) on a disposition to hold oneself answerable to external, critical perspectives on one's action-guiding commitments. Autonomy thus requires an irreducibly dialogical form of reflectiveness. But this type of relationality is formal, not substantive, and carries no specific value commitments. The paper closes with some comments on the significance of this sort of relationality to feminist theory.

## INTENTIONAL ACTION AND ‘IN ORDER TO’ (IV-H)

ERIC WILAND (UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI–ST. LOUIS)

Joshua Knobe argues that we can see whether psychological subjects regard an action as intentional by determining whether they are willing to use an ‘in order to’ construction to explain the act, where the act in question appears on the right hand side of the construction. His research suggests that psychological subjects' moral views do affect whether they are willing to use the ‘in order to’ construction in this way. Here I argue that we see whether subjects regard an action as intentional by determining whether they are *also* willing to place the act on the left hand side of an ‘in order to’ construction. My research suggests that psychological subjects' moral views do not affect whether they are willing to use the ‘in order to’ construction in this way.



## INTRINSIC POWERS (IV-K)

NEIL E. WILLIAMS (*UNIVERSITY AT BUFFALO*)

Common to most realist accounts of powers is the claim that they are intrinsic properties. Most arguments presented in defense of the intrinsicity thesis have as their targets reductive treatments of powers that conceive of powers as relations between the object described as possessing the power and either some previous manifestation event or the laws of nature. However, even if these arguments are successful, they fail to establish that powers are intrinsic properties; at best, they demonstrate the irreducibility of powers. In order to take the further step to intrinsicity, these arguments need to be supplemented by an argument to the effect that powers are not relations that hold between pairs or sets of objects. This paper aims to supply that missing argument.

## ASYMMETRIES IN FOLK JUDGMENTS OF MORAL RESPONSIBILITY AND INTENTIONAL ACTION (IV-H)

JENNIFER LYN WRIGHT (*UNIVERSITY OF WYOMING*)

JOHN T. BENSON (*UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS–AUSTIN*)

Recent work in so-called “empirical philosophy” suggests that folk judgments of intentional action are asymmetrically influenced by moral considerations. We provide reasons to (1) reject several currently prominent (sometimes revisionary) accounts of this asymmetry and (2) accept an alternative account which exploits two factors: an asymmetry between assessments of praise and blame and the fact that intentionality commonly connects the goodness/badness of actions to the praiseworthiness/blameworthiness of people. In addition to providing empirical and conceptual evidence in favor of this two-factor account, we cite reasons to think that both factors may be philosophically defensible, indicating that the folk judgments in question may be justified. We end by showing how this account enables a critique of the increasingly popular argument that the findings of empirical philosophers challenge the philosophical understanding of the “folk concept” of intentional action.

## DOES POLITICAL LIBERALISM REQUIRE CITIZENS TO SPLIT THEIR IDENTITIES? (V-I)

MELISSA YATES (*NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY*)

Critics frequently object to the moral restraints on public deliberation imposed by contemporary theories of political liberalism. In this paper I evaluate the charge that such restraints implicitly obligate citizens to split their identities between their public and private selves. I am particularly interested in the application of the split-identity objection to religious citizens, which leads critics to argue that political liberalism is uncharitable to religious doctrines. While the objection has broad implications for political liberalism, I focus on John Rawls’s theory of public reason, suggesting two plausible responses overlooked in this debate. In the end, I argue that the split-identity objection does not pose as deep a problem for political liberalism as we might expect, but that it does point to difficulties with Rawls’s distinction between public and nonpublic concerns.

## SPINOZA'S MODAL MONISM (IV-I)

ANDREW D. YOUPA (SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY—CARBONDALE)

On what basis, if any, does Spinoza believe that his model of human nature—*homo liber*—avoids being as arbitrary as any other such model that has been proposed in the history of philosophy? This question is all the more pressing and vexing given Spinoza's incisive attack in the Preface of Part 4 of the *Ethics* against the construction and use of models. In this paper I show that the resources for the correct answer appear much earlier in the *Ethics* than the appearance of the free man and any explicit mention of a model of human nature. Specifically, I argue that Spinoza does not believe that his model of human nature is in any way arbitrary and that the basis for this belief is substance monism (1p14). It is substance monism, I contend, that sets Spinoza's free man apart from every imaginable model of human nature.

## THE FUNCTION OF FOLK PSYCHOLOGY: MIND READING OR MIND SHAPING? (II-J)

TADEUSZ W. ZAWIDZKI (GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY)

I argue for two claims. First, I argue against the consensus view that accurate behavioral prediction based on accurate representation of cognitive states, i.e., *mind reading*, is the sustaining function of mental state ascription. This practice cannot have been selected in evolution and cannot persist, in virtue of its predictive utility, because there are principled reasons why it is inadequate as a tool for behavioral prediction. Second, I give reasons that favor an alternative account of the sustaining function of mental state ascription. I argue that it serves a mind-shaping function. Roughly, mental state ascription enables human beings to set up regulative ideals that function to mold behavior so as to make it easier to coordinate with.

DELIBERATIVE MAJORITARIANISM AND THE PATERNALISM OF JUDICIAL REVIEW:  
ASSESSING WALDRON'S FORMAL ARGUMENT FROM DEMOCRACY (V-E)

CHRISTOPHER F. ZURN (UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY)

This paper reconstructs and critically evaluates Jeremy Waldron's argument that any form of judicial review violates the democratic ideals of fairness that ensue from taking the individual autonomy of each citizen seriously, once we consider the unavoidable 'circumstances of politics': reasonable pluralism and the need for authoritative legal coordination. It argues that Waldron employs an overly stringent and preemptive conception of democratic legitimacy, one that his own theory disregards. The paper suggests that these problems, coupled with an insensitivity to the predictable structural defects of democratic representative processes, leave the door open to a proceduralist justification of judicial review as an independent guardian of the procedures of democracy themselves.

---

# ABSTRACTS OF SYMPOSIUM PAPERS

## MEMORY AND MORAL AGENCY: TOWARD A CLINICAL MORAL PSYCHOLOGY (I-A)

CARL F. CRAVER (*WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY IN ST. LOUIS*)

Episodic (or autobiographical) memories are defined by psychologists as memories of personal events accompanied by auto-noetic awareness, that is, awareness; that the subject has formerly experienced the event. Some psychologists and philosophers believe that the appearance of episodic memory is a crucial difference between human beings and nonhuman animals. Some believe that the appearance of episodic memory in childhood is a crucial developmental milestone in the emergence of the self. To elucidate the role of episodic memory in the self, I consider questions of moral agency that arise in the case of a person, K.C., who has profound amnesia for episodic memory with preserved semantic and procedural memory, and in the case of a person, Jon, who has had a similar condition since birth.

## PHOTOGRAPHY, NARRATIVE, AND A (NEW) PROBLEM OF IMAGINATIVE RESISTANCE (IV-E)

GREGORY CURRIE (*UNIVERSITY OF NOTTINGHAM*)

We are used to the observation that photography is not painting by other means, and that the adoption of painterly styles and genres rarely produces anything satisfactory. But are there more fundamental limitations to the representational capacity of the photograph? What of those once admired attempts to use photographs to represent something other than the object before the lens? Such efforts, most famously exemplified by Julia Margaret Cameron's illustrations for Tennyson's Arthurian poems, have been castigated on aesthetic grounds. But putting aside the shortcomings in composition and technique of these images, it has been claimed more generally that photography's nature makes it an unsuitable medium for fictional narrative illustration.

I agree that there is a tension between the realism inherent in the photographic method and the illustrative purpose Cameron intended for her pictures. Sorting out exactly what the tension is demands that we bear in mind some cross-cutting distinctions between representations: trace-based representations and intention-based representations on the one hand, and representations-by-origin and representations-by-use on the other. We also need to understand how representations-by-use can have their status raised significantly by close association with a narrative.

This puzzle about the limits of photographic representation turns out to be a new variation on the now widely discussed theme of imaginative resistance.

---

Why, we ask, is it that we are resistant to imagining certain things that fictions present us with, notably (but not exclusively) moral evaluations? Fictions in which donkeys talk or arithmetic is proved consistent by finite means don't challenge us, but fictions in which cruelty is virtuous do. I will argue that our problem involves another sort of imaginative resistance: resistance to engaging in a certain kind of imaginative project which we take Cameron's photographs to suggest. And while our resistance here is not a straightforwardly ethical one, it does depend on a negative evaluation of that project. Right at the end I'll ask what there is of interest here for those who do not endorse this evaluation.

### THE ONTOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF INSCRUTABILITY (III-A)

*MATTI EKLUND (CORNELL UNIVERSITY)*

Let an inscrutability argument be an argument that purports to establish that, for principled reasons, it is indeterminate what subsentential expressions refer to or it is indeterminate what the quantifiers range over. By 'for principled reasons' is here meant that the indeterminacy results from fundamental features of language and cannot be remedied even in principle. The most famous inscrutability arguments are due to Quine. There has been much debate over whether the inscrutability arguments that have been offered succeed in establishing what they aim to establish. I will here rather be concerned with exactly what is the upshot of the supposed inscrutability. Specifically, the focus will be on inscrutability and ontology. What are the consequences for ontology if inscrutability obtains? It is sometimes suggested that the consequences for ontology would be radical. I consider what case, if any, can be made for this. Special attention will be paid to the consequences of the inscrutability arguments for what neo-Fregeans like Crispin Wright and Bob Hale say about ontological matters.

### FEMALE TERRORISTS AND HUMANITARIAN INTERVENTIONS (II-A)

*MARILYN FRIEDMAN (WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY IN ST. LOUIS)*

Is terrorism different when the terrorists are female rather than male? This paper explores the diverse ways in which female terrorists from a variety of movements regard their own actions and what they believe their violence accomplishes. It is particularly important that women tend to resort to violence far less frequently than do men. Thus, women's use of violence may indicate that an unusually severe level of crisis has been reached in a conflict situation. In light of those thoughts, the key question for this paper is whether female terrorists regard their actions as humanitarian in any way—a kind of humanitarian "intervention" into a critically troubled situation. If so, do those perspectives make normative claims on how others should evaluate the aims and actions of female terrorists?

---

## BLACK AESTHETICS, RACIAL REPRESENTATIONS, SENSIBILITY (II-B)

ROBERT GOODING-WILLIAMS (UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO)

Beginning with the idea of a black aesthetic, this paper will be a preliminary and largely exploratory attempt broadly to “map” the conceptual possibilities available to thinking “race” and, specifically, “blackness” in connection to notions of the aesthetic. Topics I expect to consider include black aesthetic formalism, recent analyses, and criticisms of the very idea of the aesthetic; the turn from aesthetics to the critique of racial representations, and the tendency to racialize aesthetic awareness as such. Some effort to pay attention to the manner in which these issues arise with regard to literature, the visual arts, and music.

## TOLERATION AND COERCIVE INTERVENTION IN THE INTERNATIONAL SPHERE (II-A)

REX MARTIN (UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS)

*The Law of Peoples* is John Rawls’s last book. Though short, it has given rise to a wide variety of interpretations and criticism. Two areas in particular have prompted controversy: Rawls’s account of human rights and his contention that ‘decent’ but nonliberal societies—hierarchically organized, dominated by a single comprehensive doctrine (typically a religious one), and often exhibiting pervasive gender discrimination—should be accepted on their own terms and tolerated as full partners alongside liberal states in the Society of Peoples.

In this session I will first look briefly but critically at some recent attempts to recast Rawls’s international theory in a positive and novel way. Then I will try to lay out an alternative account, and I hope a defensible one, of Rawls’s justifications of international toleration and coercive interventions, with special attention paid to his justification of human rights. There are three topics here I want especially to address: (a) whether non-coercive interventions (e.g., official criticisms by liberal governments of the social and political practices of their decent but nonliberal partners) are allowed for, as consistent with toleration, in Rawls’s Society of Peoples; (b) whether other forms of non-coercive intervention, stronger than criticism, between liberal states or between such states and decent but nonliberal ones can be allowed within Rawls’s doctrine of toleration; and, finally, (c) the point of Rawls’s rather curious claim that liberal societies should not, as part of their foreign policy, grant “subsidies to other peoples as incentives to become more liberal” (*Law of Peoples*, p. 85).

## GENOCIDE AND HUMANITARIAN INTERVENTION (II-A)

LARRY MAY (WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY IN ST. LOUIS)

Even among those who are strong critics of humanitarian intervention, exceptions are often made for cases of genocide. Michael Walzer, for instance, puts genocide at the top of a very short list of exceptions to his general condemnation of humanitarian intervention for having violated the rights of a people to manage their own affairs. In this paper I will try to explain why genocide is seen as so important, and unique, that it can justify

wars that otherwise would be roundly condemned. Indeed, genocide is often the example that is appealed to when one wishes to justify almost any strategy that might have hope of success, and this is true even for those who are not generally sympathetic to consequentialist strategies of justification. I wish to ask what theoretical account can best be given of the harm of genocide, especially to those who were not killed. And I wish to ask whether the harm is such that any and every effort must be taken to stop or prevent genocide, given the high costs that will be paid, especially in terms of the lives of innocent civilians, by such attempts to confront genocide through humanitarian wars of intervention. In this paper I will begin by focusing on Claudia Card's recent, and highly persuasive, attempt to link genocide with what she calls "social death." In the second section of the paper I will give an account of humanitarian intervention that stresses some of the conceptual and normative problems with this recourse to war. And in the final section of this paper I will give a very limited justification of humanitarian intervention to stop genocide, considering whether it might be legitimate to use tactics that one knows to be immoral in order to satisfy a duty to go to the aid of those who are in distress.

#### REPRESENTATION-BUILDING IN ANALOGY (IV-B)

*NANCY J. NERSESSIAN (GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY)*

It is widely recognized that analogies play prominent roles in creative thinking. The literature on analogical reasoning focuses mainly on 1) analogical argument (philosophy) and 2) processes of analogical retrieval, mapping, and transfer (cognitive science). The customary idea of problem solving by analogy in both areas is that one recognizes some similarities between phenomena under consideration (target) and other phenomena that one is familiar with and is better-understood (source), and creates a mapping between the two that enables solving the original problem. This notion of analogy assumes the source domain provides ready-to-hand solutions that can serve as the basis of inference. However, in many instances of creative thinking the source representation itself needs to be constructed. Information from the source domain is not mapped directly to the target, rather, constraints drawn from both domains are used for constructing intermediary hybrid models, possessing their own, model constraints, through which the problem solver thinks and reasons. In this paper I will provide two exemplars of such representation-building processes in scientific problem solving, one from the history of science (Maxwell's "physical analogies" in electromagnetism) and one from a think-aloud protocol study (a scientist solving a problem about springs). These imaginary models provide parallel worlds within which to reason about selected features of the phenomena under investigation. Since the objective is to focus selectively on the relevant pieces, the models work well enough for reasoning purposes even if they might not be fully feasible as real-world entities or processes. I will consider the nature of the reasoning processes involved in constructing and making inferences from such analog models.

---

---

## KNOWING ART WHEN YOU SEE IT: HOW REPRESENTATIONAL CATEGORIES ARE RECOGNIZED (V-B)

MARK ROLLINS (*WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY IN ST. LOUIS*)

To understand a representation, we must know what kind of representation it is: word, picture, map, or graph. Such knowledge, it is often said, must be invisible, a matter of background knowledge of conventions or the image maker's intentions perhaps. The reason is that different types of representation may look exactly alike; for instance, a sketch of mountain ridges and an electrocardiograph. The point extends to subcategories. Sometimes ordinary pictures are indistinguishable from pictures taken to be works of art. Thus, special training or historical investigation is required. Categorical distinctions cannot be seen.

This reasoning is off the mark: we are misled by the prospect of image indiscernibility. Recent research in cognitive neuroscience points to a perception-based approach to pictures, in which knowledge of special conventions plays only a minimal role. Thus, the question is how such an account might provide for an understanding of the image maker's categorial intent, i.e., the type of image s/he aimed to produce. I suggest that images of various kinds are distinguished by representational techniques and devices that are born out of perceptual strategies and heuristics made possible by the structure of the visual system or, more generally, the organization of the brain. In using these techniques, image makers encourage viewers to adopt the relevant strategies and heuristics and to attribute properties to the work based on them. In that sense, the makers have and express categorial intentions and perceivers grasp them in a sense sufficient to engage in interpretation of the appropriate kind. Little background knowledge is required. This argument bears on developmental issues: I suggest that it provides an account of how children grasp representational intentions and express them in their drawings, including the intention to make pictorial art.

## DESCARTES'S CONCEPTION OF THE HUMAN GOOD (II-C)

LISA SHAPIRO (*SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY*)

It is possible to understand eudaimonism to be an ethical view that ties acting well to achieving the human good—that is, one which subscribes to some form of Aristotle's function argument. On this understanding, Descartes can be counted as a eudaimonist. However, unlike many eudaimonists, Descartes neither expressly defines virtue in terms of the human good nor identifies the human good with happiness, or true contentment (though he does think that since virtue is necessary and sufficient for happiness, happiness can be taken as the end of action). In this paper, I focus on one part of the argument that Cartesian virtue (and so acting well) is tied to our realizing our nature as human beings: his account of the human good. The problems in understanding Descartes's account of the human good derive from his conception of human nature as the union of two distinct substances: mind and body. For Descartes, the human good has two

---

aspects, for we can speak of our good as it refers to our body or as it refers to our soul. Starting from Descartes's claim in the *Passions of the Soul* that "all the good and evils of this life depend on [the passions] alone" and our ability to master them, and drawing on that work as well as remarks made in correspondence with Princess Elisabeth and Queen Christina, I explicate Descartes's conception of the human good, and show just how it contains these two aspects. I will conclude with some remarks concerning how Cartesian virtue is tied to the human good on this reading.

#### STANDARDS OF RATIONALITY AND MORAL WORTH (IV-D)

*ANITA SUPERSON (UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY)*

In aiming to defeat skepticism about acting morally, we can take either a Hobbesian or a Kantian approach. On the former, which conservatives might favor, the task is to show that it is in the interest of self-interested people, or those in a position of privilege, to act morally, even when it means surrendering some, most, or all of their economic, social, and political power. This approach takes the privileged person's or group's position as the one to defeat. The Kantian approach, in contrast, allows us to ask the question "Why be moral?" from the perspective of the disadvantaged person or group. For instance, it allows us to ask, "Why should women participate in a sexist system if they are being degraded and otherwise harmed by it?" Women would consent to doing so only when coerced or lied to, which Kant identifies as the two ways that an immoral maxim might pass the Categorical Imperative. Otherwise, women would not consent, and maxims reflecting sexist behavior would be immoral and irrational. The Kantian approach puts the burden squarely and rightly on the resisters to show what gives them the right not to respect women's equal personhood. This paper explores these two approaches and their success in defeating action skepticism.

#### THE PHENOMENOLOGY OF JOINT AGENCY (IV-A)

*DEBORAH TOLLEFSEN (UNIVERSITY OF MEMPHIS)*

The phenomenology of agency has been of interest to those working on free-will and determinism for some time now (Frankfurt, 1988), but it is not until recently, with the renaissance of interest in consciousness, that philosophers of mind and psychologists have explored the issue (Horgan and Tienson, 2005; Horgan, Tienson, and Graham, 2003; Bayne and Levy, 2007; Pacherie, 2006). These recent explorations reveal that the phenomenology of agency is a rich and fertile topic. In addition to identifying a variety of aspects of the phenomenology of agency (the experience of control, of authorship, of mental causation, among others), philosophers and psychologists are beginning to explore the ways in which this phenomenology and the specific content of phenomenological states might contribute to the specification and regulation of action. I argue that there is a phenomenology of agency associated with joint action (particularly apparent in those forms of joint agency involving the coordination of bodily movements) and that the experience of plural control and plural authorship aids in the maintenance

---



---

and regulation of joint actions and the individual actions of which they are comprised.

## HOW GRAPHICS COMMUNICATE (V-B)

*BARBARA TVERSKY (STANFORD UNIVERSITY)*

Graphics are one of the oldest and most effective forms of communication, across the planet. Cave drawings and maps are ancient examples; road signs and diagrams are recent ones. An analysis of graphic communications produced by adults and children in many cultures and for many situations reveal how they communicate. Graphics convey meaning by using elements and the spatial relations among them to convey elements and relations, spatial or metaphorically spatial. Elements may convey meaning by resemblance, by association, or by Gestalt or geometric principles. Spatial relations may be meaningful at categorical, ordinal, or interval levels. The analysis of principles underlying production and comprehension of graphics provides guidelines for design.

## PLAYING WITH QUANTITY (V-A)

*ROBERT VAN ROOIJ (UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM)*

Two game theoretical accounts of Quantity Implicatures (e.g., scalar implicatures) will be discussed: one in terms of the Optimal Assertion framework (Benz and van Rooij, *Topoi*, 2007), and one in terms of signaling games as discussed, e.g., in the entry on Games and Implicatures in the *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.

In a standard signaling game (with messages that have semantic meanings) we can account for the 'extra' pragmatic information conveyed by the use of an utterance in terms of a particular solution (Nash equilibrium) of the game that speaker and hearer have 'chosen', very much in the same way as Lewis (1969) accounted for conventional/semantic meanings. One of the standard problems here is that there are typically more Nash equilibria.

In the framework of Optimal Assertions it is assumed that the hearer (initially) updates his beliefs just with the semantic meaning of the message. This allows the speaker to choose the sentence he wants to assert just by maximizing his expected utility, i.e., backwards induction, without taking into account the strategy used by the hearer. On the basis of the assumption that the speaker chose optimally, the hearer can derive then more from the use of the sentence than just its semantic meaning. Interestingly enough, this approach can easily account for various Quantity implicatures, by having as 'solution' the play that corresponds with the 'desired' Nash equilibrium of the above signaling game. Special attention will be given to the question of why (or under which circumstances) the 'desired' Nash Equilibrium of the signaling game approach is the unique solution of the Optimal Assertion approach.

---

---

# SPECIAL SESSIONS SPONSORED BY APA COMMITTEES

## THURSDAY, APRIL 19

### **Medicine and the Pharmaceutical Industry: Ethics and Conflicts of Interest (I-L)**

Sponsored by the Committee on Philosophy and Medicine

*1:30-4:30 p.m.*

### **Assessing Critical Thinking (I-M)**

Sponsored by the Committee on the Teaching of Philosophy

*1:30-4:30 p.m.*

### **Why Are Women Only 21% of Philosophy? (I-N)**

Sponsored by the Committee on Inclusiveness and the Committee on the Status of Women

*1:30-4:30 p.m.*

## FRIDAY, APRIL 20

### **Issues in the Pedagogical Use of Computers in Philosophy (II-L)**

Sponsored by the Committee on Philosophy and Computers

*9:00 a.m.-Noon*

### **Celebrating Iris Marion Young: Her Life and Work (II-M)**

Sponsored by the Committee on the Status of Women and the Committee on Inclusiveness

*9:00 a.m.-Noon*

### **What Graduate Students Need to Know about the Community College Job and Job Market (III-K)**

Sponsored by the Committee on Philosophy in Two-Year Colleges

*1:45-4:45 p.m.*

---

**Virtue in Traditional Chinese Thought (III-L)**

Sponsored by the Committee on the Status of Asian and Asian-American Philosophers and Philosophies

*1:45-4:45 p.m.*

**Philosophy and Immigration (III-M)**

Sponsored by the Committee on Hispanics

*1:45-4:45 p.m.*

**Public Scholarship and Civic Engagement across the Disciplines (III-N)**

Sponsored by the Committee on Public Philosophy

*1:45-4:45 p.m.*

**SATURDAY, APRIL 21****Improving the Control of Technology: Contributions of Philosophy and Social Science (IV-L)**

Sponsored by the Committee on Philosophy and Computers

*9:00 a.m.-Noon*

**Mereology and Reduction (IV-M)**

Sponsored by the Committee on the Status of Asian and Asian-American Philosophers and Philosophies

*9:00 a.m.-Noon*

**Philosophical Perspectives on the “War on Terror” (IV-N)**

Sponsored by the Committee on Blacks in Philosophy

*9:00 a.m.-Noon*

**Korea Today: Anticipating the 2008 World Congress (V-K)**

Sponsored by the Committee on International Cooperation

*2:30-5:30 p.m.*

**Integrating Philosophy into the K-12 Curriculum (V-M)**

Sponsored by the Committee on Pre-College Instruction in Philosophy

*2:30-5:30 p.m.*

---

---

# GROUP SESSIONS

Sessions sponsored by affiliated groups are listed below in alphabetical order of sponsoring group. Sessions sponsored jointly by more than one group are listed once for each sponsor.

## A

Adam Smith Society, *Sat, 12:15-2:15 p.m.*

American Association of Philosophy Teachers, *Thu, 9:00 a.m.-Noon*

American Society for Aesthetics, *Thu, 9:00 a.m.-Noon*

American Society for Philosophy, Counseling, and Psychotherapy, *Sat, 12:15-2:15 p.m.*

American Society for Value Inquiry, *Fri, 7:00-10:00 p.m.*

American Society for Value Inquiry, *Sat, 12:15-2:15 p.m.*

Association for Informal Logic and Critical Thinking, *Thu, 1:30-4:30 p.m.*

Association for Informal Logic and Critical Thinking, *Thu, 5:15-7:15 p.m.*

Association for Symbolic Logic, *Thu, 9:00 a.m.-Noon*

Association for Symbolic Logic, *Fri, 9:00 a.m.-Noon*

Association for Symbolic Logic, *Sat, 9:01 a.m.-12:01 p.m.*

Association for Symbolic Logic, *Sat, 12:15-2:15 p.m.*

Association for Symbolic Logic, *Sat, 2:30-5:30 p.m.*

Association for the Advancement of Philosophy and Psychiatry, *Sat, 12:15-2:15 p.m.*

Association for the Development of Philosophy Teaching, *Thu, 7:30-10:30 p.m.*

Association for the Development of Philosophy Teaching, *Fri, 7:00-10:00 p.m.*

Association of Chinese Philosophers in America, *Thu, 9:00 a.m.-Noon*

## B

Bertrand Russell Society, *Sat, 12:15-2:15 p.m.*

## C

Committee on Institutional Cooperation, *Sat, 12:15-2:15 p.m.*

Concerned Philosophers for Peace, *Thu, 7:30-10:30 p.m.*

Concerned Philosophers for Peace, *Fri, 7:00-10:00 p.m.*

Conference of Philosophical Societies, *Thu, 5:15-7:15 p.m.*

---

**H**

Hegel Society of America, *Thu, 9:00 a.m.-Noon*

History of Early Analytic Philosophy Society, *Sat, 12:15-2:15 p.m.*

Hume Society, *Thu, 5:15-7:15 p.m.*

**I**

International Association for the Philosophy of Sport, *Sat, 12:15-2:15 p.m.*

International Institute for Field-Being, *Thu, 9:00 a.m.-Noon*

International Society for Environmental Ethics, *Thu, 9:00 a.m.-Noon*

International Society for Environmental Ethics, *Thu, 5:15-7:15 p.m.*

International Society of Chinese Philosophy, *Fri, 7:00-10:00 p.m.*

**J**

Journal of the History of Philosophy, *Sat, 10:00 a.m.-3:00 p.m.*

**K**

Karl Jaspers Society of North America, *Thu, 9:00 a.m.-Noon*

Karl Jaspers Society of North America, *Fri, 7:00-10:00 p.m.*

**N**

North American Division of the Schopenhauer Society, *Thu, 5:15-7:15 p.m.*

North American Kant Society, *Thu, 9:00 a.m.-Noon*

North American Kant Society, *Fri, 7:00-10:00 p.m.*

North American Nietzsche Society, *Thu, 5:15-7:15 p.m.*

North American Nietzsche Society, *Sat, 12:15-2:15 p.m.*

North American Society for Social Philosophy, *Thu, 7:30-10:30 p.m.*

North American Spinoza Society, *Thu, 5:15-7:15 p.m.*

**P**

Personalist Discussion Group, *Thu, 7:30-10:30 p.m.*

Philosophy of Religion Group, *Fri, 7:00-10:00 p.m.*

Philosophy of Time Society, *Thu, 7:30-10:30 p.m.*

**R**

Radical Philosophy Association, *Thu, 7:30-10:30 p.m.*

Radical Philosophy Association, *Fri, 7:00-10:00 p.m.*

**S**

Society for Analytical Feminism, *Thu, 9:00 a.m.-Noon*

Society for Analytical Feminism, *Thu, 7:30-10:30 p.m.*

Society for Ancient Greek Philosophy, *Fri, 7:00-10:00 p.m.*

Society for Asian and Comparative Philosophy, *Thu, 9:00 a.m.-Noon*

Society for Business Ethics, *Sat, 12:15-2:15 p.m.*

Society for Empirical Ethics, *Thu, 7:30-10:30 p.m.*

Society for Lesbian and Gay Philosophy, *Thu, 5:15-7:15 p.m.*

- 
- Society for Philosophy and Public Affairs, *Thu, 7:30-10:30 p.m.*  
Society for Philosophy and Technology, *Thu, 5:15-7:15 p.m.*  
Society for Philosophy and Technology, *Fri, 7:00-10:00 p.m.*  
Society for Philosophy in the Contemporary World, *Thu, 9:00 a.m.-Noon*  
Society for Realist-Antirealist Discussion, *Thu, 9:00 a.m.-Noon*  
Society for Realist-Antirealist Discussion, *Thu, 7:30-10:30 p.m.*  
Society for Student Philosophers, *Thu, 5:15-7:15 p.m.*  
Society for Student Philosophers, *Sat, 12:15-2:15 p.m.*  
Society for the Advancement of American Philosophy, *Thu, 5:15-7:15 p.m.*  
Society for the Metaphysics of Science, *Thu, 5:15-7:15 p.m.*  
Society for the Metaphysics of Science, *Fri, 7:00-10:00 p.m.*  
Society for the Philosophic Study of the Contemporary Visual Arts, *Thu, 7:30-10:30 p.m.*  
Society for the Philosophic Study of the Contemporary Visual Arts, *Fri, 7:00-10:00 p.m.*  
Society for the Philosophical Study of Education, *Fri, 7:00-10:00 p.m.*  
Society for the Philosophical Study of Education, *Sat, 12:15-2:15 p.m.*  
Society for the Philosophical Study of Marxism, *Sat, 12:15-2:15 p.m.*  
Society for the Philosophy of Creativity, *Thu, 7:30-10:30 p.m.*  
Society for the Philosophy of History, *Thu, 7:30-10:30 p.m.*  
Society for the Philosophy of History, *Fri, 7:00-10:00 p.m.*  
Society for the Study of Ethics and Animals, *Thu, 7:30-10:30 p.m.*  
Society for the Study of Indian and Tibetan Buddhist Philosophy, *Thu, 7:30-10:30 p.m.*  
Society for the Study of Indian and Tibetan Buddhist Philosophy, *Sat, 12:15-2:15 p.m.*  
Society for the Study of Process Philosophy, *Thu, 7:30-10:30 p.m.*  
Society of Christian Philosophers, *Thu, 5:15-7:15 p.m.*

**W**

- William James Society, *Thu, 9:00 a.m.-Noon*
-

---

# APA PLACEMENT SERVICE INFORMATION

Lindsay Palkovitz will be the Coordinator for the APA Placement Service at the 2007 Central Division Meeting. Questions concerning the Service should be directed to Lindsay at the American Philosophical Association, University of Delaware, 31 Amstel Avenue, Newark, DE 19716. She can also be reached by telephone at (302) 831-1112, fax: (302) 831-8690, or email: lindspal@udel.edu.

## APA PLACEMENT SERVICE GENERAL HOURS OF OPERATION:

Wednesday, April 18: Placement Information, 5:00 – 10:00 p.m.,

Placement Interviewing, 5:00 – 10:00 p.m.,

Thursday, April 19: Placement Information, 9:00 a.m. – 7:00 p.m.,

Placement Interviewing, 9:00 a.m. – 7:00 p.m.,

Friday, April 20: Placement Information, 9:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.,

Placement Interviewing, 9:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.,

Saturday, April 21: Placement Information, 9:00 a.m. – Noon,

Placement Interviewing, 9:00 a.m. – Noon,

## APA PLACEMENT SERVICE LOCATIONS

The Placement Services will be located in The Palmer House Hilton Hotel as outlined below. For your convenience, maps of the hotel appear at the back of this issue.

### JOB CANDIDATES

1. Candidate Numbers will be assigned at the Placement Desk.
  2. The location of a Job Interview will be available from the Placement staff, or posted on the bulletin board at the information desk.
  3. Additional “Request for Interview” forms will be available at the Placement Desk.
-

4. APA Membership Applications will be available at the APA Meeting Registration Desk.
5. Information and instructions for using the Service will be available at the Placement desk (also see following pages), and posted on the information bulletin board.
6. The mailboxes for Job Candidates will be located at the Placement Desk.
7. A complete set of Job Postings will be available at the Placement Desk.
8. A message for the APA Placement Ombudsperson can be left at the Placement Desk.

### **INTERVIEWERS**

1. **Interviewers check in here**—as soon as possible upon arrival.
2. Payments for **On-Site Interviewing Departments** will be received here.
3. Space will be provided here for interviewers to check their files.
4. “Request for Interview” forms received from job candidates that have been reviewed by interviewers **should be returned** here.
5. A list of interviewing table assignments will be posted on the Placement Information Bulletin Board.

### **INTERVIEWING AREA**

1. APA Interviewing Tables will be located here.
2. In the event that additional space for interviewing is needed, we will post the additional location on the Placement Information Bulletin Board.

## **INFORMATION AND INSTRUCTIONS FOR JOB CANDIDATES**

### **REQUIREMENTS FOR USING THE PLACEMENT SERVICE**

1. You **must be an APA member** in order to use the Service. Placement is a benefit of membership for candidates, and there is no additional charge to use this service. Membership applications are available on the APA web site ([www.apaonline.org](http://www.apaonline.org)) or by contacting the APA National Office (302) 831-1112, or at the Membership/Registration desk at the Meeting.
  2. You **MUST REGISTER** for the **MEETING** in order to use the Service.
    - If you **register in advance** for the meeting and indicate that you will be a candidate (an advance registration form is located at the back of this issue), a candidate number will be assigned in the National Office and will appear on the back of your badge. You **must** pick up your badge from the APA Registration staff prior to using the Placement service.
    - If you register on-site for the meeting, present your badge to the Placement Staff, who will be available to assign you a candidate number in the “Placement Service” line.
-



---

## WHAT TO BRING WITH YOU

1. Your copies of recent issues of *Jobs For Philosophers*.
2. Several copies of your curriculum vitae. If you run out of CVs at the meeting, the hotel has a copy center located in the Business Center.

## HOW TO USE THE PLACEMENT SERVICE

After you have picked up your registration materials from the APA Registration staff, you are ready to use the Service. If you do not yet have a candidate number on the back of your badge, please go to the job candidates' area to receive one.

### JOB CANDIDATES' AREA

Here you will find a file folder (mailbox) with your candidate number on it. All communications addressed to you during the meeting will be placed there. Your folder contains:

1. "Request for Interview" forms. Additional forms will be available from the Placement staff. **Be sure that your Placement Number appears at the top of all forms.**
2. A "Locator" form for you to list your name and hotel address. Please do not remove this form from your folder. This is used only in the event that we need to contact you during the meeting.

### JOB POSTINGS

New jobs (not having appeared in the *Jobs for Philosophers*) will be posted on a bulletin board in the Placement Service Area. You should check this board regularly for new postings. Each ad should contain instructions on how to apply.

### INSTITUTIONS THAT HAVE CHECKED IN WITH PLACEMENT

The names of institutions that have registered to use the Service will be posted on the bulletin board (updated regularly) in *alphabetical order*. Each listing will indicate the following:

1. If the listing institution has checked in with Placement.
2. If the institution is accepting interview requests at the meeting.
3. The relevant *JFP* for the institution's opening(s).
4. Where the institution plans on interviewing (Table with number assignment).
5. Miscellaneous notes deemed appropriate by the Placement staff or the institution.

### SUBMITTING AN INTERVIEW REQUEST FORM

Complete the *top* portion of the "Request for Interview" form and attach a copy of your CV. **Be sure that your candidate number appears at the top of all forms.** After you have completed the necessary information,

---

place your request form and CV in the box marked *Requests for Interviews* which will be prominently displayed on the Placement Service Desk. Your "Request" will be forwarded to the institution by a staff member.

## INTERVIEWS

After your "Request" has been reviewed by a representative from the institution, the form will be returned to your file folder with the institution's response appearing on the *bottom* of the form. Check your file folder often so that you can be certain to receive your messages promptly.

By Noon on April 21, all "Requests" submitted by you should have been returned to your file folder, and you should remove them at that time. Occasionally, an institution may retain applications to review at a later date. If you applied for a job that had been posted and the institution did not check in with the Service during the meeting, it is suggested that you contact the institution by mail.

## INTERVIEWING LOCATIONS

Some departments will be conducting interviews at tables. Other interviewing table locations will be posted if additional space is required. Each institution using a table for interviewing will be assigned a table number. The table numbers assigned to institutions will be posted on the bulletin board in the Placement Service Area.

## ADVICE FOR JOB APPLICANTS

The APA Committee on Career Opportunities offers the following advice for job applicants: The schedule for those seeking jobs and those Departments offering positions is difficult for all concerned. From the point of view of Departments, any publication date for *Jobs for Philosophers* is a compromise between the competing demands imposed by the need to get funding for positions, so the later the better, and by the need to have time to process applications, so the sooner the better. From the point of view of job applicants, there are also competing demands: the sooner it is published, the more time to apply, but the later it is published, the more opportunities will be available. There is no easy solution to this problem, but you can ease your difficulties somewhat by being prepared when the *JFP* is published. You should have your curriculum vitae ready to put in an envelope, a generic draft of a letter of application ready to be fine-tuned for particular job opportunities, and the rest of your file ready for mailing. This means talking to those who are to write letters of recommendation long before the *JFP* is due to arrive, preparing material about your teaching capacities, and selecting a writing sample for those Departments that request it. Applications should be complete, as well as clearly organized. It is to your advantage to send in your application as soon as possible after an ad appears.

---

---

## INFORMATION AND INSTRUCTIONS FOR INTERVIEWERS

### REQUIREMENTS FOR USING THE PLACEMENT SERVICE

1. It is expected that **all individual interviewers will register for the meeting** either by using the registration form found in the back of this issue or by stopping at the APA Registration Desk to register on-site prior to using the Placement Service.
2. All **Departments (not individuals)** planning to interview at the meeting should complete the Placement Service advance registration form found on our web site, [www.apaonline.org/apa/divisions/central](http://www.apaonline.org/apa/divisions/central) or at the end of this section.

Upon receipt of an advance registration form additional information pertaining to the Placement Service will be sent to the attention of the contact person listed on the form. In the event that we send Placement forms either via email or mail, please be sure to complete these and return them to our office **at your earliest opportunity**. Not doing so may cause your materials to arrive after the Staff has already left the office to travel to the meeting. In this case, we **must** have you fill out the forms again on site. If time does not allow sending them to us, please bring them with you and turn them in at the Placement Desk.

### CHECKING IN WITH THE SERVICE

*Before you begin to interview candidates*, please check in with the Placement Staff. We will need to know that you have arrived on site for candidates inquiring about your institution. Additional information will be requested from you (or confirmed if your department pre-registered) at this time as well.

Some institutions accept interview requests at the meeting; some of these job notices may have appeared in *Jobs for Philosophers* while others are unpublished positions. A new, unpublished position will be assigned an AD# and posted on the bulletin board in the Placement Service area. If you are bringing such a job notice with you to the meeting, please provide the Placement Staff with **four** copies of the notice for the position you are advertising. Such a position announcement should be typed on *one side only* in a good size and easy to read font, and be as brief as possible. Only positions that have **not** appeared in *Jobs for Philosophers* will be posted. If you would like a position that has been posted at this meeting to appear on our website immediately following the meeting, or in the issue of *Jobs for Philosophers*, you need to submit this ad immediately, following the close of the meeting via our website, [www.apa.udel.edu/apa/publications/jfp/advertise.asp](http://www.apa.udel.edu/apa/publications/jfp/advertise.asp). If you need assistance with this, contact the APA National Office.

Some institutions interview by prearrangement after placing an advertisement in *Jobs for Philosophers* and then contacting candidates prior to the meeting. When you arrange an interview with candidates, please inform them that they **must be APA Members in order to use the Service and they must register for the meeting in order to use the Service**.

---

If you plan to conduct job interviews anywhere other than at the interviewing tables/suites we have provided, please let us know your plans because candidates often come to us to ask questions about the location/time (etc.) of their interviews, and we need to have complete, up-to-date information in order to help them (and you).

Departments using a **Suite** for interviewing will need to complete an interview schedule form at the time they check in with the Service. Doing so enables the Service to notify the candidates you wish to interview of your interviewing location. **Be assured that only those candidates listed on your interview schedule will be told the location of your hotel room, unless you have directed us to give this information to all candidates who ask.** Departments interviewing at tables **DO NOT** need to complete this form.

N.B.: If you are conducting interviews in a hotel room, please be aware of the following policy statement adopted by the APA Board of Officers at its November 2004 meeting:

“Departments should not conduct Job Interviews in non-suite hotel rooms. Candidates who are subject to such interviews can appeal to the APA and are guaranteed anonymity.” (Originally published in *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association*, Vol. 78, No. 5, pp. 23, 119.)

## **APA INTERVIEWING TABLES**

The Placement Service provides numbered tables for interviewing purposes; you will receive your table number assignment when you check in. These table number assignments will also be posted on the Placement Service Bulletin Board. Should additional space for interviewing tables be necessary, this location will be posted as well.

## **INSTITUTION FILE FOLDER (MAILBOX)**

There will be a file folder bearing the name of your institution in the Interviewing Area. Requests for interviews from candidates will be placed in this file folder.

## **REVIEWING INTERVIEW REQUESTS**

When a candidate requests an interview with your institution, you should receive her/his curriculum vitae attached to a “Request for Interview” form. The bottom of this form is to be completed by you and returned to Placement staff. If an interview is granted, space is provided on this form to list the time, date, and location of the interview. If you are *unable to interview a candidate*, space for this response is also provided on the form. Any request you receive in an envelope contains confidential material and should be destroyed rather than returned to the candidate. As a matter of professional courtesy, *all requests should receive a response*. When a candidate receives a “Request” form back without a response, he or she is likely to assume that the material *has not been reviewed* and might return this to you via our service or contact your institution by mail.

---

---

Each candidate is assigned a numbered file folder to facilitate prompt communication between interviewers and candidates. Materials that you wish to transmit to a registered candidate should be handed in to the Placement Service staff and will be delivered to the candidate by our staff.

## **APA STATEMENT ON PLACEMENT PRACTICES**

The APA Committee on the Status and Future of the Profession reminds you of its Statement on Placement Practices: The APA discourages the nomination by graduate departments of job seekers for positions in philosophy, and the submission of their dossiers in response to announcements of positions, without their knowledge or interest. This may seriously mislead those who are conducting searches, and may have unfortunate consequences both for them and for genuinely interested applicants. Graduate departments using a nomination procedure or submitting dossiers on behalf of job seekers should either attest explicitly that the candidate wishes to be considered for the positions in question, or (preferably) ensure that the job seekers themselves submit personal letters of application for these positions. Departments conducting searches are encouraged to recommend or require explicitly (in their position announcements) that each candidate, to be assessed of full consideration, should submit a personal letter of application for and interest in the announced position.

*A Placement Ombudsperson will be available at the meeting. Please see the Placement Service Staff if you would like to contact the Ombudsperson.*

---

---

# APA PLACEMENT BROCHURE

This brochure offers some advice to those seeking jobs in philosophy. Like all advice it is to be taken with a grain of salt. It is based on the collective wisdom of the APA's Committee on Academic Careers and Placement in Fall 2004 (Larry May [chair], Andrew Light, Frank Ryan, Abby Wilkerson, Melissa Zinkin, Nancy Holland, Rebecca Copenhaver, Mark Timmons, David Tuncellito). Collective wisdom is probably somewhat less controversial than collective punishment, but more controversial than almost everything else. Nonetheless, we hope that some of what we recommend will prove helpful to some of you, some of the time. Job seeking is one of the most difficult things that people can engage in. Anything that reduces that difficulty has value.

## 1. WHEN TO START THINKING ABOUT JOBS

It is never too early to start thinking about the job market. During your first years in graduate school you should be thinking about which papers your teachers have liked. After the end of term, take the paper back to the professor who liked it and ask two questions:

What can I do to improve this paper and make it marketable for a conference or for publication?

Which conference or journal would be best suited for a paper like mine?

You don't need to do a lot of this. One or two of your best essays, sent first to a conference and then to a journal, will do nicely. Only send out your very best work to conferences, for that is what you want to be remembered for.

In addition, in these early years in graduate school, you should try to put together a good assortment of courses that you have TAed for or taught independently. You should try to TA for all of the major introductory courses (introduction to philosophy, ethics, logic and critical thinking) as well as some specialized or advanced courses in your areas of specialization and competence. At some universities, such as the large state schools, the trick will be to limit your teaching so that you can get good writing done. At other schools, you may have to be creative to get enough teaching experience (try contacting small colleges and community colleges in your area). Most importantly, keep your teaching evaluations from these courses. Or if course evaluations do not routinely have students evaluate TAs, design your own and administer it during the last week of classes (then have a departmental secretary collect and hold them for you until grades are turned in so students don't think you will retaliate against them).

---

A note of caution: Given the current and foreseeable demand for low-paid adjunct courses it can be very tempting to take on a large amount of adjunct teaching. Given the large number of graduate students seeking such teaching it can also be very tempting to take every course that is offered to you in order to ensure your place in the adjunct pool. The result sometimes can be a vicious cycle of taking more and more low-paid adjunct teaching that can impede your ability to finish your dissertation.

All other things being equal, and they hardly ever are, you could also use the early years in graduate school to get a bit (but only a bit) of service or administrative experience. The easiest here is to volunteer for a departmental committee, like the colloquium or admissions committee. If there are opportunities to work with an actual administrator, especially a Dean or higher, on a special project, you should jump at the opportunity since a letter from said administrator will make you look more attractive to administrators who will hire you down the road. Do not (repeat: do not) spend much time at this. Service is clearly a very distant third-place, after research and teaching, for the vast majority of jobs. No one gets hired on the basis of service, standing alone, unless you want to be hired into an administrative job. Remember too that one should be cautious about spending too much time on departmental or campus politics. Indeed, try to stay out of departmental politics altogether, which can come back to bite you. You are a transient in graduate school, and should not treat this as a permanent position.

It is a good idea to join the APA as soon as you can—the rates for student members are very low. And make sure to check the box on the application form saying that you would like to receive the publication called: *Jobs for Philosophers* (it's free—but you have to check the box to get it). Once you get this publication, you can scan through it and think to yourself: Do any of these jobs sound interesting to me? What do I need to do to stand the best chance of getting the job I like the most? Note whether there are any such jobs. If not, consider another career. If so, notice what combinations of things employers are looking for (for example, notice that most jobs in philosophy of science or mind also want someone who can teach logic; and most jobs in ethical theory or political philosophy also want someone who can teach applied ethics).

Another good source of experience and professional contacts can be found in the numerous smaller specialized societies organized around particular sub-fields of philosophy, affinity groups, or particular periods or figures, such as the Society for Women in Philosophy, the International Society for Environmental Ethics, or the Society for Realist/Antirealist Discussion. Such organizations can be invaluable for helping to establish you in the field and providing a set of interlocutors who can improve your work. One of the best ways to find such organizations is to survey the Group Meetings listings in the program for each divisional APA conference.

In general, use the early years in graduate school to learn as much philosophy as you can. Also, begin to develop a specialty in philosophy, and perhaps also begin to develop a competence outside of philosophy,

---

---

such as political science or computer science (although for certain jobs you might not want to highlight this). Use these early years to figure out if you really want to spend your life in a philosophy department, and to begin to get a sense of what it means to be a “professional” philosopher. While it is very romantic to want to be a philosopher, like being a poet one does not live by thoughts and words alone. The way to support yourself is by getting a job as a member of a profession, and our profession, as odd as it may sound, is teaching and publishing in philosophy, which is not especially romantic, but is better than many other jobs we know.

## **2. WHEN TO GO INTO THE “MARKET”**

One of the most important decisions you will make is when to go into the philosophy job market. This is especially important because many graduate students go in too early and waste years of their lives. The job market process is a nearly full-time job. So if you go in early and you don’t have enough of your dissertation done, you can find yourself six months later with no job prospects and no more done on your dissertation than when you started. Do this a couple of years and you nearly place yourself out of the market by being too long in graduate school—taking too long to finish a dissertation is almost always seen as a bad sign of how long it will take you to finish anything else.

So, when is it optimal to go into the job market? While this varies a bit, the best time is when you are nearly done with your dissertation. “Nearly done” is a relative term. If you have a five-chapter dissertation, “nearly done” can mean four chapters drafted and approved by your committee, and the other chapter at least begun. Or it can mean, all five chapters drafted and some fairly minor revisions needed. At bare minimum, you need three of those five chapters done by early September. The main reason for this is that you need your dissertation committee chair to say, in a letter he or she will write in late September, “Yes, Jones will be done and ready to start undistracted in the Fall.” But this is not enough, since everyone’s committee chair will say that, or else your application process is simply a waste of time. In addition, the committee chair must offer evidence to back up this claim, such as, that all five chapters are drafted and only need minor revisions, or some such. Optimally, the letter from your committee chair will say: “We have set December 8th as the defense date.” This is optimal because by the time you get to the Eastern Division meetings in late December, folks will know whether you are really done or not. January defense dates are good as well, because departments will be making hiring decisions by late January or early February, typically.

In normal years there are a lot more applicants for jobs in philosophy than there are jobs. So, employers are looking for reasons to throw out applications. The first cut at most schools is “whether the candidate is done, or will be done by September.” Unless you can make a strong case for this, and your dissertation committee chair can back you up, you are unlikely to make the first cut, and hence likely to have wasted six months or more. Don’t delude yourself. It normally takes two months of relatively

---



uninterrupted work to draft a good chapter, so it will take six months of very hard work to draft more than half of a dissertation, depending on your other commitments. If you haven't started seriously writing your dissertation by March, you don't stand much of a chance of being more than halfway done by September. But also don't wait too long. While the national average is seven years from BA to completion of the Ph.D., if after completing your coursework you take longer than three years to write the dissertation, potential employers will start to wonder whether this is a sign that you will not be able to write enough in your probationary period to be able to get tenure. So, our best advice is not to go into the market until you are done with the dissertation, or at very least "nearly done."

### 3. THE SYSTEM

In America in philosophy, the majority of jobs are advertised in *Jobs for Philosophers* in October and November and then first interviews (a half hour to an hour in length) are conducted at the APA Eastern Division meetings between Christmas and New Year's day. If you make it through the convention, then two or three people will be flown to campus for a two-day intensive interview, where you will meet all of the faculty members and present a professional paper, or teach a class, and increasingly both. There are also jobs advertised after New Year's day, although far fewer than before New Year's. These jobs will typically have their first interviews at the Pacific or Central Division meetings in late March or late April respectively. But many of these jobs will not be tenure track, but instead they are rather late announcements for temporary positions of one or more years. Some schools will do first interviews by phone, but these are still very rare. If you are seriously on the market, you should plan to go to the APA Eastern Division meetings and apply to jobs out of the October and November *JFPs*, and then keep applying throughout the year.

Many graduate students go to their first APA meeting when they go on the job market. While certainly understandable due to financial constraints, we strongly advise you to attend a meeting of the APA prior to going on the market. In particular, going to an Eastern APA meeting may help you avoid the "shell shock" of going to one of these meetings only when it "counts." We would also hope that attending these meetings without the pressure of being on the market will help you see the positive aspects of these conferences, especially the ability to reconnect with friends in the field and make new friends that you otherwise might not see in the academic year. Also, reading a paper or being a commentator might help get you a job in the following years.

### 4. THE "VITA"

One of the main ways to tell whether you are ready to go on the market is whether you can put together a respectable vita by early September. A vita is simply an academic resume, but it is not really very simple at all. You should show your vita to various faculty members and put it through the kind of drafting process that you would use for a term paper. For most applicants, the vita should be two to three pages long, with three to four

---

---

pages for dissertation abstract and summary of teaching evaluations as supplements to the vita.

- a) Address – list your departmental and home addresses and phone numbers. Also list where you can be reached right up to the beginning of the Eastern APA convention (December 27).
  - b) Area of specialization – this is optimally two or three areas of philosophy that you are especially qualified in. The dissertation is the primary, often only, basis for proof of a specialization. To figure out what would be good combinations of specialization, consult back issues of *Jobs for Philosophers* and then make sure that your dissertation really does cover those areas.
  - c) Area of competence – this is optimally four or five areas of philosophy that you are ready to offer courses in, different from your specialized areas. The best way to demonstrate this is in terms of what you have taught or TAed.
  - d) Publications or conference presentations – this could be one area of the vita or several, depending on what you have accomplished. Do not pad your vita with very minor things (or optimally, list them under a separate category for minor publications). Try to list the most significant first—they don't need to be in chronological order. Make sure to indicate whether something was peer refereed.
  - e) Teaching experience – list TA experience in a separate category from autonomous teaching. List the dates and places of the experience.
  - f) Special honors and awards – list whatever seems relevant to a job search in philosophy. Mainly focus on things you earned in graduate school.
  - g) Recommendation writers – list the names of all of those who will write letters for you and the addresses and phone numbers for them. This list should include all three (or four) members of your primary dissertation committee, as well as someone who will write specifically about your teaching—preferably someone who has good first-hand experience of it. And it is sometimes an especially good thing to be able to have someone write for you who is not a faculty member at your department or school. Those letters are more believable since the reputation of the recommendation writer is not tied up with whether you get a job or not. For example, if you give a conference paper and have a commentator who liked the paper, ask that person to write a letter for you; act similarly for a paper you have written about a prominent philosopher who has read your work and appreciated it, but such letters are limited in scope. It often is a good idea to give to prospective letter writers a letter from you that indicates what things optimally you'd like them to cover in the recommendation, and give them lots of time—ask them by Sept. 1.
-

- h) List of graduate courses taken: list all courses (including those you audited) along with the name of the professor and the semester taken. It is often a good idea to group these by subject areas rather than merely to present them chronologically. **DO NOT LIST GRADES**—no one cares anymore.
- i) Summary of selected course evaluations: on no more than two sheets of paper, list five or six sets of teaching evaluations, displayed in graphic form that is easy to read
- j) Dissertation abstract—on one or two sheets of paper give a detailed description of the arguments of the dissertation. Provide a summary paragraph and long paragraphs on each chapter. [NOTE: if you can't easily provide this abstract then you are definitely not ready to go on the market.]

It is hard to stress enough how important it is to get the vita just right. The trick is not to pad the vita and yet to list all of the important stuff about your fledgling professional life.

On a more mundane subject, normal white paper and average size typeface work best. This is why you need lots of feedback and redraftings to get it right. If you have any questions about how you “appear” through the vita, ask people you can trust to give you frank advice, and then, with several such pieces of advice, make a decision about how you want to “appear.”

Do not waste your time applying for jobs that list an AOS different from the ones you list on the vita.

## **5. THE COVER LETTER**

The cover letter for each job application should basically be a one-page attempt to demonstrate that you fit the job description. This means that you should highlight aspects of the vita that demonstrate your qualifications for the things mentioned in the job ad. You should have a paragraph on teaching and a paragraph on research, at bare minimum.

The cover letter is sometimes the only thing that members of a hiring committee read, so take your time with it and try to convey as much information as you can in a page or so without being excessively wordy or using terms and expressions that may be esoteric to a particular sub-field of philosophy—keep in mind that most people reading this letter will not be working in the specialty area in which you work. It is not a problem to go over one page in length, but remember that folks may not read the second page.

If at all possible, put the cover letter on departmental stationary. If you already have a job, this is easy. But if you are still in graduate school, most departments will let you use departmental stationary. If your department secretary complains about the cost of letterhead stock, merely ask for one sheet, and then photocopy it and print your covering letter on the photocopied departmental letterhead.

---

---

## 6. THE WRITING SAMPLE

You will need to supply at least one writing sample with each application. It is commonly thought that the writing sample should come from the dissertation. If it does not, people may wonder whether the dissertation is indeed almost done. You should take a chapter from the dissertation and make it a free-standing 25-page paper. If you have a paper that has been accepted for publication, you should include this as well; but especially if it is not from the dissertation, this should be included in addition to, not instead of, the dissertation chapter.

In all cases, the writing sample should be your very best work. After all, someone may actually read it and base the whole interview on it. How embarrassing it will be for you if you really don't think that thesis is defensible anymore. Writing samples should be very carefully edited for typos and infelicities of style, since this is the only piece of your work members of a hiring committee are likely to see. You should never send out a writing sample that has not been seen, and critiqued, by several people in your field, even if these are only fellow graduate students. Do not assume that even if people have seen earlier drafts of the writing sample, say when it was merely a chapter, that is good enough. As with everything else you send out for the purposes of getting a job, only send things out that others have looked at for you in advance. [Note: Your writing sample should not be the same as the professional paper you deliver on campus, lest folks think that you only have one good idea.]

## 7. WHICH SCHOOLS TO APPLY TO

Our standard advice is that if you are serious about the job market you should be able to apply to 30-80 jobs before Christmas. Of course, it is a waste of everyone's time to apply to jobs that you are not qualified for, or for which you do not have the right AOS. But so many jobs list open specializations, or merely list courses to be taught, that it shouldn't be hard to find quite a number of jobs that one is qualified for out of the 300-plus advertised in the October and November issues of *Jobs for Philosophers*.

Many students decide to do a more limited search. In order to accomplish this goal they try to determine which departments are most likely to hire them, and then only apply to those schools. For instance, if someone really wants to teach applied ethics, then one often applies only to jobs that list applied ethics as an AOS, rather than also to jobs that list ethical theory or political philosophy as specializations. In deciding whether to pursue this strategy, you should realize that departments often change their minds about precisely what they want. If you do a limited search, still apply to as many jobs as you can from those that you are qualified for. Remember that you don't have to take every job that is offered, but unless you get an offer from somewhere you won't get a job at all.

## 8. PREPARING FOR THE INTERVIEW

Before going to the APA Eastern convention for the first round of job interviews, everyone should first have a mock interview. If this is not a

---

regular feature of your graduate program, mock interviews are easy to organize on your own. Merely find two or three faculty members, give them a copy of your vita a few minutes in advance (to make it seem like the real thing) and have them sit in a room with you for an hour and role-play.

The first half of the interview should be about research, and it should begin with someone asking you to describe your dissertation in about ten minutes. The “Spiel” should be memorized and well-rehearsed in front of a mirror. Of course, you will rarely get through ten minutes before questions start flying. And that’s good—since the whole point of an interview is to have a conversation where three things are learned: how good a philosopher you are, what kind of a teacher you are likely to be, and whether you will be a good conversationalist as a colleague. Since you won’t normally be allowed to finish the “Spiel” front-load it with the most interesting ideas.

The second half of the mock interview, like most of the real interviews you will face, should be focused on teaching. You should come prepared to discuss in detail how you would teach courses that would naturally fall out of your areas of specialization and competence. Be prepared to explain what you think students should get out of a given course in order to motivate your teaching approach. Prepare elaborately for these mock interviews, as well as for the real one, and bring sample syllabi for a host of courses you are likely to be asked to teach.

At the mock interview, those mocking you should put on different hats, preferably trying to simulate folks who will indeed interview you. For that reason, wait to do this until early to middle December so it is likely that you will have started to hear from schools. Also, ask the mockers to be brutally frank with you. A lot of what goes wrong in interviews is easy to fix if you know about it in advance. It is easy to redo your “Spiel.” And, if you bite your thumb or scratch your rear end, this can easily be corrected once you know it. If you look distracted, you can sit up straight and then lean forward. If you look too intense or nervous, you can slide down in the chair and slump a little. If you look too buttoned-up, unbutton; if you look too laid-back, button-up, etc.

When you get interviews, go onto the departmental web site and look at the courses that would naturally fall into your specialization and competence. It is also a good idea to try to get a sense of what type of school it is. And if this is a “plum” job for you, you might want to read some things that people in the department, especially those in your area, have written.

At nearly every real interview, you will be asked if you have any questions for them, so make that part of the mock interview as well. If you don’t know this you can be flummoxed by this question—so have one or two questions, ideally based on your knowledge of the department and the curriculum, e.g.: “Are your 400 level courses only upper level undergraduate courses or are there both graduate students and undergraduate students in these courses?” Don’t be too provocative here and generally stay away from salary issues.

---

---

Very often you will be asked what your “next” project will be, now that you are nearing the end of your dissertation—you don’t have to have a super-detailed answer to this, but you should have some answer. Don’t try to make something up on the spur of the moment. A good strategy is to work up a project that spins off the dissertation, perhaps writing the chapter you never got to, or that is a natural follow-up to the dissertation. That way you can still talk about stuff you know something about.

## **9. WHAT TO WEAR**

The best advice about what to wear is to wear what will make you comfortable. Men don’t need to wear a suit, nor do women. Jackets are pretty much required though. Don’t wear a loud tie or a loud scarf. You don’t want to be remembered later as that person with the weird thing on—much better to be remembered for what you said—the person who had a really interesting response to Smith’s hard question, for instance. Ties for men are not strictly required; but more men wear them than not, so... Women, as is true for men, can certainly wear pants, as long as they look professional, and indeed you might prefer them. In general, dress comfortably—the placement process will be uncomfortable enough as it is.

## **10. GENERAL CONVENTION ADVICE**

If you can afford it, plan to spend two or three nights at the hotel where the convention occurs. And best not to have a roommate, unless it is someone you really trust. Things will be stressful enough without having anywhere to escape to (and watch cartoons, or the weather channel, or whatever relaxes you) between interviews. Also, for two of the evenings there will be receptions (still called “smokers” by most attendees, even though there hasn’t been any smoke or fire for many years) in the evening, often going on till late hours, and it is best not to have to navigate mass transit after midnight.

Generally, drink little if any alcohol during the convention. And try to stay away from folks who have been drinking and have interviewed you. Aside from this advice, though, there is nothing wrong with trying to find folks who interviewed you later in the day at the “smokers.” Many a job has been secured with an extra effort at finding and conversing with folks where you effectively get a second interview to only one for your competitors. Of course, don’t make a pest out of yourself. Look sheepish as you approach them, and ask if it is OK to continue the conversation that was begun earlier. Many departments make finding them at the smoker easy by reserving a table in the large hall where these events occur. When you enter the hall the APA will provide a list of the numbered tables that have been reserved by various departments. When departments have reserved a table they are signaling in part that they are encouraging candidates to stop by for a chat after the interview, so you should plan on coming by.

---

## 11. APRES CONVENTION

After the convention go back home and prepare a campus job talk. Better yet, you should have had such a talk already planned out in October. In any event, you should not delay doing this since you might get a call only a few days after the meetings asking you to fly out for a campus visit. Almost everyone wants either a formal or informal paper, and you should get one ready right away just in case. It is also a good idea to go over the convention with your placement director or mentor and see if follow-up e-mails might be warranted. Also try to set up a mock job talk—round up your friends and stray faculty members and make them sit down for an hour with you while you do a dress rehearsal.

If you get a job offer and still haven't heard from a school you prefer, call them up. Nothing is lost here. If they don't want you, and they have any manners at all, then they'll let you down gently. But the worst thing is if they do want you but are merely being slow and you don't give them enough notice about a deadline for another job.

## 12. LATE BREAKING JOBS AND PERSISTENCE

Keep yourself open to the possibility that nothing will happen as a result of the first round of job interviews. Keep sending out applications until you are sure you'll be employed. This is psychologically hard to do, but it is necessary. Many of our students have gotten jobs in the second or third round, after the competition has diminished a bit. Those jobs are no less desirable, often, than those that interview at the Eastern. And always remember, you don't have to stay in the same position forever.

As was briefly mentioned above, some jobs that are advertised in the Fall, and comparatively more advertised in the Spring, are not tenure-track but limited term appointments for a year or more. These jobs can be important stepping-stones to a good tenure-track job. While many if not most of these limited term positions are for sabbatical replacements and so not renewable, some can become gateways for permanent positions at the same institution. In addition, having letters of reference from members of a department who have gotten to know you as a colleague, rather than as a grad student, can be very valuable in helping you to land a tenure-track job.

It is also increasingly common for departments to advertise full time postdoctoral fellowships of one to three years. You might even consider looking for and taking one of these positions rather than initially seeking a tenure-track job. Most postdocs do not teach full loads and will allow you to build a strong record of publications. Helpful hint: Many postdoctoral positions are not advertised in *Jobs for Philosophers* when they are part of a college or university's on-going "society of fellows" program or part of an established research center. Those interested in such positions should consult the job listings in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* and individual university web-sites.

## 13. PROBLEMS

---

---

If problems (of harassment, intimidation, or general annoyance) occur, talk to the APA staff or to the ombudsperson for the meetings, normally a friendly member of the very APA committee that wrote this brochure, and hence someone who cares about you. It is simply unacceptable for any job candidate to be made to feel uncomfortable because of comments about physical appearance, and certainly about sex or race. There is no reason not to complain, and the members of our committee who attend every APA meeting will not treat such complaints lightly.

If you are disabled, your right to full access in every aspect of the placement process *ought* to be extended without question or repercussion, just as you should be able freely to disclose your disability status. The APA is now beginning to address these problems, as are many institutions. In the meantime, candidates must not hesitate to request necessary accommodations, yet still have to strategize about disclosure or access requests. At the campus visit stage, wheelchair-accessible spaces cannot be assumed, yet are probably one of the simpler accommodations for most institutions, which may not be prepared to provide interpreter services or assume the travel costs of assistants. Candidates should carefully think through how they will negotiate these issues. Currently, the APA will provide a quiet interview room for candidates or interviewers for whom the large common interviewing area is inaccessible for reasons of disability such as, but not limited to, deafness, hearing impairment, cognitive impairments, or speech impairments. Contact the placement service if you need this provision. Additional concerns related to access or ableist bias in the placement process may be taken up with the placement ombudsperson through the APA placement service.

---



---

# PAPER SUBMISSION GUIDELINES

**Online Paper Submissions NEW! Blind Review:** Papers in any area are welcome. All papers are blind reviewed. Author's name, institution, or references pertaining to the identity of the author should be omitted from the paper, abstract, notes, and bibliography. Submitted papers are not returned to authors. Papers not accepted by one Division may be re-submitted for consideration to another Division. In submitting papers, authors warrant that those papers are entirely their own work or the joint work of the authors identified in the cover letter, and that, where appropriate, acknowledgement of the contributions of others has been made.

**Graduate Student Travel Stipends and Awards:** Papers to be considered for Graduate Student Travel Stipends/Awards must meet the criteria specified by each Division. For more information, visit the following address: [www.apa.udel.edu/apa/divisions/stipends](http://www.apa.udel.edu/apa/divisions/stipends).

## GUIDELINES FOR ALL THREE DIVISIONS

(\*Guidelines 6, 7, 9, and 10 only apply to authors who are submitting papers in hard copy.)

1. Authors must be members in good standing of the APA.
  2. 1 copy of the paper.
  3. 1 copy of the abstract.
  4. Colloquium papers are limited to 3,000 words.
  5. Abstracts for colloquium papers are limited to 150 words.
  - \*6. Title or cover page, which must include: a) title; b) word counts for all papers and abstracts; c) author's contact information; d) the Division the paper is to be submitted for.
  - \*7. Papers must be typed on one side of page, double spaced, 1-inch margins on all sides, all pages numbered, 10-12 pt. font.
  8. No more than one submission by the same author for the same Division will be considered.
  - \*9. Indicate name of Division on outside lower left side of the envelope containing the paper.
  - \*10. Include a self-addressed stamped envelope to the National Office if you wish the receipt of your paper to be acknowledged.
  11. Any paper which is under consideration for publication elsewhere will be considered, provided that it will not appear in print until after the Divisional meeting is held. If this is the case, indicate when and where the paper is expected to be published.
-

12. Papers are not accepted by e-mail.
13. Authors are advised to provide accurate email addresses as part of their contact information because they may be contacted by email, sometimes under urgent circumstances. Authors who expect to relocate between the date of submission and the date of the meeting should arrange for email forwarding, or else provide both current and new email addresses with their contact information.

## **EASTERN DIVISION:**

Meeting is held December 27-30.

Selections are announced in May or June.

Papers accepted by either the Central Division or the Pacific Division may not be presented at any subsequent meeting of the Eastern Division.

Papers exceeding 3,000 words will not be considered as colloquium papers.

Submissions for consideration as symposium papers must not exceed a length of 5,000 words. Abstracts for symposium papers must not exceed a length of 300 words. Authors should be aware that only a few papers are selected for presentation as symposium papers. If authors wish to have a shortened version of their paper considered as a colloquium paper, they should submit the appropriately shortened version, along with a shortened abstract, simultaneously with the submission of the symposium paper.

Any paper submitted without an abstract will not be considered. Any paper whose abstract is deemed unacceptable by the Program Committee will not be accepted. No revised abstract submitted after the paper's acceptance will be published in the *Proceedings and Addresses of The American Philosophical Association* without the approval of the Program Committee.

## **PACIFIC DIVISION:**

Meeting is usually held at the end of March.

Selections are announced in January.

A paper that has been on the Main Program at a past APA meeting (any division), or will be on the Main Program at a future Central or Eastern Division meeting, cannot be presented as a Main Program colloquium/symposium paper at the Pacific Division meeting.

Submissions for consideration as colloquium papers must not exceed 3,000 words.

Submissions for consideration as symposium papers must not exceed a length of 5,000 words. Abstracts for symposium papers must not exceed a length of 300 words. Authors should be aware that only a few papers are selected for presentation as symposium papers. If authors wish to have a shortened version of their paper considered as a colloquium paper, they

---

---

should submit the appropriately shortened version, along with a shortened abstract, simultaneously with the submission of the symposium paper. (This will be considered a single submission.)

### **CENTRAL DIVISION:**

Meeting is usually held at the end of April.

Selections are announced in January, or before when possible.

Papers exceeding 3,000 words will not be considered as colloquium papers.

Submissions for consideration as symposium papers must not exceed a length of 5,000 words. Abstracts for symposium papers must not exceed a length of 300 words. Authors should be aware that only a few papers are selected for presentation as symposium papers. If authors wish to have a shortened version of their paper considered as a colloquium paper, they should submit the appropriately shortened version, along with a shortened abstract, simultaneously with the submission of the symposium paper.

The Central Division will not include a paper on its meeting program if that paper has already been presented or is scheduled for presentation on the Main Program of another APA Divisional meeting.

### **EASTERN, CENTRAL, AND PACIFIC DIVISION SUBMISSIONS SHOULD BE SENT TO:**

Lindsay Palkovitz, ATTN: [Eastern, Pacific, or Central] Division Papers, The American Philosophical Association, University of Delaware, Newark, DE 19716, (302) 831-1112.

**NOTE:** Authors of accepted papers will be asked to submit a copy of their abstract by e-mail to the National Office.

---

---

# DRAFT MINUTES OF THE 2006 CENTRAL DIVISION BUSINESS MEETING

AMERICAN PHILOSOPHICAL ASSOCIATION  
CENTRAL DIVISION  
DRAFT MINUTES: 2006 BUSINESS MEETING

PALMER HOUSE HILTON HOTEL, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS  
WABASH PARLOR  
FRIDAY, APRIL 28, 2006

- 1. Call to Order:** President Eleonore Stump called the meeting to order at 12:15 p.m. and appointed Richard DeGeorge parliamentarian.
  - 2. Approval of Minutes:** The draft Minutes of the 2005 meeting, as printed in *Proceedings and Addresses of the APA*, Vol. 79 #4 (February 2006), pp. 147-150, were approved without correction on motion by Thomas Wren.
  - 3. Report on the 2006 Executive Committee Meeting:** Secretary-Treasurer Robin Smith reported on the actions of the 2005 Executive Committee, as follows:  

[See the draft Minutes of the 2005 Executive Committee meeting published immediately following these Minutes.]
  - 4. Report of the Nominating Committee:** Past President Karl Ameriks presented the Report of the 2004-2005 Nominating Committee, as printed in *Proceedings and Addresses of the APA*, Vol. 79 #4 (February 2006), pp. 155-156, with one correction. After the *Proceedings* issue had been printed, Thomas McCarthy withdrew as a candidate for Executive Committee Member-at-Large, and the Nominating Committee then nominated Daniel Farrell in his place. President Eleonore Stump noted that the Division's Bylaws allow additional nominations to be added from the floor by any group of ten members present and asked if there were such nominations forthcoming. No such nominations were proposed. The list of nominees as prepared by the Nominating Committee, with the replacement of Thomas McCarthy by Daniel Farrell, is therefore to be sent to mail ballot.
  - 5. Reports from the Board of Officers, the National Office, APA Committees:** Ernest Sosa, Chair of the Board of Officers, discussed actions at the 2005 Board meeting, including the revised Bylaws of the APA proposed to the Divisions (which will appear on the 2006 Central
-

Division ballot) and the Board's recommendation to the Divisions that they strongly consider using union hotels for annual meetings. He then reported on the search in progress for a new Executive Director, noting that finalists for the position were being interviewed by the Board at the meeting in progress.

William E. Mann, Acting Executive Director, reported on several developments in the National Office, including the hiring of a new financial manager and the selection of a new auditing firm, which he said had resulted in considerable clarification of the APA's fiscal situation. He also noted that the Board had established a prize in honor of the late Philip Quinn. Finally, he reported on the appointment of a search committee for a new Executive Director and the procedures being followed in that process.

6. **Recognition of Graduate Student Travel Stipend Winners:** President Eleonore Stump read the names of those who had received Graduate Student Travel Stipend Awards, as printed on pages 6-7 of the *Proceedings and Addresses of the APA*, Vol. 79 #4 (February 2006).
7. **New Business:** Under New Business, Marilyn Friedman indicated that she wished to make a motion to reconsider the decision by the Executive Committee not to make a contribution from the Division to the funding of the PIKSI project. Friedman's concern was that the Executive Committee had made its decision without up-to-date information about the proposal, information which she offered to present to the members at the meeting. Parliamentarian Richard DeGeorge ruled that it is not in order for a Business Meeting to reverse a decision of the Executive Committee in this way. Friedman then made a motion instead "that the Executive Committee be advised to reconsider the PIKSI proposal in light of further information about it." Eleonore Stump seconded the motion. After lengthy debate, Robert Audi moved the question. The motion to end debate passed, and the main motion passed. *[Note: subsequently, a majority of the Executive Committee convened to discuss whether there was an appropriate way for the Executive Committee to reconsider this issue and unanimously agreed that it might be proposed by mail ballot to the Executive Committee. Following the meeting, further information was circulated to Executive Committee members along with a mail ballot on the following question: "Resolved, that the Central Division provide \$3,250 for each of the next three years for the Philosophy in an Inclusive Key Institute (PIKIS), to be paid for out of the Advertising Fund." The ballots were counted on May 31, and the motion passed, 5-3.]*
8. **Memorial:** President Eleonore Stump read the names of those members of the Association who had died since the last meeting of the Central Division:  
 Frederick Adelman  
 Claude Caspar

James W. Child  
Gerrit Daams  
Theodore C. Denise  
M. C. Dillon  
John M. Dolan  
Willis Doney  
Brian K. Etter  
Charles A. Fritz  
James R. Greenwell  
John L. Groves  
David Gruber  
Catherine Harris  
Dewey J. Hoitenga  
James J. Jelinek  
James H. Kiersky  
C. H. Kenneth Knisely  
Ramon M. Lemos  
Paul L. Mathews  
Louis P. Pojman  
Edward Pols  
Harry Prosch  
Frederick Purnell, Jr.  
John G. Robison  
Charles M. Sherover  
Craig Staudenbaur  
Roger J. Sullivan  
Theodore Waldman  
John William Yolton

**9. Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned at 1:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Robin Smith, Secretary-Treasurer  
APA Central Division

---

---

# DRAFT MINUTES OF THE 2006 CENTRAL DIVISION EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

AMERICAN PHILOSOPHICAL ASSOCIATION  
CENTRAL DIVISION  
DRAFT MINUTES: 2006 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

PALMER HOUSE HILTON HOTEL, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS  
CRESTHILL ROOM  
FRIDAY, APRIL 28, 2006

*Present:* Karl Ameriks, Margaret Atherton, Ted Cohen, Marilyn Friedman, Richard Fumerton, Robin Smith, Eleonore Stump, Joan Weiner.

- 1. Call to Order:** President Eleonore Stump called the meeting to order at 7:14 p.m.
- 2. Approval of Minutes:** The Minutes of the 2005 meeting, as printed in the *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 79.4 [February 2006], pp. 151-154, were approved as printed.
- 3. Approval of Agenda:** The proposed agenda was approved by consensus.
- 4. Report from Chair of the Board of Officers.**
- 5. Report of the 2005-2006 Nominating Committee:** Past President Karl Ameriks, Chair *ex officio* of the 2005-2006 Nominating Committee, reported the nominees for Central Division officers to be elected in the 2006 elections as follows:

*For Vice-President and President-Elect:*

Alison Jaggar (University of Colorado)

Robert B. Pippin (University of Chicago)

James P. Sterba (University of Notre Dame)

*For Divisional Representative, term 2006-2009:*

Daniel Farrell (Ohio State University)

Marilyn Friedman (Washington University in St. Louis)

Linda Zagzebski (University of Oklahoma)

---

*For Member-at-Large of the Executive Committee, term 2006-2009:*

Charlotte Brown (Illinois Wesleyan University)

Timothy O'Connor (University of Illinois–Urbana-Champaign)

Peter van Inwagen (University of Notre Dame)\*

*\*Note:* Thomas McCarthy was originally nominated but withdrew after the nominations had already been published; the Nominating Committee then nominated Peter van Inwagen in his place.

*For the 2006-2007 Nominating committee (4 to be elected):*

Robert Audi (University of Notre Dame)

Daniel Breazeale (University of Kentucky)

Gary Ebbs (University of Illinois–Urbana-Champaign)

Sarah Holtman (University of Minnesota–Twin Cities)

Anthony Laden (University of Illinois–Chicago)

Gabriel Richardson Lear (University of Chicago)

Paul Thompson (Michigan State University)

Sally Sedgwick (University of Illinois–Chicago)

6. **Report on Plans for the 2007 Meeting:** Secretary-Treasurer Smith reported on the state of planning for the 2007 meeting, including the results of the use of electronic submission of papers, following the procedure used by the Eastern Division for its 2005 meeting.
7. **Financial Report and Proposed Budget for 2006-2007:** Secretary-Treasurer Smith distributed the Financial Report for 2005-2006 and proposed budget for 2006-2007 as a combined document. He projected a budget for 2005-2006 with revenues (including advertising) of approximately 43,200, investment interest of 1,500, and outlays of 45,272. After transfer of advertising revenues to the fund shared by the three Divisions and a transfer from the advertising fund to cover Program Committee meeting expenses and Graduate Student Travel Stipends beyond the first ten, the projection for the current year is that revenues will essentially equal expenses (the actual revenue and expenses for 2006 cannot be known until after the 2006 meeting is completed). The 2005-2006 budget showed significant decreases in audiovisual charges for the meeting, Program Committee meeting costs, and other meeting expenses below the amounts budgeted. The proposed budget for 2006-2007 assumes income and expense levels close to those projected for 2006. After discussion, the Executive Committee approved the proposed budget.

The Secretary-Treasurer also said that he had not implemented the increase in the Secretary-Treasurer's stipend from \$6,600 to \$10,000 per year approved by the 2005 Executive Committee Meeting. President Eleonore Stump instructed the Secretary-Treasurer to correct this.

---



- 
- 8. Report on Newly Affiliated Groups:** Secretary-Treasurer Smith reported that he had received and approved requests for affiliation from the following groups since the 2006 meeting:

International Berkeley Society

Philosophy of Education Society

Society for the Metaphysics of Science

- 9. Report of Actions Taken Since the 2005 Meeting:** Secretary-Treasurer Smith reported that the following actions by the Executive Committee through email discussion and vote since its 2005 meeting (under the laws of Pennsylvania, where the APA is incorporated, official actions through electronic media are not allowed: these items have the status of informal discussions which may lead to proposals acted on at the annual Executive Committee meeting):

1. Discussed the question whether registration fees should be waived, or travel grants provided, for participants in the 2006 program whose institutions were severely affected by Hurricanes Katrina or Rita.

2. Discussed the Nominating Committee's decision to nominate a current member of the Executive Committee for the position of Divisional Representative. The consensus was that under our Bylaws, if that candidate were elected, then the candidate in second place for Member-at-Large would be elected for the balance of her unexpired term.

- 10. PIKSI Proposal:** The Executive Committee considered a proposal for the "Philosophy in an Inclusive Key" (PIKSI) Summer Institute from the Rock Ethics Institute at Pennsylvania State University. This proposal had been approved for support by the Board of Officers, with requests for partial funding sent to each of the Divisions, on the understanding that the Board authorized the use of APA funds in place of the amounts requested from the Divisions in the event that any Division did not approve the request. The request to the Central Division was for \$3,250 per year for three years. The Secretary-Treasurer noted that given the Division's fiscal situation, the only likely source of funds from the Central Division for this proposal would be a request to draw down the shared advertising fund. After lengthy discussion, in which some members spoke in favor of the proposal but others questioned the appropriateness of committing funds in a way that would lead to a deficit budget, the proposal was defeated by a vote of 2-1, with five abstentions.

- 11. Adjournment:** The meeting adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Robin Smith

Secretary-Treasurer, APA Central Division

---

---

# REPORT OF THE 2006-2007 NOMINATING COMMITTEE

The 2006-2007 Central Division Nominating Committee, composed of Eleonore Stump (Chair), Robert Audi, Gary Ebbs, Sarah Holtman, and Sally Sedgwick, proposes the following nominations for 2007:

## **FOR VICE-PRESIDENT AND PRESIDENT-ELECT:**

Elizabeth Anderson (University of Michigan)

\*Peter Van Inwagen (University of Notre Dame)

Kendall Walton (University of Michigan)

*\*Note: Peter Van Inwagen is currently Member-at-Large of the Executive Committee, term 2006-2009. If he is elected as Vice President, the candidate for Member-at-Large who is in second place in the election for that position will become Member-at-Large for the remainder of his term.*

## **FOR EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBER-AT-LARGE, TERM 2007-2010:**

Lisa Downing (Ohio State University)

Richard Kraut (Northwestern University)

Timothy O'Connor (Indiana University)

## **FOR THE 2007-2008 NOMINATING COMMITTEE (4 TO BE ELECTED):**

Michael Bergmann (Purdue University)

Nick Huggett (University of Illinois–Chicago)

Michael Kremer (University of Chicago)

Hugh J. McCann, Jr. (Texas A&M University)

Lisa Shabel (Ohio State University)

Marya Schechtman (University of Illinois–Chicago)

David Sussman (University of Illinois–Urbana-Champaign)

Rachel Zuckert (Rice University)

---

**FOR SECRETARY-TREASURER, TERM 2007-2010:**

Robin Smith (Texas A&M University)

The *By-Laws of the Central Division* contain this provision concerning nominations from the floor at the Business Meeting (Article 1.c):

“Upon receipt of the report of the Nominating Committee, additional nominations for the next year’s Nominating Committee, for officers, and members of the Executive Committee, may be made from the floor by any ten members of the Association affiliated with the Central Division. Before ballots are prepared, the individuals nominated shall be invited by mail to signify their willingness to stand for election. No name shall appear on a ballot unless the individual named has filed a signed statement of willingness to stand for election.”

---

---

# RESULTS OF THE 2006 APA CENTRAL DIVISION ELECTIONS

In the Central Division elections in May-June 2006:

- James P. Sterba was elected Vice President for 2006-2007 (and thus President for 2007-2008).
  - Marilyn Friedman was elected Divisional Representative for the term 2006-2009.
  - Peter Van Inwagen was elected Member-at-Large of the Executive Committee for the term 2006-2009.
  - Charlotte Brown was elected Member-at-Large of the Executive Committee for the term 2006-2008, filling the balance of Marilyn Friedman's term.
  - Robert Audi, Gary Ebbs, Sarah Holtman, and Sally Sedgwick were elected to the 2006-2007 Nominating Committee.
  - The Proposed Revised Bylaws of the American Philosophical Association were approved by a vote of 295 for and 12 against.
-

---

# LIST OF BOOK EXHIBITORS

BLACKWELL PUBLISHING

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

HACKETT PUBLISHING COMPANY

MCGRAW-HILL HIGHER EDUCATION

OPEN COURT PUBLISHING COMPANY

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

PARMENIDES PUBLISHING

PEARSON EDUCATION

PHILOSOPHER'S INFORMATION CENTER

PHILOSOPHY DOCUMENTATION CENTER

ROUTLEDGE

THE CRITICAL THINKING LAB

THE EDWIN MELLEN PRESS

THE MIT PRESS

THE SCHOLAR'S CHOICE

WADSWORTH, THOMSON

---

---

# LIST OF ADVERTISERS

BLACKWELL PUBLISHING (A-170-173)

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS (A-182-183)

CONTINUUM BOOKS (A-178)

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS (A-190)

LONGMAN PUBLISHERS (A-179)

PARMENIDES PUBLISHING (A-187)

PENN STATE UNIVERSITY PRESS (A-175)

PHILOSOPHY DOCUMENTATION CENTER (A - OUTSIDE BACK COVER)

PHILOSOPHER'S INFORMATION CENTER (A-189)

PROMETHEUS BOOKS (A-181)

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS (A-176-177)

ROUTLEDGE (A-184-186)

SUNY PRESS (A - INSIDE FRONT COVER)

THE JOURNAL OF PHILOSOPHY (A-188)

THE MIT PRESS (A-174)

*TIMAEUS* CONFERENCE, SEPT. 2007 (A-191)

WADSWORTH, THOMSON (A-180)

---

---

# RESTAURANTS WITHIN A FIVE-MINUTE WALK

Price per entree:           \$ = \$5-\$10                               \$\$ = \$10-\$15  
                                      \$\$\$ = \$15-\$25                               \$\$\$\$ = \$25 and up

**Big Downtown** (American/Steaks) (\$\$) 726-7500 ext. 5298 *Reservations accepted.* Exit Wabash Door. Make a left. Big Downtown is next door to the Palmer House Hilton.

**French Quarter** (Steak/American) (\$\$) 726-7500 ext. 5360 *Reservations accepted.* French Quarter is located on the lobby level of the Palmer House.

**Ada's Deli**, 14 S. Wabash (Casual American) (\$) 214-4282 *Open late.* Exit Wabash St. Turn left and proceed one block on Wabash to 14 S. Wabash.

**Atwood Café**, 1 W. Washington (Continental) (\$\$) 368-1900 *Reservations accepted.* Exit State St. door. Make a right. Walk two blocks to Washington. The Atwood Café is located on the Southwest corner of State and Washington.

**Beef & Brandy**, 127 S. State (Diner) (\$) 372- 3451 *All day breakfast.* Exit State Street Door. Make a left. Beef and Brandy is next to the Palmer House Hilton.

**Berghoff**, 17 W. Adams (German) (\$\$) 427-3170 \*\*\***BAR OPEN ONLY**\*\*\* *No reservations accepted.* Exit State Street Door. Make a left. Walk a half block to Adams. Turn right on Adams. Berghoff is at the southeast corner of Dearborn and Adams. (Closed on Sundays)

**Exchequer Pub**, 226 S. Wabash (Pizza/Burgers/Ribs) (\$\$) 939-5633 *Reservations accepted.* Exit Wabash Door. Make a right. Walk two blocks on Wabash. Exchequer Pub is on the right side of Wabash.

**Giordano's**, 236 S. Wabash (Chicago-style Pizza) (\$\$) 939-4646 *No reservations accepted.* Exit Wabash Door. Make a right. Walk one block on Wabash. Giordano's is on the right side of Wabash.

**Grillroom**, 33 W. Monroe (Steaks/Seafood) (\$\$\$) 960-0000 *Reservations accepted.* Exit Monroe Door. Make a left. Walk one block and the Grillroom will be on left. Across from Shubert.

**Heaven on Seven**, 111 N. Wabash (Cajun) (\$) (cash only) 263-6443 *\*Breakfast/lunch only.* Exit Wabash Door. Make a left. Walk two and a half blocks. Heaven on Seven is on the right side of Wabash. (Closed on Sundays)

---

**Italian Village**, 71 W. Monroe (Italian) (\$-\$\$\$) 332-7005 *Reservations accepted*. Exit Monroe Door. Make a left. Walk one and a half blocks on Monroe. Italian Village is on the left side.

**Miller's Pub**, 134 S. Wabash (Burgers, Salads, Ribs) (\$\$) 645-5377 *Reservations accepted*. Exit Wabash Door. Make a right. Miller's Pub is next door to the Palmer House Hilton.

**Nick's Fishmarket**, 51 S. Clark (Seafood/Steaks) (\$\$\$\$) 621-0200 *Reservations requested*. Exit Monroe Door. Make a left. Walk two and a half blocks on Monroe to Clark. Make a right on Clark. Entrance is on the right. (Closed most Sundays)

**Rhapsody**, 65 E. Adams (American/European) (\$\$\$) 786-9911 *Reservations requested*. Exit Wabash Door. Make a right and go to Adams St. Make a left at Adams. Rhapsody is on the right side of Adams between Wabash and Michigan.

**Russian Tea Time**, 77 E. Adams (Russian/Vegetarian) 360-0000 *Reservations requested*. Exit Wabash Door. Make a right and go to Adams St. Make a left at Adams. Russian Tea Time is on your right in the middle of the block.

**Trattoria #10**, 10 N. Dearborn (Northern Italian) (\$\$\$) 984-1718 *Reservations requested*. Exit Monroe door. Make a left. Walk one and a half blocks on Monroe. At Dearborn, make a right. Walk one and a half blocks. Trattoria #10 is on the left side of Dearborn. (Closed on Sundays)

---



---

# CHILDCARE INFORMATION

Members who need childcare during the 2007 Central Division meeting may wish to contact one of the following Chicago providers:

**American Childcare Service**

445 E. Ohio St. Suite 306

Chicago, IL 60611

(312) 644-7300

<http://www.americanchildcare.com/>

**American Registry for Nannies and Sitters**

980 N Michigan Ave

Chicago, IL 60611

(312) 475-1515

<http://www.american-registry.com/>

The Palmer House Concierge can also provide assistance in locating childcare providers.

The APA Board of Officers has instituted a new trial program for the subsidization of childcare and eldercare in connection with APA Divisional meetings. Information about this program is posted on the APA website. For details about obtaining a subsidy for the meeting in Chicago, please contact Katina Saunders at [katina@udel.edu](mailto:katina@udel.edu).

Please check at Registration or on the APA's website prior to the meeting for additional information concerning childcare.

---





