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LETTER FROM THE SECRETARY-TREASURER

To All Members of the Association:

You are cordially invited to attend the one hundred third Annual Meeting of the Central Division at the Palmer House Hilton Hotel, Chicago, Illinois, April 26-29, 2006. This year’s program committee has organized an extensive array of twenty-nine Colloquium sessions, seventeen Symposia, two Invited Paper sessions, and seven Author-Meets Critics sessions. Our program also includes twelve special sessions organized by Committees of the APA and over seventy affiliated group sessions. The program also includes the Patrick Romanell Lecture, given by Stephen Gaukroger, and the first in what we expect to be a series of annual John Dewey Lectures (with the sponsorship of the John Dewey Foundation) given by Nicholas Wolterstorff.

This issue of the Proceedings contains a complete convention program, including scheduled group meetings. At the back of this issue, you will find a hotel reservation form, a meeting registration form, a form for reserving tables at the receptions, and maps of the hotel’s location and meeting rooms. Also included are information forms concerning the 2007 meeting and the 2006-2007 Nominating Committee for your use if you have suggestions for future meetings or wish to offer your services to the Division.

1. 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: Use the following URL: http://www.hilton.com/en/hi/groups/private_groups/chiphhh_amp/index.jhtml. Please note that reservations at the special graduate student rate cannot be made through this online link. Graduate students must instead call 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 28, 2006. 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.

• 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 advantages of being closer to the Loop and somewhat less crowded.

Ground Transportation from O'Hare and Midway: The most economical way to reach the hotel is the Chicago Transit Authority trains (fare $1.75 as of Jan. 1, 2006). 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 45 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 at http://www.transitchicago.com/maps/maps/F2003D.html.

• Airport shuttle buses to the loop are (at this writing) $25 one way/$46 round trip from O'Hare, $19 one way/$34 round trip from Midway. See http://www.ohare.com/ohare/ground_transport/ground_shuttles.shtml for more information. 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 10-15 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 very small suitcase).

• Accessible transportation: For a wheelchair-accessible cab for either airport, call 1-800-281-4466 (United Dispatch). 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. 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

• **Driving to Chicago:** See http://www.hilton.com/en/hi/hotels/maps_directions.jhtml?ctyhocn=CHIPHHH for maps and driving directions to the Palmer House. Valet parking is $35 per day, self-parking $25 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.

**2. 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 11th 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 majority of the meeting rooms for this meeting are on the third floor, as is the registration area, the book exhibits, and the Placement Center. However, the third floor is divided into two sections that are at different elevations. Registration, the Book Exhibits, and the Placement Center are all in the Lower Exhibit Hall, which is in the lower part of the 3rd floor. This part is accessible only by the State Street elevators or by escalator from the lobby. All other 3rd-floor meeting rooms are on the upper side of the floor, which is connected to the lower part by a short stairway. This part is accessible only via the main elevators. In brief: to reach the Lower Exhibit Hall (Registration, Placement, Book Exhibits), take the State Street elevators or the escalators from the lobby. To reach the 3rd floor meeting rooms (Crystal, Cresthill, Wabash, and Private Dining Rooms 1-9), take the main elevators.
Fourth and Fifth Floors. The ballroom used for receptions and the Presidential Address (Red Lacquer) is on the 4th floor, which 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 (Private Dining Rooms 16-18) are accessible only by the State Street elevators and by a stairway from the 4th floor.

Sixth Floor. Parlors A-H are located in the 6th floor, which is accessible by means of all elevators.

3. Meeting Registration

Rates for registration are as follows:

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

The Central Division rebates $10 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, 2006. 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.

4. Placement Service

The Placement Center will open for business at 5:00 p.m. on Wednesday, April 26, and continue in operation through noon, Saturday, April 29 (see the Program for specific times). The Placement Center will be located adjacent to registration, in Salons 1 and 3, which are in the Lower Exhibit Hall on the third floor (use the State Street elevators). 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 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 third floor: use State Street elevators). A quiet interview space is available for those requiring a less distracting environment for interviewing. Contact the Placement Service for further information.

5. **BOOK EXHIBITS**

The publishers’ book exhibits will be located in the Lower Exhibit Hall on the third floor. Exhibits will be open 9:00 a.m.-5:00 p.m. on Thursday and Friday and 9:00 a.m.-Noon on Saturday.

6. **RECEPTIONS**

The reception on Thursday, April 27, will begin at 8:30 p.m. in the Red Lacquer Room on the fourth floor. 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 28, will begin at 9:00 p.m. in the Red Lacquer Room on the fourth floor. 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*).

7. **BUSINESS MEETING**

The annual Business Meeting of the Central Division will be held Friday, April 28, at 12:15 p.m. in the Wabash Parlor. 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 2006-2007. The 2006 Nominating Committee will present a slate of nominees for the positions of Vice President, Member of the Executive Committee, and the four members of the 2007 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 155 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 2005 Executive Committee Meeting and draft minutes of the 2005 Business Meeting are published in this issue of the *Proceedings*, pp. 147-154.

8. **PATRICK ROMANELL LECTURE**

The Central Division is pleased to host the 2006 Patrick Romanell Lecture on Philosophical Naturalism, to be given by Stephen Gaukroger of the University of Sydney. The lecture will be presented 9:00 a.m.--Noon on Saturday, April 29, in the Crystal Room (Session IV-N).
9. JOHN DEWEY LECTURE

At its 2005 meeting, the Central Division Executive Committee accepted a generous offer from the John Dewey Foundation to fund a John Dewey Lecture at each annual meeting. The Dewey Lecture will be given by a prominent American philosopher who will be invited to reflect broadly on philosophy in America. The Central Division is pleased to announce that the first John Dewey Lecture will be given by Nicholas Wolterstorff on Thursday, April 27, 1:30-4:30 p.m., in the Crystal Room (Session I-N). Professor Wolterstorff will be introduced by Alvin Plantinga.

10. PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

President Eleonore Stump will present the 2006 Presidential Address, “Love, by All Accounts,” at 5:00 p.m. on Saturday in the Red Lacquer Room. She will be introduced by Ted Cohen, Vice President of the Central Division.

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. There are 18 such graduate students for 2006. The Executive and Program Committees are pleased to announce the 18 winners of stipends for this year:

Matthew Haug (Cornell University): “Natural Selection as a Realized Causal Process.” Paper 1 in Session I-F, ‘Metaphysics of Science’ (Thursday 1:30 p.m., Private Dining Room 5)

Stephen R. Grimm (University of Notre Dame): “The Sense of Understanding.” Paper 2 in Session I-K, ‘Consciousness and Understanding’ (Thursday 1:30 p.m., Parlor C)

Wayne Wu (University of California–Berkeley/Carnegie Mellon University): “How to Do Things with Reasons.” Paper 2 in Session II-I, ‘Action Theory’ (Friday 9:00 a.m., Private Dining Room 8)

Eugene J. Marshall (University of Wisconsin–Madison): “Spinoza on Akrasia.” Paper 1 in Session IV-K, ‘Spinoza’ (Saturday 9:00 a.m., Cresthill Room)

Benjamin Bayer (University of Illinois–Urbana-Champaign): “Neglecting Indeterminacy and Behaviorism: Kim’s Critique of Quine’s Naturalized Epistemology.” Paper 1 in Session V-H, ‘Challenges to Traditional Epistemology’ (Saturday 2:30 p.m., Private Dining Room 7)

Andrew D. Spear (University at Buffalo): “The Coherence of Rationalism.” Paper 3 in Session III-I, ‘Rationalism and Common Sense’ (Friday 1:45 p.m., Private Dining Room 8)

Melissa Seymour (Indiana University–Bloomington): “Kant’s Later Argument for a Duty of Beneficence.” Paper 1 in Session II-G, ‘Kantian Ethics’ (Friday 9:00 a.m., Private Dining Room 6)
Steven E. Viner (Washington University in St. Louis): “On State Self-Defense and Guantanamo Bay.” Paper 1 in Session V-I, ‘War’ (Saturday 2:30 p.m., Private Dining Room 8)

Justin C. Fisher (University of Arizona): “Color Representations as Hash Values.” Paper 2 in Session II-F, ‘Philosophy of Psychology’ (Friday 9:00 a.m., Private Dining Room 5)

Shannon Dea (University of Western Ontario): “Spinoza on the Indivisibility of Substance and the Inconceivability of Extension.” Paper 3 in Session IV-K, ‘Spinoza’ (Saturday 9:00 a.m., Cresthill Room)

Thomas D. Harter (University of Tennessee): “Dying to Be Good: Kant and the Permissibility of Suicide.” Paper 2 in Session II-G, ‘Kantian Ethics’ (Friday 9:00 a.m., Private Dining Room 6)

Sarah Harper (Boston College): “What’s So Special about Special Responsibilities?” Paper 1 in Session I-J, ‘Special Responsibilities’ (Thursday 1:30 p.m., Private Dining Room 4)

Christopher Martin (Purdue University): “Rethinking Spinoza’s Concept of Ideas of Ideas.” Paper 2 in Session IV-K, ‘Spinoza’ (Saturday 9:00 a.m., Cresthill Room)


Jeppe Platz (University of Tennessee): “On Kant’s Distinctions between Perfect and Imperfect and Narrow and Wide Duties.” Paper 2 in Session IV-H, ‘Historical Kant’ (Saturday 9:00 a.m., Private Dining Room 7)

Ted L. Poston (University of Missouri): “Internalism and the Problem of Scatter.” Paper 3 in Session I-I, ‘Epistemic Justification’ (Thursday 1:30 p.m., Private Dining Room 8)

Chris Tucker (Purdue University): “Agent Causation and the Alleged Impossibility of Rational Free Action.” Paper 3 in Session II-I, ‘Action Theory’ (Friday 9:00 a.m., Private Dining Room 8)


12. 2007 Program Committee

Vice President Ted Cohen has appointed the following Program Committee for the 2007 Central Division Meeting:

Jenefer Robinson (University of Cincinnati), Chair; Margaret Atherton (University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee)

Eric A. Brown (Washington University in St. Louis)
Ann E. Cudd (University of Kansas)
Justin D’Arms (Ohio State University)
Ann Eaton (University of Illinois–Chicago)
Robert Howell (Southern Methodist University)
Peter Ludlow (University of Michigan–Ann Arbor)
Steven Nadler (University of Wisconsin)
Laura Perini (Virginia Tech University)
Fred Rush (University of Notre Dame)
Carolina Sartorio (University of Wisconsin–Madison)
Alan D. Schrift (Grinnell College)
Robin Smith (Texas A&M University)
James Tappenden (University of Michigan–Ann Arbor)
Jonathan Weinberg (Indiana University–Bloomington)

13. CALL FOR PAPERS, 2007

The Program Committee for 2007 invites APA members to submit papers for presentation at the One Hundred Fourth annual meeting, to be held in Chicago, Illinois, at the Palmer House Hilton hotel, April 18-21, 2007. Papers should be submitted to Linda Smallbrook, APA National Office, University of Delaware, Newark, DE 19716. Papers must be submitted in triplicate, with an abstract of not more than 150 words. (Please mark the words ‘Central Division’ on the envelope in which the copies are sent.) Papers may also be submitted in electronic format: see the APA website at http://www.apa.udel.edu/apa for procedures and details. The deadline for submission is July 1, 2006. Papers themselves may not exceed 3,000 words in length and must include a word count on the title page. Since papers will be blind-reviewed, the author’s name and institution should not appear in the paper itself. For hard-copy submissions, this information should appear only on a separate title page that can be easily detached when the paper is coded for review. For electronic submissions, this information is entered in the appropriate place in the APA’s website for paper submissions. The author’s name and institutional affiliation, as well as any reference from which the author’s identity might readily be inferred, must not occur in the body of the paper itself: any paper which does contain such identifying references may be disqualified. The Central Division will not consider any paper that is also submitted for consideration to the Pacific Division Program Committee for the same year or that has already been accepted for presentation at another APA Divisional meeting. Authors are limited to a single submission. The Program Committee regrets that it is unable to return submitted papers.

14. PARTICIPATION

APA members who wish to be considered for as commentators or session chairs for the 2007 meeting should use the Program Information 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.

18. **CHILDCARE**

Information about childcare can be found in the back of this issue preceding the hotel meeting room diagrams.

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 Third Annual Meeting.

Robin Smith
Secretary-Treasurer, APA Central Division
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PLACEMENT INTERVIEW AREA
5:00-10:00 p.m., Salon 3 (3rd Floor (S))

PLACEMENT SERVICE
5:00-10:00 p.m., Salon 1 (3rd Floor (S))

REGISTRATION
5:00-10:00 p.m., Salon 2 (3rd Floor (S))

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
7:00-11:00 p.m., Cresthill Room (3rd Floor (M))

THURSDAY, APRIL 27

BOOK EXHIBITS
9:00 a.m.-5:00 p.m., Lower Exhibit Hall Salons 4-12 (3rd Floor (S))

GROUP AND COMMITTEE SESSIONS, THURSDAY MORNING
(See Group Meeting Program for details)

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

GI-1: Joint Session: American Association of Philosophy Teachers and the Association for Informal Logic and Critical Thinking, Crystal Room

GI-2: Radical Philosophy Association, Wabash Parlor

GI-3: International Association for the Philosophy of Sport, Private Dining Room 9

GI-4: American Society for Aesthetics, Private Dining Room 4

GI-5: Bertrand Russell Society, Private Dining Room 5
GI-6: Joint Session: Hannah Arendt Circle and the Karl Jaspers Society of North America, Private Dining Room 6
GI-7: Philosophy of Religion Group, Private Dining Room 7
GI-8: Society for the Advancement of American Philosophy, Private Dining Room 8
GI-9: American Society for Value Inquiry, Private Dining Room 16
GI-10: Joint Session: Personalist Discussion Group and the Society for the Study of Process Philosophy, Private Dining Room 17
GI-11: Society for Student Philosophers, Private Dining Room 18
GI-12: Society for Realist-Antirealist Discussion, Parlor A
GI-13: North American Kant Society, Parlor B
GI-14: William James Society, Parlor C
GI-15: Association for the Development of Philosophy Teaching, Parlor D

**Placement Interview Area**
9:00 a.m.-7:00 p.m., Salon 3 (3rd Floor (S))

**Placement Service**
9:00 a.m.-7:00 p.m., Salon 1 (3rd Floor (S))

**Registration**
9:00 a.m.-5:00 p.m., Salon 2 (3rd Floor (S))

**Group and Committee Sessions, Thursday afternoon/evening**
(See Group Meeting Program for details)

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

GII-1: Association for Informal Logic and Critical Thinking, Crystal Room
GII-2: Joint Session: Committee on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender People in the Profession and the Society for Lesbian and Gay Philosophy, Wabash Parlor
GII-3: Society for the Study of Ethics and Animals, Private Dining Room 9
GII-4: North American Kant Society, Private Dining Room 4
GII-5: North American Spinoza Society, Private Dining Room 5
GII-6: Society for Philosophy and Public Affairs, Private Dining Room 6
GII-7: Hume Society, Private Dining Room 7
GII-8: International Society for Environmental Ethics, Private Dining Room 8
GII-9: Society for the Metaphysics of Science, Private Dining Room 16
GII-10: International Association for Computing and Philosophy, Private Dining Room 17
GII-11: North American Nietzsche Society, Private Dining Room 18
GII-12: American Society for Philosophy, Counseling, and Psychotherapy, Parlor A
GII-13: Society for the Advancement of American Philosophy, Parlor B
GII-14: Concerned Philosophers for Peace, Cresthill Room
GII-15: Committee on Institutional Cooperation, Parlor D

Session GIII: 7:30-10:30 p.m.
GIII-1: Radical Philosophy Association, Crystal Room
GIII-3: Convivium: The Philosophy and Food Roundtable, Private Dining Room 9
GIII-4: Joint Session: International Society for Environmental Ethics and the Society for Philosophy and Technology, Private Dining Room 4
GIII-5: Leibniz Society of North America, Private Dining Room 5
GIII-6: North American Division of the Schopenhauer Society, Private Dining Room 6
GIII-7: Society for the Philosophy of Creativity, Private Dining Room 7
GIII-8: Society for the Philosophy of History, Private Dining Room 8
GIII-9: American Society for Value Inquiry, Private Dining Room 16
GIII-10: Max Scheler Society, Private Dining Room 17
GIII-11: Society for the Philosophic Study of Genocide and the Holocaust, Private Dining Room 18
GIII-12: Society for the Philosophic Study of the Contemporary Visual Arts, Parlor A
GIII-13: Society for Asian and Comparative Philosophy, Parlor B
GIII-14: History of Early Analytic Philosophy Society, Cresthill Room

I-A. Symposium: Truthmakers
1:30-4:30 p.m., Private Dining Room 9 (3rd Floor (M))
Chair: Marian David (University of Notre Dame)
Speakers: J.C. Beall (University of Connecticut)
Trenton Merricks (University of Virginia)
“Truth Supervenes on Being”
Commentator: Helen Beebee (University of Birmingham)

I-B. Symposium: Deliberative Democracy
1:30-4:30 p.m., Wabash Parlor (3rd Floor (M))
Chair: Cristina Lafont (Northwestern University)
Speakers: Iris Marion Young (University of Chicago)
“The Importance of De-Centering Deliberative Democracy”
David Estlund (Brown University)

James Bohman (St. Louis University)
“Deliberative Democracy and the European Union: The Aims of Transnational Constitutionalism”

Commentator: Thomas Christiano (University of Arizona)

I-C. Symposium: Aristotle’s Metaphysics
1:30-4:30 p.m., Private Dining Room 16 (5th Floor (S))
Chair: Tad Brennan (Northwestern University)
Speakers: Stephen Menn (McGill University)
Lloyd Gerson (University of Toronto)
Commentator: Jonathan Beere (University of Chicago)

I-D. Symposium: Cosmological Arguments
1:30-4:30 p.m., Private Dining Room 17 (5th Floor (S))
Chair: William Rowe (Purdue University)
Speakers: Alexander R. Pruss (Georgetown University)
Graham Oppy (Monash University)
“Cosmological Arguments”
Commentator: Robert Koons (University of Texas–Austin)

I-E. Symposium: Memorial Session for Berent Enç
1:30-4:30 p.m., Private Dining Room 18 (5th Floor (S))
Chair: Dennis Stampe (University of Wisconsin)
Speakers: Fred Dretske (Duke University/Stanford University)
“Enç on Action”
Alfred R. Mele (Florida State University)

I-F. Colloquium: Metaphysics of Science
1:30-4:30 p.m., Private Dining Room 5 (3rd Floor (M))

1:30-2:30 p.m.
Chair: Kenneth Aizawa (Centenary College of Louisiana)
Speaker: Matthew Haug (Cornell University)
“Natural Selection as a Realized Causal Process”

**Graduate Student Travel Stipend Winner**
Commentator: Robert Skipper (University of Cincinnati)

2:30-3:30 p.m.
Chair: Mark Criley (Illinois Wesleyan University)
Speaker: Kenneth A. Presting (University of North Carolina–Chapel Hill)
“Lange on Stability”
Commentator: Barry M. Ward (University of Arkansas)
Main Program

3:30-4:30 p.m.
Chair: Mylan Engel, Jr. (Northern Illinois University)
Speaker: Barbara G. Montero (City University of New York)
"Physicalism in an Infinitely Decomposable World"
Commentator: Andrew Melnyk (University of Missouri–Columbia)

I-G. Colloquium: Descartes
1:30-4:30 p.m., Private Dining Room 6 (3rd Floor (M))

1:30-2:30 p.m.
Chair: Joel A. Schickel (Hampton-Sydney College)
Speaker: Andrew D. Youpa (Southern Illinois University–Carbondale)
"Will, Intellect, and Cartesian Virtue"
Commentator: Lisa Shapiro (Simon Fraser University)

2:30-3:30 p.m.
Chair: Margaret Atherton (University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee)
Speaker: Raffaella De Rosa (Rutgers University–Newark)
"The Myth of Cartesian Qualia"
Commentator: Roger Florka (Ursinus College)

3:30-4:30 p.m.
Chair: David R. Cunning (University of Iowa)
Speaker: Matthew J. Kisner (University of South Carolina)
"Descartes and the Limits of Reason"
Commentator: Antonia LoLordo (University of Virginia)

I-H. Colloquium: Moral Psychology
1:30-4:30 p.m., Private Dining Room 7 (3rd Floor (M))

1:30-2:30 p.m.
Chair: Ronald L. Sandler (Northeastern University)
Speaker: Jeffrey C. Brand-Ballard (George Washington University)
"Favoring, Polarity, and Particularism"
Commentator: Andrew M. Cullison (University of Rochester)

2:30-3:30 p.m.
Chair: Heidi Lene Meibom (Carleton University)
Speaker: Andrea Westlund (University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee)
"Anger, Pain, and Forgiveness"
Commentator: Rodney C. Roberts (East Carolina University)

3:30-4:30 p.m.
Chair: Vincent Chiao (Northwestern University)
Speaker: Joseph Quinn Olechnowicz (Florida State University)
“What’s the Harm in a Little Self-Deception?”
Commentator: Adam A. Kovach (Marymount University)

I-I. Colloquium: Epistemic Justification
1:30-4:30 p.m., Private Dining Room 8 (3rd Floor (M))
1:30-2:30 p.m.
Chair: Christopher R. Green (University of Notre Dame)
Speaker: Timm Triplett (University of New Hampshire)
“The Role of Certainty”
Commentator: Jennifer Lackey (Northern Illinois University)

2:30-3:30 p.m.
Chair: Allen Plug (Malone College)
Speaker: Robert W. Schroer (Arkansas State University)
“Can the Mere Passage of Time Justify a Belief? A Defense of Memory Foundationalism”
Commentator: Earl Conee (University of Rochester)

3:30-4:30 p.m.
Chair: Glenn Ross (Franklin & Marshall College)
Speaker: Ted L. Poston (University of Missouri)
“Internalism and the Problem of Scatter”
**Graduate Student Travel Stipend Winner**
Commentator: Juan Comesaña (University of Wisconsin–Madison)

I-J. Colloquium: Special Responsibilities
1:30-4:30 p.m., Private Dining Room 4 (3rd Floor (M))
1:30-2:30 p.m.
Chair: Linda Radzik (Texas A&M University)
Speaker: Sarah Harper (Boston College)
“What’s So Special about Special Responsibilities?”
**Graduate Student Travel Stipend Winner**
Commentator: Diane Jeske (University of Iowa)

2:30-3:30 p.m.
Chair: Marilea Bramer (University of Minnesota–Twin Cities)
Speaker: David Schwartz (Randolph Macon Woman’s College)
“Consumer Choice and Moral Responsibility”
Commentator: Christopher M. Caldwell (Southwestern College)

3:30-4:30 p.m.
Chair: Richard T. DeGeorge (University of Kansas)
Speaker: Denis G. Arnold (University of Tennessee)
“The Ethical Obligations of Corporations Concerning Global Climate Change”
Commentator: Terry L. Price (University of Richmond)

I-K. Colloquium: Consciousness and Understanding

1:30-4:30 p.m., Parlor C (6th Floor (M,S))

1:30-2:30 p.m.
Chair: Malcolm Forster (University of Wisconsin–Madison)
Speaker: Sean J. Allen-Hermanson (Florida International University)
“Morgan's Canon Revisited”
Commentator: Colin Allen (Indiana University)

2:30-3:30 p.m.
Chair: Warren E. Shrader (Indiana University–South Bend)
Speaker: Stephen R. Grimm (University of Notre Dame)
“The Sense of Understanding”

**Graduate Student Travel Stipend Winner**
Commentator: J. D. Trout (Loyola University Chicago)

3:30-4:30 p.m.
Chair: William Jaworski (Fordham University)
Speaker: Torin Alter (University of Alabama)
“What Do Split-Brain Cases Show about the Unity of Consciousness?”
Commentator: Brie Gertler (University of Virginia)

I-L. Special Session Sponsored by the APA Committee on Blacks in Philosophy: Author Meets Authors Critically

1:30-4:30 p.m., Parlor A (6th Floor (M,S))
In this session, three authors of recent books will comment on one another’s work:

Tommie Shelby (author of Ethics Along the Color Line)
Anna Stubblefield (author of We Who Are Dark)
Paul C. Taylor (author of Race: A Philosophical Introduction)

Chair: Bill E. Lawson (University of Memphis)
Critics:
Tommie Shelby (Harvard University)
Anna Stubblefield (Rutgers University)
Paul C. Taylor (Temple University)

I-M. Special Session Sponsored by the APA Committee on the Status of Asian and Asian-American Philosophers and Philosophies: Mark Siderits, Personal Identity and Buddhist Philosophy

1:30-4:30 p.m., Parlor B (6th Floor (M,S))
Chair: Chang-Seong Hong (Minnesota State University–Moorhead)
Critics: Jay L. Garfield (Smith College, University of Massachusetts, Melbourne University, Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies)
“Fusion and Fiction: Other Models for Buddhist Theories of Personal Identity”
John Taber (University of New Mexico)
“Subjectivity and Reductionism: Some Vedantic Misgivings”
Dan Arnold (University of Chicago)
“On How It Can Be Ultimately True That There Is No Ultimate Truth”

Author: Mark Siderits (Illinois State University)

I-N. The John Dewey Lecture
1:30-4:30 p.m., Crystal Room (3rd Floor (M))
Chair: Alvin Plantinga (University of Notre Dame)
Speaker: Nicholas Wolterstorff (Yale University)

RECEPTION
8:30 p.m.-Midnight, Red Lacquer Room (4th Floor (M))

FRIDAY, APRIL 28

BOOK EXHIBITS
9:00 a.m.-5:00 p.m., Lower Exhibit Hall Salons 4-12 (3rd Floor (S))

PLACEMENT INTERVIEW AREA
9:00 a.m.-7:00 p.m., Salon 3 (3rd Floor (S))

PLACEMENT SERVICE
9:00 a.m.-5:00 p.m., Salon 1 (3rd Floor (S))

REGISTRATION
9:00 a.m.-5:00 p.m., Salon 2 (3rd Floor (S))

II-A. Symposium: Induction and Scientific Explanation
9:00 a.m.-Noon, Crystal Room (3rd Floor (M))
Chair: Daniel McKaughan (University of Notre Dame)
Speakers: Branden Fitelson (University of California–Berkeley)
“Inductive Logic and Probabilistic Explanation”
Michael Strevens (New York University)
“In Praise of Instance Confirmation”
Commentator: James Joyce (University of Michigan)
II-B. Symposium: Epistemic Relativism

9:00 a.m.-Noon, Wabash Parlor (3rd Floor (M))
Chair: Sherrilyn Roush (Rice University)
Speakers: Paul Boghossian (New York University)
Michael Williams (Johns Hopkins University)
Commentator: Gideon Rosen (Princeton University)

II-C. Author Meets Critics: Claude Panaccio, Ockham on Concepts

9:00 a.m.-Noon, Private Dining Room 16 (5th Floor (S))
Chair: Susan Brower-Toland (St. Louis University)
Critics: Marilyn McCord Adams (Oxford University)
John Bolter (University of Washington)
Author: Claude Panaccio (University of Quebec–Montreal)

II-D. Author Meets Critics: Jonathan Dancy, Ethics without Principles

9:00 a.m.-Noon, Private Dining Room 17 (5th Floor (S))
Chair: Russ Shafer-Landau (University of Wisconsin–Madison)
Critics: Margaret Little (Georgetown University)
Michael Ridge (University of Edinburgh)
Sean D. McKeever (Davidson College)
Author: Jonathan Dancy (University of Reading/University of Texas–Austin)

II-E. Symposium: The Metaphysics of Causation

9:00 a.m.-Noon, Private Dining Room 18 (5th Floor (S))
Chair: Timothy O'Connor (Indiana University–Bloomington)
Speakers: Stephen Mumford (University of Nottingham)
Jonathan M. Schaffer (University of Massachusetts–Amherst)
Commentator: John W. Carroll (North Carolina State University)

II-F. Colloquium: Philosophy of Psychology

9:00 a.m.-Noon, Private Dining Room 5 (3rd Floor (M))
9:00-10:00 a.m.
Chair: Robert Schwartz (University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee)
Speaker: Paula J. Droege (Pennsylvania State University)
“Time and the Observer Redux"
Commentator: John Jacobson (University of California–San Diego)
10:00-11:00 a.m.
Chair: Jonathan D. Cohen (University of California–San Diego)
Friday Morning, II-F to II-J

II-G. Colloquium: Kantian Ethics

9:00 a.m.-Noon, Private Dining Room 6 (3rd Floor (M))

9:00-10:00 a.m.
Chair: Sally Sedgwick (University of Illinois–Chicago)
Speaker: Melissa Seymour (Indiana University–Bloomington)
“Kant’s Later Argument for a Duty of Beneficence”

**Graduate Student Travel Stipend Winner**
Commentator: Timothy J. Rosenkoetter (Dartmouth College)

10:00-11:00 a.m.
Chair: Andrew Cutrofello (Loyola University Chicago)
Speaker: Thomas D. Harter (University of Tennessee)
“Dying to Be Good: Kant and the Permissibility of Suicide”

**Graduate Student Travel Stipend Winner**
Commentator: David Sussman (University of Illinois–Urbana-Champaign)

11:00 a.m.-Noon
Chair: Benjamin A. Sachs (University of Wisconsin–Madison)
Speaker: Cynthia A. Schossberger (Southern Illinois University–Edwardsville)
“Moral Worth and Common Sense: Kant’s Use of Example”

Commentator: David Forman (University of Nevada–Las Vegas)

II-H. Colloquium: Aesthetics

9:00 a.m.-Noon, Private Dining Room 7 (3rd Floor (M))

9:00-10:00 a.m.
Chair: Dan Flory (Montana State University)
Speaker: Henry J. Pratt (Bucknell University)
“Formula and Comparison: Against the Uniqueness of Art”

Commentator: Mitchell Avila (California State University–Fullerton)
10:00-11:00 a.m.
Chair: William Tolhurst (Northern Illinois University)
Speaker: Molly Sturdevant (DePaul University)
Commentator: Jacqueline Marina (Purdue University)

11:00 a.m.-Noon
Chair: James K. Swindler (Illinois State University)
Speaker: Kenneth F. Rogerson (Florida International University)
“Kant, Free Harmony, and Aesthetic Ideas”
Commentator: William P. Seeley (Franklin and Marshall College)

II-I. Colloquium: Action Theory
9:00 a.m.-Noon, Private Dining Room 8 (3rd Floor (M))
9:00-10:00 a.m.
Chair: Luca Ferrero (University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee)
Speaker: Edward S. Hinchman (University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee)
“Receptivity and the Will”
Commentator: Andrei A. Buckareff (Franklin and Marshall College)

10:00-11:00 a.m.
Chair: Abraham Roth (University of Illinois–Chicago)
Speaker: Wayne Wu (University of California–Berkeley/Carnegie Mellon University)
“How to Do Things with Reasons”
**Graduate Student Travel Stipend Winner**
Commentator: Noel E. Hendrickson (James Madison University)

11:00 a.m.-Noon
Chair: Tamler Sommers (University of Minnesota–Morris)
Speaker: Chris Tucker (Purdue University)
“Agent Causation and the Alleged Impossibility of Rational Free Action”
**Graduate Student Travel Stipend Winner**
Commentator: Alicia Finch (Saint Louis University)

II-J. Colloquium: Ethics and Religion
9:00 a.m.-Noon, Private Dining Room 4 (3rd Floor (M))
9:00-10:00 a.m.
Chair: C. Stephen Evans (Baylor University)
Speaker: Ian M. Duckles (Indiana University of Pennsylvania)
“Kierkegaard, MacIntyre and the Limits of Reflection in Ethics”
Commentator: Steven M. Emmanuel (Virginia Wesleyan College)
10:00-11:00 a.m.
Chair: Katherin A. Rogers (University of Delaware)
Speaker: Dean A. Kowalski (University of Wisconsin–Waukesha)
“Alston’s Evaluative Particularism and Euthyphro’s Dilemma”
Commentator: Christina Van Dyke (Calvin College)

11:00 a.m.-Noon
Chair: Hugh J. McCann (Texas A&M University)
Speaker: R. Zachary Manis (Baylor University)
**Graduate Student Travel Stipend Winner**
Commentator: Thomas Williams (University of South Florida)

II-K. Colloquium: Hermeneutic Philosophy
9:00 a.m.-Noon, Private Dining Room 9 (3rd Floor (M))

9:00-10:00 a.m.
Chair: Dermot Moran (University College Dublin)
Speaker: Myron A. Penner (Trinity Western University)
“The Doctrine of the Hermeneutical Circle and Traditional Epistemology”
Commentator: David M. Kaplan (University of North Texas)

10:00-11:00 a.m.
Chair: Christian Lotz (Michigan State University)
Speaker: Daniel P. Malloy (Appalachian State University)
“Accusing Being: Heidegger’s Concept of Categories in Being and Time”
Commentator: Leslie MacAvoy (East Tennessee State University)

11:00 a.m.-Noon
Chair: Thomas McCarthy (Northwestern University)
Speaker: David T. Vessey (University of Chicago)
“Disconnecting Intersubjectivity and Ethics”
Commentator: Christopher F. Zurn (University of Kentucky)

II-L. Special Session Sponsored by the APA Committee on Blacks in Philosophy: Author Meets Critics: Anthony Bogues, Black Heretics, Black Prophets: Radical Political Intellectuals
9:00 a.m.-Noon, Parlor A (6th Floor (M.S))

Chair: Frank Kirkland (Hunter College)
Critics: Gertrude James Gonzalez de Allen (Spelman College)
Charles Mills (University of Illinois–Chicago)
Eddy Souffrant (University of North Carolina–Charlotte)

Author: Anthony Bogues (Brown University)
II-M. Special Session Sponsored by the APA Committee on the Status of Asian and Asian-American Philosophers and Philosophies: Themes from Jaegwon Kim

9:00 a.m.-Noon, Parlor B (6th Floor (M,S))
Chair: Marcelo H. Sabatés (Kansas State University)
Critics: Carl Gillett (Illinois Wesleyan University)
Larry Shapiro (University of Wisconsin–Madison)
Thomas W. Polger (University of Cincinnati)
Response: Jaegwon Kim (Brown University)

II-N. Special Session Sponsored by the APA Committee on the Status of Women: Breakfast Meeting

7:30-9:00 a.m., Cresthill Room (3rd Floor (M))

GROUP AND COMMITTEE SESSIONS, FRIDAY AFTERNOON/EVENING
(See Group Meeting Program for details)

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

GIV-1: Joint Session: Hannah Arendt Circle and the Karl Jaspers Society of North America, Private Dining Room 16

GIV-2: Philosophers for Social Responsibility, Wabash Parlor

GIV-3: Society for Ancient Greek Philosophy, Private Dining Room 9

GIV-4: Society for Analytical Feminism, Private Dining Room 18

GIV-5: Society for Asian and Comparative Philosophy, Private Dining Room 5

GIV-6: Society for the Study of Husserl’s Philosophy, Private Dining Room 6

GIV-7: International Institute for Field-Being, Private Dining Room 7

GIV-8: Society for the Philosophy of History, Private Dining Room 8

GIV-9: Midwest Society for Women in Philosophy, Crystal Room

GIV-10: Søren Kierkegaard Society, Parlor C

GIV-11: Joint Session: Society for Systematic Philosophy and the Society for Systematic Philosophy, Private Dining Room 4

GIV-12: Society for the Philosophic Study of Genocide and the Holocaust, Parlor A

GIV-13: North American Spinoza Society, Parlor B

GIV-14: Society for the Study of Indian and Tibetan Buddhist Philosophy, Private Dining Room 17

GIV-15: Society for Student Philosophers, Parlor D

BUSINESS MEETING

12:15-1:30 p.m., Wabash Parlor (3rd Floor (M))
III-A. Symposium: Theories of Substance: Ancient, Medieval, Modern
1:45-4:45 p.m., Crystal Room (3rd Floor (M))
Chair: Robert Pasnau (University of Colorado–Boulder)
Speakers: Christopher Shields (Oxford University)
Jeffrey E. Brower (Purdue University)
Calvin Normore (University of California–Los Angeles)

III-B. Symposium: Fine Tuning and the Improbable Universe
1:45-4:45 p.m., Wabash Parlor (3rd Floor (M))
Chair: Neil A. Manson (University of Mississippi)
Speakers: Robin Collins (Messiah College)
“On Making the Fine-Tuning Design Argument Rigorous”
John Earman (University of Pittsburgh)
Timothy McGrew (Western Michigan University)

III-C. Author Meets Critics: Graham Priest, Towards Non-Being
1:45-4:45 p.m., Private Dining Room 16 (5th Floor (S))
Chair: Edward N. Zalta (Stanford University)
Critics: Terence Horgan (University of Arizona)
Terence Parsons (University of California–Los Angeles)
Author: Graham Priest (University of Melbourne)

III-D. Symposium: The Re-Emergence of the Torture Debate
1:45-4:45 p.m., Private Dining Room 17 (5th Floor (S))
Chair: Avery Kolers (University of Louisville)
Speakers: Claudia Card (University of Wisconsin–Madison)
Thomas E. Hill, Jr. (University of North Carolina–Chapel Hill)
Alastair Norcross (Rice University)

III-E. Author Meets Critics: Larry Shapiro, Mind Incarnate
1:45-4:45 p.m., Private Dining Room 18 (5th Floor (S))
Chair: Elliott Sober (University of Wisconsin)
Critics: Mark Rowlands (University of Hertfordshire)
Frederick Adams (University of Delaware)
Author: Larry Shapiro (University of Wisconsin–Madison)

III-F. Colloquium: Philosophy of Mathematics and Logic
1:45-4:45 p.m., Private Dining Room 5 (3rd Floor (M))
1:45-2:45 p.m.
Chair: Michael Kremer (University of Chicago)
Speaker: Otávio A. Bueno (University of South Carolina)  
“How Structuralism Can Solve the ‘Access’ Problem”
Commentator: Christopher Pincock (Purdue University)

2:45-3:45 p.m.
Chair: Gerald Vision (Temple University)
Speaker: Berit Brogaard (University of Missouri–St. Louis)  
“Quantifying over Cases”
Commentator: Andrew Egan (University of Michigan–Ann Arbor)

3:45-4:45 p.m.
Chair: Walter Edelberg (University of Illinois–Chicago)
Speaker: Gregory Landini (University of Iowa)  
“Was Frege’s Original Logicism a Success?”
Commentator: Patricia Blanchette (University of Notre Dame)

III-G. Colloquium: Metaphysics and Philosophy of Physics
1:45-4:45 p.m., Private Dining Room 6 (3rd Floor (M))

1:45-2:45 p.m.
Chair: Nick Huggett (University of Illinois–Chicago)
Speaker: Bradford Skow (University of Massachusetts–Amherst)  
“Sophisticated Substantivalism and Spacetime Symmetries”
Commentator: J. Brian Pitts (University of Notre Dame)

2:45-3:45 p.m.
Chair: William Hasker (Huntington College)
Speaker: Patrick Toner (University of Virginia)  
“Emergent Substance”
Commentator: Jeffrey H. Green (University of Notre Dame)

3:45-4:45 p.m.
Chair: Daniel Speak (Azusa Pacific University)
Speaker: Roberta Ballarin (Southern Methodist University)  
“Omissions: Responsibility and Causation”
Commentator: Carolina Sartorio (University of Wisconsin–Madison)

III-H. Colloquium: Plato
1:45-4:45 p.m., Private Dining Room 7 (3rd Floor (M))

1:45-2:45 p.m.
Chair: Richard Bett (Johns Hopkins University)
Speaker: Daw-Nay Evans (DePaul University)  
“Nietzsche’s Décadent: A Reading of ‘The Problem of Socrates’ in Twilighet of the Idols”
Commentator: Clancy Martin (University of Missouri–Kansas City)
2:45-3:45 p.m.
Chair: David K. O’Connor (University of Notre Dame)
Speaker: Matthew C. Cashen (Washington University in St. Louis)
“Does Wisdom Make You Lucky? Euthydemus 279d-280b”

**Graduate Student Travel Stipend Winner**
Commentator: Angela Curran (Carleton College)

3:45-4:45 p.m.
Chair: Julie Ward (Loyola University Chicago)
Speaker: Charlie Tanksley (University of Virginia)
“The Third Man, Resemblance Regress, and Parmenides: A New Interpretation”

III-I. Colloquium: Rationalism and Common Sense
1:45-4:45 p.m., Private Dining Room 8 (3rd Floor (M))

1:45-2:45 p.m.
Chair: Dennis Whitcomb (Rutgers University)
Speaker: Baron Reed (Northern Illinois University)
“Epistemic Circularity Squared? Skepticism about Common Sense”
Commentator: Noah Lemos (College of William and Mary)

2:45-3:45 p.m.
Chair: Albert Casullo (University of Nebraska–Lincoln)
Speaker: James R. Beebe (University at Buffalo)
“BonJour’s Arguments Against Skepticism about the A Priori”
Commentator: Adam J. Leite (Indiana University–Bloomington)

3:45-4:45 p.m.
Chair: Daniel M. Mittag (University of Rochester)
“The Coherence of Rationalism”

**Graduate Student Travel Stipend Winner**
Speaker: Andrew D. Spear (University at Buffalo)
Commentator: Stephen Maitzen (Acadia University)

III-J. Colloquium: Political Philosophy
1:45-4:45 p.m., Private Dining Room 4 (3rd Floor (M))

1:45-2:45 p.m.
Chair: Kevin Graham (Creighton University)
Speaker: Gerald Doppelt (University of California–San Diego)
“Can Political Liberalism Deliver Equality in the Social-Bases of Self-Respect?”
Commentator: Paul Weithman (University of Notre Dame)

2:45-3:45 p.m.
Chair: Colleen Murphy (Texas A&M University)
Speaker: Kai Chong Wong (Washington University in St. Louis)
"Inter-Group Forgiveness in Multicultural Democracies: Self-Respect and Self-Esteem as Evaluative Criteria"
Commentator: Mariano Crespo (Catholic University of Chile)

III-K. Colloquium: Virtue

1:45-4:45 p.m., Private Dining Room 9 (3rd Floor (M))

1:45-2:45 p.m.
Chair: Heidi Malm (Loyola University Chicago)
Speaker: Judith Andre (Michigan State University)
"Facets of Honesty"
Commentator: Jon Garthoff (Northwestern University)

2:45-3:45 p.m.
Chair: Thomas L. Carson (Loyola University Chicago)
Speaker: Matthew A. Tedesco (Beloit College)
"Indirect Consequentialism, Suboptimality, and Friendship"
Commentator: Eric Wiland (University of Missouri–St. Louis)

3:45-4:45 p.m.
Chair: Scott Anderson (University of British Columbia)
Speakers: Mariam Thalos (University of Utah) and Chrisoula Andreou (University of Utah)
"Sense and Sensibility"
Commentator: Mark P. Jenkins (Johns Hopkins University)

III-L. Joint Session Sponsored by the Committee on Inclusiveness and the Committee on the Status of Women: Roundtable on Inclusiveness Issues in the Profession

1:45-4:45 p.m., Parlor A (6th Floor (M,S))
Chair: Susana Nuccetelli (University of Texas–Pan American)
Speakers: Mary Bloodsworth-Lugo (Washington State University)
Frank Kirkland (Hunter College)
Elizabeth Millán-Zaibert (DePaul University)
Rosemarie Tong (University of North Carolina–Charlotte)
Commentator: Greg Gilson (University of Texas–Pan American)
III-M. Special Session Sponsored by the APA Committee on Philosophy in Two-Year Colleges: Strategies and Standards for Introducing Philosophy: Lessons from Two-Year Colleges

1:45-4:45 p.m., Parlor B (6th Floor (M,S))

Speakers: Charles R. Myers (Okaloosa-Walton College)
          Daniel E. Palmer (Kent State University–Trumbull)
          Eric Brandon (Fresno City College)
          Gerald Mozur (Lewis and Clark Community College)

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

5:00-6:00 p.m., Red Lacquer Room (4th Floor (M))

Introduction: Ted Cohen
Speaker: Eleonore Stump

“Love, By All Accounts”

PRESIDENTIAL RECEPTION

9:00 p.m.-Midnight, Red Lacquer Room (4th Floor (M))

SATURDAY, APRIL 29

BOOK EXHIBITS

9:00 a.m.-Noon, Lower Exhibit Hall Salons 4-12 (3rd Floor (S))

PLACEMENT INTERVIEW AREA

9:00 a.m.-Noon, Salon 3 (3rd Floor (S))

PLACEMENT QUIET INTERVIEW SPACE

9:00 a.m.-Noon, Private Dining Room 3 (3rd Floor (M))

PLACEMENT SERVICE

9:00 a.m.-Noon Salon 1 (3rd Floor (S))

REGISTRATION

9:00 a.m.-Noon, Salon 2 (3rd Floor (S))

IV-A. Invited Session: The Patrick J. Romanell Lecture

9:00 a.m.-Noon, Crystal Room (3rd Floor (M))

Speaker: Stephen Gaukroger (University of Sydney)

“Home Alone: Cognitive Solipsism in the 17th and 18th Centuries”

IV-B. Symposium: The Metaphysics of Ordinary Objects

9:00 a.m.-Noon, Private Dining Room 9 (3rd Floor (M))

Chair: Michael Rea (University of Notre Dame)
Speakers: L. A. Paul (University of Arizona)  
“Material Coincidence”  
Josh Parsons (University of Otago)

Commentator: Thomas M. Crisp (Biola University)

**IV-C. Symposium: Anscombe on Action**

9:00 a.m.-Noon, Private Dining Room 16 (5th Floor (S))

Chair: Candace Vogler (University of Chicago)

Speakers: Michael Thompson (University of Pittsburgh)  
Richard Moran (Harvard University)

Commentator: J. David Velleman (University of Michigan)

**IV-D. Author Meets Critics: Deborah Modrak, Aristotle’s Theory of Language and Meaning**

9:00 a.m.-Noon, Private Dining Room 17 (5th Floor (S))

Chair: Robin Smith (Texas A&M University)

Critics: David Charles (Oxford University)  
Paolo Crivelli (Oxford University)  
Fred D. Miller, Jr. (Bowling Green State University)

Author: Deborah Modrak (University of Rochester)

**IV-E. Author Meets Critics: Nomy Arpaly, Unprincipled Virtue**

9:00 a.m.-Noon, Private Dining Room 18 (5th Floor (S))

Chair: Douglas Lavin (Harvard University)

Critics: Robert B. Pippin (University of Chicago)

Author: Nomy Arpaly (Brown University)

**IV-F. Invited Session: The Extended Mind and Scientific Psychology**

9:00 a.m.-Noon, Wabash Parlor (3rd Floor (M))

Chair: Carl Gillett (Illinois Wesleyan University)

Speakers: Alva Noë (University of California–Berkeley)  
“Extended Consciousness”  
Rick Grush (University of California–San Diego)  
Robert Rupert (University of Colorado–Boulder)  
“Extended Cognition As a Framework for Cognitive Science: The Costs Outweighs the Benefits”

Commentator: Robert A. Wilson (University of Alberta)

**IV-G. Colloquium: Philosophy of Science**

9:00 a.m.-Noon, Private Dining Room 6 (3rd Floor (M))

9:00-10:00 a.m.

Chair: Daniel M. Hausman (University of Wisconsin–Madison)

Speaker: Jeffrey Roland (Louisiana State University)  
“Kitcher and the Obsessive Unifier”
Commentator: John T. Roberts (University of North Carolina–Chapel Hill)

10:00-11:00 a.m.
Chair: Joshua Thurow (University of Wisconsin–Madison)
Speaker: Marc A. Alspector-Kelly (Western Michigan University)
“Empiricism as Stance and Empiricism Naturalized”
Commentator: Bradley Monton (University of Kentucky)

11:00 a.m.-Noon
Chair: Robert Batterman (University of Western Ontario)
Speaker: Sorin Bangu (University of Toronto)
“Underdetermination and the Argument from Indirect Confirmation”
Commentator: John Koolage (University of Wisconsin–Madison)

IV-H. Colloquium: Historical Kant
9:00 a.m.-Noon, Private Dining Room 7 (3rd Floor (M))

9:00-10:00 a.m.
Chair: Jane Kneller (Colorado State University)
Speaker: Kenneth R. Westphal (University of East Anglia)
“Kant’s Transcendental Proofs of Mental Content Externalism”
Commentator: Nelson Potter (University of Nebraska–Lincoln)

10:00-11:00 a.m.
Chair: Karl Ameriks (University of Notre Dame)
Speaker: Jeppe Platz (University of Tennessee)
“On Kant’s Distinctions between Perfect and Imperfect and Narrow and Wide Duties”
**Graduate Student Travel Stipend Winner**
Commentator: Jeanine M. Grenberg (St. Olaf College)

11:00 a.m.-Noon
Speaker: James Kreines (Yale University)
“Between Human Experience and Divine Intuition: Hegel’s Response to Kant’s Limitation of Our Knowledge”
Commentator: Jennifer A. Mensch (Villanova University)

IV-I. Colloquium: Epistemology, Logic, and Language
9:00 a.m.-Noon, Private Dining Room 8 (3rd Floor (M))

9:00-10:00 a.m.
Chair: Stephanie Lewis (Municipal Capital Management, LLC)
Speaker: Janice L. Dowell (Bowling Green State University)
“Meaning, Reason, and Modality”
Commentator: Josh Dever (University of Texas–Austin)

10:00-11:00 a.m.
Chair: Ian Proops (University of Michigan–Ann Arbor)
Speaker: Jon M. Cogburn (Louisiana State University)
“Moore Problems for the Anti-Realist?”
Commentator: Joe R. Salerno (St. Louis University)

11:00 a.m.-Noon
Chair: Jason Bridges (University of Chicago)
Speaker: Mark Silcox (University of Central Oklahoma)
“On the Conceivability of an Omniscient Interpreter”
Commentator: Anthony Dardis (Hofstra University)

IV-J. Colloquium: Democracy
9:00 a.m.-Noon, Private Dining Room 4 (3rd Floor (M))

9:00-10:00 a.m.
Chair: Nancy Fraser (New School for Social Research)
Speaker: Diane Perpich (Vanderbilt University)
“The Equality-Difference Dilemma and Contemporary Feminist Politics”
Commentator: Penelope Deutscher (Northwestern University)

10:00-11:00 a.m.
Chair: David B. Ingram (Loyola University Chicago)
Speaker: Christopher King (Vanderbilt University)
“The Logic of Political Liberalism: A Critique of Estlund’s Acceptance Criterion”
Commentator: William Rehg (St. Louis University)

11:00 a.m.-Noon
Chair: Anthony S. Laden (University of Illinois–Chicago)
Speaker: Robert Talisse (Vanderbilt University)
“Why Pragmatists Must Be Perfectionists”
Commentator: Kenneth Baynes (Syracuse University)

IV-K. Colloquium: Spinoza
9:00 a.m.-Noon, Cresthill Room (3rd Floor (M))

9:00-10:00 a.m.
Chair: Matthew J. Kisner (University of South Carolina)
Speaker: Eugene J. Marshall (University of Wisconsin–Madison)
“Spinoza on Akrasia”
**Graduate Student Travel Stipend Winner**
Commentator: Michael LeBuffe (Texas A&M University)
10:00-11:00 a.m.
Chair: Diane Steinberg (Cleveland State University)
Speaker: Christopher Martin (Purdue University)
"Rethinking Spinoza’s Concept of Ideas of Ideas"

**Graduate Student Travel Stipend Winner**
Commentator: Karolina Hubner (University of Chicago)

11:00 a.m.-Noon
Chair: Charles Hueneman (Utah State University)
Speaker: Shannon Dea (University of Western Ontario)
"Spinoza on the Indivisibility of Substance and the Inconceivability of Extension"

**Graduate Student Travel Stipend Winner**
Commentator: Samuel Newlands (Yale University)

IV-L. Colloquium: Wittgenstein
9:00 a.m.-Noon, Private Dining Room 5 (3rd Floor (M))

9:00-10:00 a.m.
Chair: James C. Klagge (Virginia Tech)
Speaker: Andrew Graham (Acadia University)
"Wittgenstein and Kripke on the Standard Metre"
Commentator: Heather J. Gert (University of North Carolina–Greensboro)

10:00-11:00 a.m.
Chair: Kelly Dean Jolley (Auburn University)
Speaker: Craig Fox (University of Illinois–Chicago)
“The Transient Paragraph: An Understanding of PI §43 Aided by an Analysis of a Late Stage of Composition of the Philosophical Investigations”
Commentator: Alice Crary (The New School for Social Research)

IV-M. Special Session Sponsored by the APA Committee on Hispanics: What Is an Ethnic Group?
9:00 a.m.-Noon, Parlor B (6th Floor (M,S))

Chair: Gary Seay (City University of New York)
Speakers: Jorge Gracia (University at Buffalo)
Susana Nuccetelli (University of Texas–Pan American)
Michael D. Root (University of Minnesota)
Pauł C. Taylor (Temple University)

Commentators: Jesús Aguilar (Rochester Institute of Technology)
Omar Mirza (St. Cloud State University)
Onyoutgh Oh (Medgar Evers College/CUNY Graduate Center)
Steve Tammeldeo (Lake Forest College)
IV-N. Special Session Sponsored by the APA Committee on Inclusiveness: Theorizing Disability

9:00 a.m.-Noon, Parlor A (6th Floor (M,S))
Chair: Abby Wilkerson (George Washington University)
Speakers: Paul R. Marchbanks (English, University of North Carolina–Chapel Hill)
“Intimations of Developmental Disability: Configuring Care and Causation in the Brontës’ Villette and Wuthering Heights”
Scott DeShong (English, Quinebaugh Valley Community College)
“Disability Studies and the Metaphysics of Ability”
Christine A. James (Valdosta State University)
“Disability Interpreted in the Early Modern Period and in Medical Ethics”

IV-O. Special Session Sponsored by the APA Committee on Inclusiveness: Breakfast Meeting

7:30-9:00 a.m., Parlor C (6th Floor (M,S))

SATURDAY AFTERNOON/EVENING, APRIL 29

GROUP AND COMMITTEE SESSIONS, SATURDAY AFTERNOON/EVENING

(See Group Meeting Program for details)

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

GV-1: Society for Analytical Feminism, Private Dining Room 7
GV-2: Society for the Philosophic Study of the Contemporary Visual Arts, Wabash Parlor
GV-3: Society for Philosophy in the Contemporary World, Private Dining Room 9
GV-4: Concerned Philosophers for Peace, Private Dining Room 4
GV-5: Society for Philosophy and Technology, Private Dining Room 5
GV-6: Max Scheler Society, Private Dining Room 6
GV-7: Society for Bioethics and Classical Philosophy, Crystal Room
GV-8: Society for Business Ethics, Private Dining Room 8
GV-9: North American Nietzsche Society, Private Dining Room 16
GV-10: Journal of the History of Philosophy, Private Dining Room 17
GV-11: Conference of Philosophical Societies, Private Dining Room 18
GV-12: Society for the Study of Indian and Tibetan Buddhist Philosophy, Parlor A
GV-13: Association for the Development of Philosophy Teaching, Parlor B
V-A. Invited Session: Mechanism in the Sciences
2:30-6:00 p.m., Crystal Room (3rd Floor (M))
Chair: Robert Richardson (University of Cincinnati)
Speakers: William Wimsatt (University of Chicago)
"Introductory Overview: The Biological Origins of Modern Mechanism in Philosophy"
Peter Machamer (University of Pittsburgh (HPS))
"Mechanisms, Explanations and Information"
Stuart Glennan (Butler University)
"Prospects and Problems for a Mechanical Theory of Causation"
Commentators: Stathis Psillos (University of Athens)
Carl F. Craver (Washington University in St. Louis)

V-B. Symposium: Philosophy of Religion in the 21st Century
2:30-5:30 p.m., Wabash Parlor (3rd Floor (M))
Chair: Michael Bergmann (Purdue University)
Speakers: Richard Swinburne (Oxford University)
"Justification of Religious Belief"
Paul Draper (Florida International University)
"Partisanship and Inquiry in Philosophy of Religion"
Nicholas Wolterstorff (Yale University)

V-C. Symposium: Early Modern Theories of Causation
2:30-5:30 p.m., Private Dining Room 16 (5th Floor (S))
Chair: Karen Detlefsen (University of Pennsylvania)
Speakers: Eileen O’Neill (University of Massachusetts)
Tad M. Schmaltz (Duke University)
Commentator: Sukjae Lee (Ohio State University)

V-D. Symposium: Recognition or Redistribution?
2:30-5:30 p.m., Private Dining Room 17 (5th Floor (S))
Chair: José Medina (Vanderbilt University)
Speakers: Nancy Fraser (New School for Social Research)
Rainer Forst (Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität)
"First Things First: (Re-)Distribution, Recognition, and Power"
Commentator: Linda Martín Alcoff (Syracuse University)

V-E. Author Meets Critics: Scott Soames, Reference and Description: The Case against Two-Dimensionalism
2:30-5:30 p.m., Private Dining Room 18 (5th Floor (S))
Chair: David Sosa (University of Texas–Austin)
Critics: David Chalmers (Australian National University)
V-F. Colloquium: Philosophy of Language
2:30-5:30 p.m., Private Dining Room 5 (3rd Floor (M))

2:30-3:30 p.m.
Chair: John Fennell (Grinnell College)
Speaker: Paul Saka (University of Houston)
“Ambiguity Beyond Number”
Commentator: Chris Kennedy (University of Chicago)

3:30-4:30 p.m.
Chair: Leonard Clapp (Illinois Wesleyan University)
Speaker: Michael A. Rescorla (University of California–Santa Barbara)
“Assertion and Its Constitutive Norms”
Commentator: Gary Ebbs (University of Illinois–Urbana-Champaign)

4:30-5:30 p.m.
Chair: William W. Taschek (Ohio State University)
Speakers: Peter W. Hanks (University of Minnesota–Twin Cities) and Brendan O’Sullivan (Rhodes College)
“Reflexive Content and the Modal Argument”
Commentator: Boris Kment (University of Michigan–Ann Arbor)

V-G. Colloquium: Aristotle
2:30-5:30 p.m., Private Dining Room 6 (3rd Floor (M))

2:30-3:30 p.m.
Chair: Martha Nussbaum (University of Chicago)
Speaker: Stephanie Gregoire (St. Jerome’s University)
“Can Women Be Philosophers for Aristotle?”
Commentator: Marguerite Deslauriers (McGill University)

3:30-4:30 p.m.
Chair: Gabriel Richardson Lear (University of Chicago)
Speaker: Kevin Sharpe (Purdue University)
“A Neglected Premise in Aristotle’s Argument for the Unity of the Virtues”
Commentator: Miriam N. Byrd (University of Texas–Arlington)

4:30-5:30 p.m.
Chair: Lawrence J. Jost (University of Cincinnati)
Speaker: Thomas M. Tuozzo (University of Kansas)
“A Reductionist Account of Aristotelian Powers to Cause Change”
Commentator: Richard J. Tierney (University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee)
V-H. Colloquium: Challenges to Traditional Epistemology

2:30-5:30 p.m., Private Dining Room 7 (3rd Floor (M))

2:30-3:30 p.m.
Chair: Marcelo H. Sabatés (Kansas State University)
Speaker: Benjamin Bayer (University of Illinois–Urbana-Champaign)
“Neglecting Indeterminacy and Behaviorism: Kim’s Critique of Quine’s Naturalized Epistemology”

**Graduate Student Travel Stipend Winner**
Commentator: Cory F. Juhl (University of Texas–Austin)

3:30-4:30 p.m.
Chair: Frederick F. Schmitt (Indiana University–Bloomington)
Speaker: E. J. Coffman (University of Notre Dame)
“Williamson’s Evidence”
Commentator: Nicholas L. Silins (New York University)

4:30-5:30 p.m.
Chair: Jesús Aguilar (Rochester Institute of Technology)
Speaker: Jared G. Bates (Hanover College)
“Kornblith on the Value of Knowledge”
Commentator: Jonathan Weinberg (Indiana University–Bloomington)

V-I. Colloquium: War

2:30-5:30 p.m., Private Dining Room 8 (3rd Floor (M))

2:30-3:30 p.m.
Chair: Mark N. Jensen (University of Notre Dame)
Speaker: Steven E. Viner (Washington University in St. Louis)
“On State Self-Defense and Guantanamo Bay”

**Graduate Student Travel Stipend Winner**
Commentator: John Davenport (Fordham University)

3:30-4:30 p.m.
Chair: Rory J. Conces (University of Nebraska–Omaha)
Speaker: Stephen L. Nathanson (Northeastern University)
“Terrorism and the Ethics of War”
Commentator: James P. Sterba (University of Notre Dame)

V-J. Colloquium: Metaethics

2:30-5:30 p.m., Private Dining Room 4 (3rd Floor (M))

2:30-3:30 p.m.
Chair: Fritz Allhoff (Western Michigan University)
Speaker: Peter B. M. Vranas (Iowa State University)
“I Ought, Therefore I Can”
Commentator: Anastasia Panagopoulos (University of Minnesota)

3:30-4:30 p.m.
Chair: John Hare (Yale University)
Speaker: Nathan Nobis (University of Alabama–Birmingham)
“R. M. Hare, Non-Moral ‘Oughts’ and the Value of Reason and Consistency”
Commentator: Christian Miller (Wake Forest University)

4:30-5:30 p.m.
Chair: Terence Cuneo (Calvin College)
Speaker: Andrew Payne (St. Joseph’s University)
“Gibbard on Thick Concepts and Normative Facts”
Commentator: Melissa Barry (Williams College)

V-K. Special Session Sponsored by the APA Committee on Philosophy and Medicine: The Role of Compassion in Medical Education and Medical Practice
2:30-5:30 p.m., Private Dining Room 9 (3rd Floor (M))
Chair: Lee M. Brown (Howard University)
 Speakers: Laura Ekstrom (College of William and Mary)
“Compassion, Autonomy, and Respect”
Gordon Greene (University of Hawaii–Manoa)
“Imperturbability Is Not Armor: Approaches to Training”
Benjamin Rich (University of California–Davis)
“Breeding Cynicism: The Re-Education of Medical Students”
Sandra L. Shapshay (Indiana University/Indiana University Center for Bioethics)
“Compassion, A Double-edged Scalpel”
Howard Spiro (Yale University)
“Is It Passion or Compassion That Is Needed?”
Angelo Volandes (Harvard University, Center for Bioethics, Brigham and Women’s Hospital)
“Illness as Experience: Beyond the Language of Autonomy and Disease”

V-L. Special Session Sponsored by the APA Committee on Philosophy and Law: State, Religion, and the Establishment Clause Today
2:30-5:30 p.m., Parlor A (6th Floor (M,S))
Chair: Lucinda Joy Peach (American University)
Speakers: Robert Audi (University of Notre Dame)
“Scientific Education and Church-State Separation”
Kent Greenwalt (Columbia University)

Michael Perry (Emory University)
“The Nonestablishment Ideal”

Steven Shiffrin (Cornell University)
“Liberalism and the Establishment Clause: Is Religion Special?”

V-M. Symposium: Memorial Session for Richard Popkin
2:30-5:30 p.m., Cresthill Room (3rd Floor (M))
Chair: Al Martinich (University of Texas–Austin)
Speakers: Jose Maia Neto (Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais)
“Suspension of Judgment and Belief in Early Modern Skepticism”
Margaret Osler (University of Calgary)
“Reading Gassendi: Sceptics, Libertines, and Historians of Philosophy”
James Force (University of Kentucky)
“Samuel Clarke (1675-1729): Subtle Newtonian”
GROUP MEETING PROGRAM

GROUP SESSION GI: THURSDAY, APRIL 27, 9:00 A.M.-NOON

GI-1. Joint Session Sponsored by the American Association of Philosophy Teachers and the Association for Informal Logic and Critical Thinking

9:00 a.m.-Noon, Crystal Room (3rd Floor (M))

Topic: Learning to Teach Informal Logic: Aligning Graduate Education with Hiring and Work Realities

Chair: Betsy Decyk (California State University–Long Beach)

Speakers: Rod Bertolet (Purdue University)
Adrienne McEvoy (Mansfield University)
Ralph Johnson (University of Windsor)
Tony Blair (University of Windsor)

GI-2. Radical Philosophy Association

9:00 a.m.-Noon, Wabash Parlor (3rd Floor (M))

“Distinguished Families: An Interrogation of the Prosaic Ontology of Biological versus Adoptive Ties”
“Genetic Engineering and the ‘Triumph of Nurture over Nature’”

Speakers: Ljubov Bugaeva (Saint Petersburg University/University of Salzburg)
“Sexuality and Society”
Dawn Jakubowski (University of Central Arkansas)
“Prozac: The New Opiate of the Masses”
Amy Beth Hilden (College of St. Catherine)
Scott Wisor (University of Colorado)
“An Argument for the Selection of Government Representatives by Random Lottery”

GI-3. International Association for the Philosophy of Sport

9:00 a.m.-Noon, Private Dining Room 9 (3rd Floor (M))

Topic: Sports Ethics

Chair: Jan Boxill (University of North Carolina–Chapel Hill)
Thursday Morning, GI-3 to GI-11

Speakers: Michael Morgan (Indiana University–Bloomington)  
“Do Sports Lack Moral Gravitas?”
Nicholas Dixon (Alma College)  
“A Moral Evaluation of Dangerous Sport”
Jeffrey P. Fry (Ball State University)  
“Sports and ‘the Therapy of Desire’”

GI-4. American Society for Aesthetics  
9:00 a.m.-Noon, Private Dining Room 4 (3rd Floor (M))

GI-5. Bertrand Russell Society  
9:00 a.m.-Noon, Private Dining Room 5 (3rd Floor (M))
Speakers: Stephen Mumford (University of Nottingham)  
“Russell’s Defense of Idleness”
Sean Crawford (Lancaster University)  
“On Belief as a Multiple Relation”
Nikolay Milkov (Universität Bieleford)  
“The Joint Program of Russell and Wittgenstein (March-November 1912)”
Erik J. Wielenberg (DePauw University)  
“Bertrand Russell and C. S. Lewis: Two Peas in a Pod”
Commentator: Nikolay Milkov (Universität Bieleford)

GI-6. Joint Session Sponsored by the Hannah Arendt Circle and the Karl Jaspers Society of North America  
9:00 a.m.-Noon, Private Dining Room 6 (3rd Floor (M))

Topic: Philosophy, Religion, and Politics  
Chair: Dianna Taylor (John Carroll University)
Speakers: Craig M. Nichols (University of Rhode Island)  
“Beyond Liberal and Conservative: Freedom, Transcendence, and the Human Condition in Arendt, Jaspers, and Niebuhr”
Stephen Schulman (Ball State University)  
“Public Forgiveness and Friendship in the Work of Hannah Arendt”
Commentator: David Pellauer (DePaul University)

GI-7. Philosophy of Religion Group  
9:00 a.m.-Noon, Private Dining Room 7 (3rd Floor (M))

Topic: Analytic Theology  
Chair: Michael Rea (University of Notre Dame)
Speakers: Oliver Crisp (University of Bristol)  
Andrew Dole (Amherst College)  
Thomas M. Crisp (Biola University)
GI-8. **Society for the Advancement of American Philosophy**  
*9:00 a.m.-Noon, Private Dining Room 8 (3rd Floor (M))*

**Topic: Origins of C.S. Peirce’s Philosophy of Religion: Roundtable Discussion**

Speakers:  
- Felicia Kruse (Xavier University)  
  “Peirce, God, and the ‘Transcendentalist Virus’”
- David O’Hara (Augustana College)  
  “‘Playing on the way to Oregon’: Peirce’s N.A. in light of Thoreau’s ‘Walking’”
- Stacey Ake (Drexel University)  
  “When God Does Roll Dice: Finitude and Natural Evil in the Thought of C. S. Peirce”
- Douglas R. Anderson (Southern Illinois University–Carbondale)  
  “Peircean Faith?”

GI-9. **American Society for Value Inquiry**  
*9:00 a.m.-Noon, Private Dining Room 16 (5th Floor (S))*

**Topic: Moral Values**

Chair: Thomas Magnell (Drew University)  
Speakers:  
- James Stacey Taylor (St. Norbert College)  
  “Rawls, Epicurus, and Abortion”
- Anita Superson (University of Kentucky)  
  “Bodily Autonomy”

GI-10. **Joint Session Sponsored by the Personalist Discussion Group and the Society for the Study of Process Philosophy**  
*9:00 a.m.-Noon, Private Dining Room 17 (5th Floor (S))*

Speakers:  
- William T. Myers (Birmingham Southern University)  
  “Why Process Philosophers Need John Dewey”
- Joe Frank Jones III (Barton College)

GI-11. **Society for Student Philosophers**  
*9:00 a.m.-Noon, Private Dining Room 18 (5th Floor (S))*

Chair: Eric Chelstrom (State University of New York at Buffalo)  
Speakers:  
- Eric Chelstrom (State University of New York at Buffalo)  
  “Kantian Criticism of BonJour’s Moderate Rationalism”
- Michael Macomber (New School for Social Research)  
  “Are All Young Poets Naïve? Questioning the Possibility of Erroneous Judgments of Taste in Kant’s *Critique of Judgment*”
Samuel Duncan (University of Virginia)
“The Difference Principle and Treating Others as Ends in Themselves”

Danielle LaSusa (Temple University)
“Eiffel Tower Statuettes and Other Pieces of Reality: A Philosophical Look at the Tourist’s Habit of Souvenir Collecting”

GI-12. Society for Realist-Antirealist Discussion
9:00 a.m.-Noon, Parlor A (6th Floor (M,S))
Chair: Mark Okrent (Bates College)
Speakers: Lee J. Braver (Hiram College)
“Davidson’s Reading of Gadamer: What He Missed and What He Could Have Learned”
Timothy J. Nulty (University of Massachusetts, Dartmouth)
“Metaphysical Pluralism without Conceptual Schemes”
Samuel C. Wheeler III (University of Connecticut)
“Truth, Being, Davidson and Derrida”

GI-13. North American Kant Society
9:00 a.m.-Noon, Parlor B (6th Floor (M,S))
Chair: Ian Proops (University of Michigan–Ann Arbor)
Speaker: Andrew Chignell (Cornell University)
“Kant on the Kinds of Knowledge”
Commentator: Anja Jauernig (University of Notre Dame)
Speaker: Desmond Hogan (Princeton University)
“Metaphysical Motives of Kant’s Analytic-Synthetic Distinction”
Commentator: R. Lanier Anderson (Stanford University)

GI-14. William James Society
9:00 a.m.-Noon, Parlor C (6th Floor (M,S))

GI-15. Association for the Development of Philosophy Teaching
9:00 a.m.-Noon, Parlor D (6th Floor (M,S))

GROUP SESSION GII: THURSDAY, APRIL 27, 5:15-7:15 P.M.

GII-1. Association for Informal Logic and Critical Thinking
5:15-7:15 p.m., Crystal Room (3rd Floor (M))
Chair: Peter D. Asquith (Michigan State University)
Speaker: Tom Solon (Danville Area Community College)
“Generic Critical Thinking Infusion and Course Content Learning in Introductory Psychology”
Commentator: Donald L. Hatcher (Baker University)
Speaker: David Sherry (Northern Arizona University)
“Yanal et al. on Linked and Convergent”
Commentator: Robert J. Yanal (Wayne State University)

**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., Wabash Parlor (3rd Floor (M))

**Topic: War, Terrorism, and LGBT Issues**

Chair: Vince Samar (Loyola University of Chicago/Illinois Institute of Technology)

Speakers: William Gay (University of North Carolina–Charlotte)  
“Political Use of the ‘War on Terrorism’ to Augment Military and Domestic LGBT Repression”

Mary Bloodsworth-Lugo (Washington State University) and Carmen R. Lugo-Lugo (Washington State University)  
“The War in Iraq and Same-Sex Marriage: U.S. State Discourse, the ‘War on Terror’, and a Decline in Public Approval”

Commentator: Raja Halwani (School of the Art Institute of Chicago)

**GII-3. Society for the Study of Ethics and Animals**

5:15-7:15 p.m., Private Dining Room 9 (3rd Floor (M))

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

Speakers: Bart Gruzalski (Pacific Center for Sustainable Living)  
“Since Vegetable Farming Kills Sentient Beings, What Is a Utilitarian to Eat?”

Gaverick Matheny (Dept. of Agriculture and Resource Economics, University of Maryland)

Commentators: Henry R. West (Macalester College)  
Alastair Norcross (Rice University)

**GII-4. North American Kant Society**

5:15-7:15 p.m., Private Dining Room 4 (3rd Floor (M))

**Topic: Kant’s Philosophy of Right (The Mary Gregor Memorial Lecture)**

Chair: Patricia Kitcher (Columbia University)

Speaker: Marcus Willaschek (Universität Frankfurt/Main)  
“Kant on Right without Ethics: Reflections on Kant’s Conception of ‘Strict Right’ in the *Metaphysics of Morals*”

Commentator: Arthur Ripstein (University of Toronto)

*There will be a short business meeting at the beginning of this session.*
GII-5. North American Spinoza Society
5:15-7:15 p.m., Private Dining Room 5 (3rd Floor (M))
Chair: Debra Nails (Michigan State University)
Speaker: Gary Esposito (Marquette University)
“Spinoza and the Order of Nature”
Commentator: Matt Wion (Marquette University)
Speaker: Richard N. Manning (Georgetown University)
“Spinoza’s Individuals”
Commentator: Brandon Look (University of Kentucky)

GII-6. Society for Philosophy and Public Affairs
5:15-7:15 p.m., Private Dining Room 6 (3rd Floor (M))
Topic: Environmentalism and Environmental Justice
Chair: Christine Sistare (Muhlenberg College)
Speakers: Laura Westra (Osgoode Hall Law School/York University)
Mark Woods (University of San Diego)
Ronald L. Sandler (Northeastern University)

GII-7. Hume Society: Author Meets Critics: Claudia Schmidt, 
David Hume: Reason in History
5:15-7:15 p.m., Private Dining Room 7 (3rd Floor (M))
Critics: Corliss Swain (St. Olaf College)
Saul Traiger (Occidental College)
Christopher Williams (University of Nevada–Reno)
Author: Claudia Schmidt (Marquette University)

GII-8. International Society for Environmental Ethics
5:15-7:15 p.m., Private Dining Room 8 (3rd Floor (M))
Speaker: Steven Weiss (Augusta State University)
“Making the Connection Between Women’s Empowerment, Well-Being, and Land Rights: Examining Bina Agarwal’s A Field of One’s Own”
Commentator: Judith Andre (Michigan State University)
Speaker: Lisa M. Heldke (Gustavus Adolphus College)
“Newcomers Need Not Apply: A Racialized Reading of Wendell Berry”
Commentator: Lee McBride (Georgia Institute of Technology)

GII-9. Society for the Metaphysics of Science
5:15-7:15 p.m., Private Dining Room 16 (5th Floor (S))
Speakers: Kenneth Aizawa (Centenary College of Louisiana)
“Biochemistry and Multiple Realization”
Robert A. Wilson (University of Alberta)
“Meaning Making and the Mind of the Externalist”
GII-10.  International Association for Computing and Philosophy
5:15-7:15 p.m., Private Dining Room 17 (5th Floor (S))

Topic: Issues concerning Open Source Software
Chair:  Thomas Wren (Loyola University Chicago)
Speakers:  John Snapper (Illinois Institute of Technology)
           George Thiruvathukal (Loyola University Chicago)
           Samir Chopra (City University of New York–Brooklyn College)
           Scott Dexter (City University of New York–Brooklyn College)

5:15-7:15 p.m., Private Dining Room 18 (5th Floor (S))

Topic: Nietzsche on Agency and Reliability
Chair:  R. Lanier Anderson (Stanford University)
Speakers:  Paul Katsafanas (Harvard University)
           “Nietzsche on Agency and Self-Ignorance”
           Randall Havas (Willamette University)
           “Individuality as Reliability: A Dog Trainer’s Guide to Nietzsche”

GII-12.  American Society for Philosophy, Counseling, and Psychotherapy
5:15-7:15 p.m., Parlor A (6th Floor (M,S))

Chair:  Samuel Zinaich (Purdue University–Calumet)
Speaker:  Kevin Aho (Florida Gulf Coast University)
Commentator:  Nan-Nan Lee (St. Xavier University–Chicago)

GII-13.  Society for the Advancement of American Philosophy
5:15-7:15 p.m., Parlor B (6th Floor (M,S))

Topic: John Dewey’s Educational Philosophy and Its Critics
Chair:  Stuart Rosenbaum (Baylor University)
Speakers:  Matthew Flamm (Rockford College)
           “Education, Humanism, and the Highbrow: Dewey versus Babbitt”
           Victor Kestenbaum (Boston University)
           “Pragmatism and ‘Spiritual Disorder’”
Commentator:  Jessica Wahman (Dickinson College)

GII-14.  Concerned Philosophers for Peace
5:15-7:15 p.m., Cresthill Room (3rd Floor (M))

Topic: Iraq: Ethics and Exit
Chair:  Harry van der Linden (Butler University)
Thursday Evening, GII-14 to GII-4

Speakers: Joseph C. Kunkel (University of Dayton)
“Restoring Justice after an Unjust War”

John W. Lango (Hunter College)
“Applying Just War Principles to the Iraq Insurgency”

George Lucas (United States Naval Academy)
“Preventing Preventive Wars: Lessons Learned in Iraq”

Andrew Valls (Oregon State University)
“Jus Post Bellum: A Hobbesian Perspective”

GII-15. Committee on Institutional Cooperation
5:15-7:15 p.m., Parlor D (6th Floor (M,S))

GROUP SESSION GIII: THURSDAY, APRIL 27, 7:30-10:30 P.M.

GIII-1. Radical Philosophy Association
7:30-10:30 p.m., Crystal Room (3rd Floor (M))
Speakers: Edward Abplanalp (University of Nebraska)
“Nature and the Nature of Capitalism”

David Schweickart (Loyola University Chicago)

Paul Warren (Florida International University)
“Global Exploitation and its Discontents: A Defense of the Labor Injustice Charge”

Jacob Held (Marquette University)
“Rethinking Marxism: The Universal Class and Misrecognition”

Tony Smith (Iowa State University)
“Marx on Technology: Furthering or Overcoming Uneven Development in the Capitalist Global System”

7:30-10:30 p.m., Wabash Parlor (3rd Floor (M))

Topic: Recent Work in Race Theory
Chair: Nancy E. Snow (Marquette University)
Speakers: Linda Martín Alcoff (Syracuse University)
“Comparative Races, Comparative Racisms”

Lewis Gordon (Temple University)
“Philosophies of Myth, Symbols, and Form: Race in Philosophical Anthropology”

Anika M. Mann (Morgan State University)
“Phenomenology and Racialized Subjectivity”
Michael Monahan (Marquette University)
“On Becoming Anti-Racist: Nietzschean Reflections on Racial Psychology”

GIII-3. Convivium: The Philosophy and Food Roundtable
7:30-10:30 p.m., Private Dining Room 9 (3rd Floor (M))

Topic: The Atkins Diet and Philosophy: A Roundtable
Chair: Lisa M. Heldke (Gustavus Adolphus College)
Speakers: Randall E. Auxier (Southern Illinois University–Carbondale)
“Cutting the Conceptual Carbs: Dewey as Dietician, Atkins as Pragmatist”
William Irwin (King’s College)
“Nietzsche and the Art of Eating: A Sound Mind in an Atkins Body”
Daniel O’Connell (Institute for Cusanus Research, Trier University)
“Brillat-Savarin’s Nineteenth-Century Proto-Atkins Diet: A Case Study in Inductive Inference”
Raymond Boisvert (Siena College)
“Atkins: Who Gets Philosophical Credit? An Imaginary Dialogue”
Catherine A. Womack (Bridgewater State College)
“The Structure of Atkins’s New Diet Revolution: Proposing a Paradigm Shift in Fighting Obesity”
Abby Wilkerson (George Washington University)
“Bias and Body Size: The Social Contract and the Fat Liberation Movement”
David Detmer (Purdue University–Calumet)
“A Vegetarian’s Beef with Atkins”
Corinne Bedecarré (Normandale Community College)
“Tyranny of the Carbohydrate: Feminist Dietary Drama”

7:30-10:30 p.m., Private Dining Room 4 (3rd Floor (M))
Chair: Paul B. Thompson (Michigan State University)
Critics: Larry Hickman (Center for Dewey Studies, Southern Illinois University–Carbondale)
Kelley A. Parker (Grand Valley State University)
Jennifer Welchman (University of Alberta)
Author: Bryan Norton (Georgia Institute of Technology)
**GIII-5. Leibniz Society of North America**

*7:30-10:30 p.m., Private Dining Room 5 (3rd Floor (M))*

Chair: Laurence Carlin (University of Wisconsin–Oshkosh)

Speaker: Stefano Di Bella (Scuola Normale Superiore–Pisa)

“Leibniz's Theory of Conditions: A Framework for Ontological Dependence”

**GIII-6. North American Division of the Schopenhauer Society:**

*Author Meets Critics: Douglas L. Berger, The Veil of Maya: Schopenhauer’s System and Early Eastern Thought*

*7:30-10:30 p.m., Private Dining Room 6 (3rd Floor (M))*

Chair: David E. Cartwright (University of Wisconsin–Whitewater)

Critics: Richard Nance (Independent Scholar)

Lance Byron Richey (Cardinal Stritch University)

Author: Douglas L. Berger (Oakton College)

**GIII-7. Society for the Philosophy of Creativity: Gordon D. Kaufman, A Religious View of Creativity: Creativity as God**

*7:30-10:30 p.m., Private Dining Room 7 (3rd Floor (M))*

Chair: John Cogan (Southern Illinois University–Carbondale)

Critics: Jerome Stone (William Rainey Harper College/Meadville Theological School)

Stephen H. Bickham (Mansfield University)

Author: Gordon D. Kaufman (Harvard Divinity School)

**GIII-8. Society for the Philosophy of History**

*7:30-10:30 p.m., Private Dining Room 8 (3rd Floor (M))*

**Topic: Genealogies, Exceptions, and Norms**

Chair: Benjamin S. Pryor (University of Toledo)

Speakers: Lee J. Braver (Hiram College)

“Heidegger, Genealogies, History of Being: Why Heidegger Has Always Been, for Foucault’s Genealogy, the Essential Philosopher”

Jeanne Marie Kusina (Bowling Green State University)

“The Wolf at the Door: Agamben’s History of Exception”

Michael Allen (St. Louis University)

“Spontaneity and Generativity in the Co-Determination of Norms”

**GIII-9. American Society for Value Inquiry**

*7:30-10:30 p.m., Private Dining Room 16 (5th Floor (S))*

**Topic: Value Theory**

Chair: G. John M. Abbarno (D'Youville College)
Speakers:  David Schrader (Washington and Jefferson College)
“Naturalizing Value Theory”
Charles Watson (Earlham College)
“With Genus and Justice for All: John Dewey and Cornel West on Freedom and Democracy as Moral Ideals”

GIII-10. **Max Scheler Society**  
*7:30-10:30 p.m., Private Dining Room 17 (5th Floor (S))*  
**Speaker:** Daniel Dahlstrom (Boston University)  
“Scheler on the Essence of Christian Religious Consciousness”  
**Commentator:** Daw-Nay Evans (DePaul University)  
**Speaker:** John White (Franciscan University–Steubenville)  
“Two Idols of Phenomenology Idolatry in the Philosophies of Max Scheler and Jean-Luc Marion”  
**Commentator:** Kenneth Stikkers (Southern Illinois University–Carbondale)  
**Speakers:** Zachary Davis (Keene State College)  
“Scheler on the Relation between Political Idolatry and Despotism”  
Eugene Kelly (New York Institute of Technology)  
“In Lumine Dei: The Phenomenology of World and God”

GIII-11. **Society for the Philosophic Study of Genocide and the Holocaust**  
*7:30-10:30 p.m., Private Dining Room 18 (5th Floor (S))*  
**Chair:** André Mineau (University of Quebec–Rimouski)  
**Speakers:** Jennifer Scuro (St. John’s University)  
“The Legacy of Auschwitz: Determining a New Sense of Intergenerational Responsibility”  
Roderick M. Stewart (Austin College)  
“Responsibility and Luck in the Holocaust: Towards a Functionalist Compatibilism”  
André Mineau (University of Quebec at Rimouski)  
“Biological Values in the Background of the Holocaust: A Case Study”

GIII-12. **Society for the Philosophic Study of the Contemporary Visual Arts**  
*7:30-10:30 p.m., Parlor A (6th Floor (M,S))*  
**Topic:** Film and Emotion  
**Chair:** Mitchell Avila (California State University–Fullerton)  
**Speakers:** Daniel Barratt (University of Kent)
“Tracing the Routes to Filmic Empathy: Association, Simulation, or Appraisal?”
Amy Coplan (California State University–Fullerton)
“Film Feelings: Affective Engagement with Narrative Fiction Film”
Dan Flory (Montana State University)
“Race and Empathy in Narrative Film”
Jonathan Frome (University of Wisconsin–Madison)
“The Role of Reality in Film Emotions”
Commentator: Mitchell Avila (California State University–Fullerton)

**GIII-13. Society for Asian and Comparative Philosophy**

*7:30-10:30 p.m., Parlor B (6th Floor (M,S))*

**Topic: Classical Asian Traditions in Retrospect and Prospect**

Chair: J. N. Mohanty (Temple University)
Speakers: Bina Gupta (University of Missouri–Columbia)  
“Common Myths about Indian Philosophy”
Donna Giancola (Suffolk University)
“Maya-Shakti-Devi (Maya): The Mother of Eco-Justice”
Marc Applebaum (Saybrook Graduate School)
“Sufism and Democratization: The Nuriyya-Melamiyya and the Turkish Revolution”
Commentator: J. N. Mohanty (Temple University)

**GIII-14. History of Early Analytic Philosophy Society**

*7:30-10:30 p.m., Cresthill Room (3rd Floor (M))*

Speaker: Paul Pojman (Towson University)
“From Mach to Carnap: A Tale of Confusion”
Commentator: Christopher Pincock (Purdue University)
Speaker: Aaron Preston (Malone College)
“Scientism and the Emergence of Analytic Philosophy”
Commentator: John Ongley (Edinboro University)
Speaker: Giancarlo Zanet (University of Palermo)
“Pragmatism, the A Priori, and Analyticity: Peirce, C. I. Lewis, and Quine”
Commentator: Stefanie Rocknak (Hartwick College)

**GROUP SESSION GIV: FRIDAY, APRIL 28, 7:00-10:00 P.M.**

**GIV-1. Joint Session Sponsored by the Hannah Arendt Circle and the Karl Jaspers Society of North America**

*7:00-10:00 p.m., Private Dining Room 16 (5th Floor (S))*

**Topic: Jaspers/Arendt**
Group Program

Chair: Alan M. Olson (Boston University)
Speakers: Shadia Drury (University of Regina, Canada)
          “Aquinas and the Inquisition”
          Lee Cooper (Colorado State University)
          “Hannah Arendt on the Anti-Political Paradigm of Fabrication in Plato’s Political Philosophy”
Commentator: David Pellauer (DePaul University)

GIV-2. Philosophers for Social Responsibility
7:00-10:00 p.m., Wabash Parlor (3rd Floor (M))
Chair: Dennis Rohatyn (University of San Diego)
Speakers: Douglas Kellner (University of California–Los Angeles)
          “Lying in Politics: The Case of George W. Bush and Iraq”
          Deni Elliott (University of South Florida)
          “The Stability of Journalistic Responsibilities”
          Eric Pierson (University of San Diego)
          “The Digital Divide: Fairness and Equity in Cable Access Cost”
          Edward Berggren (Wright College)
          “Chomsky on the Media”

GIV-3. Society for Ancient Greek Philosophy
7:00-10:00 p.m., Private Dining Room 9 (3rd Floor (M))
Chair: Anthony Preus (Binghamton University)
Speakers: Rachel Singpurwalla (Southern Illinois University–Edwardsville)
          “Reasoning with the Irrational: Moral Psychology in the Protagoras”
          Andrew Payne (St. Joseph’s University)
          “Eudaimonism and the Demands of Justice”
          Steven Skultety (Northwestern University)
          “Is ‘Part of Justice’ Justice at All? Reconsidering Pol. III.9”

GIV-4. Society for Analytical Feminism
7:00-10:00 p.m., Private Dining Room 18 (5th Floor (S))
Speakers: Devora Shapiro (University of Michigan–Ann Arbor)
          “Knowledge of ‘What It’s Like’: Introducing Non-Propositional, x-Experiential Knowledge”
          Evelyn Brister (Rochester Institute of Technology)
          “The Skeptical Ploy and a Feminist Response”
          Sophie Fortin (Washington University in St. Louis)
          “Rawls, Family, Limits of Political Liberalism”
Commentator: Elizabeth Brake (University of Calgary)
GIV-5. **Society for Asian and Comparative Philosophy**

*7:00-10:00 p.m., Private Dining Room 5 (3rd Floor (M))*

**Topic: Chinese and Comparative Philosophy**

Chair: May Sim (College of the Holy Cross)
Speakers: Travis Holloway (Boston College)
   “Heidegger/Asian Thought”
Eric S. Nelson (University of Massachusetts–Lowell)
   “Does the Zhuanzi Have an Ethic?”
May Sim (College of the Holy Cross)
   “Virtue Oriented Politics: Confucius and Aristotle”

GIV-6. **Society for the Study of Husserl’s Philosophy**

*7:00-10:00 p.m., Private Dining Room 6 (3rd Floor (M))*

**Topic: Phenomenology and Asian Philosophies**

GIV-7. **International Institute for Field-Being**

*7:00-10:00 p.m., Private Dining Room 7 (3rd Floor (M))*

**Topic: John Dewey’s Process Philosophy**

Chair: Elizabeth F. Cooke (Creighton University)
Speakers: David E. White (St. John Fisher College)
   “Art, Experience and the Common Faith of Field-Being”
Casey Haskins (State University of New York–Purchase College)
   “The Disunified Field of Cultural Inquiry”
William T. Myers (Birmingham Southern University)
   “John Dewey’s Metaphysics of Moral Experience”

GIV-8. **Society for the Philosophy of History**

*7:00-10:00 p.m., Private Dining Room 8 (3rd Floor (M))*

**Topic: Postcolonial Histories**

Speakers: Lori Witthaus (Grand Valley State University)
   “Competing for History in South Asian Politics”
Shaureen Rasheed (Long Island University)
   “Eroticizing Historical Space: Subverting the Post-Colonial Other”
Namita Goswami (DePaul University)
   “Pride and Prejudice: Postcolonial Masculinity and National Iconicity”

GIV-9. **Midwest Society for Women in Philosophy**

*7:00-10:00 p.m., Crystal Room (3rd Floor (M))*
GIV-10.  Søren Kierkegaard Society
7:00-10:00 p.m., Parlor C (6th Floor (M,S))

Topic: Kierkegaard and Epistemology
Chair: Ian M. Duckles (Indiana University of Pennsylvania)
Speakers: Ulrich Knappe (University of Copenhagen)
“Keynote Address: To Kant and Kierkegaard’s Conceptions of Theoretical Truth”
Mark Tietjen (Baylor University)
“Doubts about Doubting: Kierkegaard’s Response to Skepticism in Works of Love”
Thomas Carroll (Boston University)
“Fideism and the Nature of Truth in Kierkegaard’s Philosophical Fragments and Concluding Unscientific Postscript”

Commentator: Rick Furtak (Colorado College)

GIV-11. Society for Systematic Philosophy
7:00-10:00 p.m., Private Dining Room 4 (3rd Floor (M))

Topic: Presentism
Chair: L. Nathan Oaklander (University of Michigan–Flint)
Speakers: Ulrich Meyer (Colgate University)
“Presentism and Actualism”
M. Joshua Mozersky (Queen’s University (Ontario))
“The Future of Presentism”

Commentator: V. Alan White (University of Wisconsin–Manitowoc)

GIV-12. Society for the Philosophic Study of Genocide and the Holocaust
7:00-10:00 p.m., Parlor A (6th Floor (M,S))

Chair: André Mineau (University of Quebec–Rimouski)
Speakers: T. Storm Heter (East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania)
“Are We All Murderers? Sartre and the Ethics of Collective Evil”
Stephen Schulman (Ball State University)
“Can We Say: ‘We Should Forgive Them’? Jankélévitch on the Impossibility of Forgiveness as an Ethical Prescription”

7:00-10:00 p.m., Parlor B (6th Floor (M,S))

Topic: Panel Discussion: Seeing Through Spinoza’s Lenses
Speakers: Melissa M. Shew (University of Oregon)
“Dead or Alive: Schelling’s Struggles with Spinoza’s System”
Carolyn Culbertson (University of Oregon)
“Thinking God: Hegel on the Pantheism Controversy”
Adam Arola (University of Oregon)
“A Solitude for Two: Nietzsche and Spinoza”

**GIV-14. Society for the Study of Indian and Tibetan Buddhist Philosophy**

*7:00-10:00 p.m., Private Dining Room 17 (5th Floor (S))*

**Topic: Santaraksita: Comparative Issues, Tantra, and Philosophy**

Chair: Raziel Abelson (New York University)
Speakers: Ben Vilhauer (William Paterson University)
“Santaraksita and Kant on the Infinite Divisibility and Insubstantiality of Matter”
Marie Friquegnon (William Paterson University)
“Santaraksita and the Logic of the Tantra”
Toy Tung (Padmasambhava Buddhist Center/ Columbia University)
“Santaraksita and Longchenpa on Causality”

**GIV-15. Society for Student Philosophers**

*7:00-10:00 p.m., Parlor D (6th Floor (M,S))*

Chair: Francis Bottenberg (Temple University)
Speakers: Francis Bottenberg (Temple University)
“The Barren Truth of Hegel’s Sense-Certainty”
Jackson T. Kirklin (University of Chicago)
“Necessitarianism in Spinoza’s *Ethics*”
Tuomas Manninen (University of Iowa)
“Decomposing the Sorties of Decomposition”
Craig Roxborough (York University)
“Determinism, Admonishment and Self-Refutation: A Critique of Derek Pereboom’s Determinism al Dente”

**GROUP SESSION GV: SATURDAY, APRIL 29, 12:15-2:15 P.M.**

**GV-1. Society for Analytical Feminism**

*12:15-2:15 p.m., Private Dining Room 7 (3rd Floor (M))*

Chair: Sharon Crasnow (Riverside Community College, Norco Campus)
Speaker: Diana Tietjens Meyers (University of Connecticut)
“Two Models of Autonomy: Identity-Based Versus Action-Centered”
Commentator: Marilyn Friedman (Washington University in St. Louis)

_A Business Meeting will follow the paper_
GV-2.  Society for the Philosophic Study of the Contemporary Visual Arts

12:15-2:15 p.m., Wabash Parlor (3rd Floor (M))

Topic: Aesthetic Symbolism and Abstraction

Chair: Dan Flory (Montana State University)

Speakers: Raphael Sassower (University of Colorado–Colorado Springs)
          “The Myths of Freedom: Aesthetic Symbols of Inspiration and Deception”
          Jeffrey Strayer (Indiana University/Purdue University–Fort Wayne)
          “Essentialist Abstraction”

Commentator: Phil Jenkins (Pennsylvania State University)

GV-3.  Society for Philosophy in the Contemporary World

12:15-2:15 p.m., Private Dining Room 9 (3rd Floor (M))

Topic: Enactivism and Representation in Theories of Consciousness

Chair: Ralph D. Ellis (Clark Atlanta University)

Speakers: Richard Menary (University of Hertfordshire)
          “Do Enactivists Need Representation?”
          Natika Newton (Nassau Community College)
          “An Enactivist Approach to Mental Imagery”
          Mark Rowlands (University of Hertfordshire)
          “Representing in Action”
          Daniel Hutto (University of Hertfordshire)
          “Radical Enactivism and Representation”

GV-4.  Concerned Philosophers for Peace

12:15-2:15 p.m., Private Dining Room 4 (3rd Floor (M))

Topic: Core Beliefs and Other Factors in Causing War and Violence

Chair: William Gay (University of North Carolina–Charlotte)

Speakers: Carlo Filice (State University of New York–Geneseo)
          “Violence and Amoral Group-Beliefs”
          David Koukal (University of Detroit Mercy)
          “Discreditation”
          Mary Lenzi (University of Wisconsin–Platteville)
          “The Philosophical, Psychological Causes of War and Peace”
          Gail M. Presbey (University of Detroit Mercy)
          “Gandhi’s Ideal of Ahimsa: Its Roots in Jainism, Hinduism, and Buddhism, and His Own Unique Twist”
GV-5. Society for Philosophy and Technology
12:15-2:15 p.m., Private Dining Room 5 (3rd Floor (M))

GV-6. Max Scheler Society
12:15-2:15 p.m., Private Dining Room 6 (3rd Floor (M))
Speakers: Manfred Frings (Depaul University (Emeritus))
“The Impossibility of Proofs of the Existence of God and the Sphere of the Absolute”
John Crosby (Franciscan University–Steubenville)
“From Human Beings to Human Persons: Questions about the Radical Theocentrism in Scheler’s Anthropology”
Commentator: Philip Blosser (Lenoir Rhyne College)
Speaker: Peter H. Spader (Marywood University)
“Scheler’s Panentheism, Pantheism, and Theism”
Commentator: Philip Cronce (Chicago State University)

GV-7. Society for Bioethics and Classical Philosophy
12:15-2:15 p.m., Crystal Room (3rd Floor (M))

12:15-2:15 p.m., Private Dining Room 8 (3rd Floor (M))
Chair: Denis G. Arnold (University of Tennessee)
Critics: Chris MacDonald (Saint Mary’s University)
Daniel E. Palmer (Kent State University–Trumbull)
Author: James S. Taylor (Louisiana State University)

12:15-2:15 p.m., Private Dining Room 16 (5th Floor (S))
Chair: Richard Schacht (University of Illinois–Urbana-Champaign)
Speakers: Matthew Meyer (Boston University)
“The Comic Nature of Ecce Homo”
Tsarina Doyle (University College Dublin)
“The Kantian Background of Nietzsche’s Views on Causality”

GV-10. Journal of the History of Philosophy
12:15-2:15 p.m., Private Dining Room 17 (5th Floor (S))

GV-11. Conference of Philosophical Societies
12:15-2:15 p.m., Private Dining Room 18 (5th Floor (S))
Chair: G. John M. Abbarno (D’Youville College)
GV-12. Society for the Study of Indian and Tibetan Buddhist Philosophy  
12:15-2:15 p.m., Parlor A (6th Floor (M,S))  
Topic: Reflexive Awareness in Buddhist Philosophy  
Speakers: Jay L. Garfield (Smith College, University of Massachusetts, Melbourne University, Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies)  
“The Conventional Status of Reflexive Awareness”  
Paul Bernier (University of Moncton)  
“Reflexive Awareness and the Cogito”  
Commentator: Raziel Abelson (New York University)  

GV-13. Association for the Development of Philosophy Teaching  
12:15-2:15 p.m., Parlor B (6th Floor (M,S))
MAIN AND GROUP MEETING PARTICIPANTS

ABBARNO, G. John M. (D’Youville College)..... GIII-9 Thu PM, GV-11 Sat PM
ABELSON, Raziel (New York University).......... GIV-14 Fri PM, GV-12 Sat PM
ABPLANALP, Edward (University of Nebraska).................. GIII-1 Thu PM
ADAMS, Frederick (University of Delaware).................... III-E Fri PM
ADAMS, Marilyn McCord (Oxford University)..................II-C Fri AM
AGUILAR, Jesús (Rochester Institute of Technology)..................IV-M Sat AM, V-H Sat PM
AHO, Kevin (Florida Gulf Coast University).................. GII-12 Thu PM
AIZAWA, Kenneth (Centenary College of Louisiana).............................I-F Thu PM, GII-9 Thu PM
AKE, Stacey (Drexel University).............................. GI-8 Thu AM
ALCOFF, Linda Martin (Syracuse University)........ V-D Sat PM, GIII-2 Thu PM
ALSPECTOR-KELLY, Marc A. (Western Michigan University).... IV-G Sat AM
ALTER, Torin (University of Alabama).............................. I-K Thu PM
ALLEN, Colin (Indiana University).............................. I-K Thu PM
ALLEN, Michael (St. Louis University).............................. GIII-8 Thu PM
ALLEN-HERMANSON, Sean J. (Florida International University).............................. I-K Thu PM
ALLHOFF, Fritz (Western Michigan University).................. V-J Sat PM
AMERIKS, Karl (University of Notre Dame).................. IV-H Sat AM
ANDERSON, Douglas R. (Southern Illinois University–Carbondale).............................. GI-8 Thu AM
ANDERSON, R. Lanier (Stanford University).................. GI-13 Thu AM, GII-11 Thu PM
ANDERSON, Scott (University of British Columbia)..................III-K Fri PM
ANDRE, Judith (Michigan State University).................. III-K Fri PM, GII-8 Thu PM
ANDREOU, Chrisoula (University of Utah).................... III-K Fri PM
APPLEBAUM, Marc (Saybrook Graduate School)........ GIII-13 Thu PM
ARNOLD, Dan (University of Chicago).................... I-M Thu PM
ARNOLD, Denis G. (University of Tennessee).................. I-J Thu PM, GV-8 Sat PM
AROLA, Adam (University of Oregon).................... GIV-13 Fri PM
ARPALY, Nomy (Brown University).................... IV-E Sat AM
ASQUITH, Peter D. (Michigan State University).................. GII-1 Thu PM
ATHERTON, Margaret (University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee).................. I-G Thu PM
AUDI, Robert (University of Notre Dame).................. V-L Sat PM
AUXIER, Randall E. (Southern Illinois University–Carbondale) .................................................. GIII-3 Thu PM
AVILA, Mitchell (California State University–Fullerton) ...................................................... II-H Fri AM, GIII-12 Thu PM

B
BALLARIN, Roberta (Southern Methodist University) ................................... III-G Fri PM
BANGU, Sorin (University of Toronto) .......................................................... IV-G Sat AM
BARRATT, Daniel (University of Kent) ........................................................... GIII-12 Thu PM
BARRY, Melissa (Williams College) .................................................................. I-A Thu PM
BATES, Jared G. (Hanover College) ...................................................................... V-H Sat PM
BATTERMAN, Robert (University of Western Ontario) ................................... IV-G Sat AM
BAYER, Benjamin (University of Illinois–Urbana-Champaign) .... V-H Sat PM
BAYNES, Kenneth (Syracuse University) ................................................... IV-J Sat AM
BEALL, J.C. (University of Connecticut) ...................................................... I-A Thu PM
BEDECARRÉ, Corinne (Normandale Community College) .... GIII-3 Thu PM
BEEBE, James R. (University at Buffalo) ...................................................... III-I Fri PM
BEEBEE, Helen (University of Birmingham) ........................................... I-A Thu PM
BEERE, Jonathan (University of Chicago) .............................................. I-C Thu PM
BERGER, Douglas L. (Oakton College) .................................................. GIII-6 Thu PM
BERGGREN, Edward (Wright College) ..................................................... GIV-2 Fri PM
BERGMANN, Michael (Purdue University) ........................................... V-B Sat PM
BERNIER, Paul (University of Moncton) .................................................. GV-12 Sat PM
BERTOLET, Rod (Purdue University) ..................................................... GI-1 Thu AM
BETT, Richard (Johns Hopkins University) .......................................... III-H Fri PM
BICKHAM, Stephen H. (Mansfield University) ................................... GIII-7 Thu PM
BLAIR, Tony (University of Windsor) ............................................................ GI-1 Thu AM
BLANCHETTE, Patricia (University of Notre Dame) ................................ III-F Fri PM
BLOODSWORTH-LUGO, Mary (Washington State University) .................. III-L Fri PM, GIII-2 Thu PM
BLOSSER, Philip (Lenoir Rhyne College) ................................................. GV-6 Sat PM
BOGOHSSIAN, Paul (New York University) ............................................. II-B Fri AM
BOGUES, Anthony (Brown University) ...................................................... II-L Fri AM
BOHMAN, James (St. Louis University) ...................................................... I-B Thu PM
BOISVERT, Raymond (Siena College) ...................................................... GIII-3 Thu PM
BOLER, John (University of Washington) ............................................... II-C Fri AM
BOTTENBERG, Francis (Temple University) ........................................... GIV-15 Fri PM
BOXILL, Jan (University of North Carolina–Chapel Hill) ................... GI-3 Thu AM
BRAKE, Elizabeth (University of Calgary) ................................................ GIV-4 Fri PM
BRAMER, Marilea (University of Minnesota–Twin Cities) ....................... I-J Thu PM
BRAND-BALLARD, Jeffrey C. (George Washington University) .... I-H Thu PM
BRANDON, Eric (Fresno City College) ..................................................... III-M Fri PM
BRAVER, Lee J. (Hiram College) ....................................................... Gl-12 Thu AM, GIII-8 Thu PM
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRENNAN, Tad</td>
<td>Northwestern University</td>
<td>I-C Thu PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIDGES, Jason</td>
<td>University of Chicago</td>
<td>IV-I Sat AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRISTER, Evelyn</td>
<td>Rochester Institute of Technology</td>
<td>GIV-4 Fri PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROGAARD, Berit</td>
<td>University of Missouri-St. Louis</td>
<td>III-F Fri PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROWER, Jeffrey E.</td>
<td>Purdue University</td>
<td>III-A Fri PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROWER-TOLAND, Susan</td>
<td>St. Louis University</td>
<td>II-C Fri AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROWN, Lee M.</td>
<td>Howard University</td>
<td>V-K Sat PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUCKAREFF, Andrei A.</td>
<td>Franklin and Marshall College</td>
<td>II-I Fri AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUENO, Otávio A.</td>
<td>University of South Carolina</td>
<td>III-F Fri PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUGAEVA, Ljubov</td>
<td>Saint Petersburg University/University of Salzburg</td>
<td>GI-2 Thu AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BYRD, Miriam N.</td>
<td>University of Texas at Arlington</td>
<td>V-G Sat PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caldwell, Christopher M.</td>
<td>Southwestern College</td>
<td>I-J Thu PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARD, Claudia</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin-Madison</td>
<td>III-D Fri PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARLIN, Laurence</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh</td>
<td>GIII-5 Thu PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARSON, Thomas L.</td>
<td>Loyola University Chicago</td>
<td>III-K Fri PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARTWRIGHT, David E.</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin-Whitewater</td>
<td>GIII-6 Thu PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARROLL, John W.</td>
<td>North Carolina State University</td>
<td>II-E Fri AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARROLL, Thomas</td>
<td>Boston University</td>
<td>GIV-10 Fri PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASHEN, Matthew C.</td>
<td>Washington University in St. Louis</td>
<td>III-H Fri PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASULLO, Albert</td>
<td>University of Nebraska-Lincoln</td>
<td>III-I Fri PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHALMERS, David</td>
<td>Australian National University</td>
<td>V-E Sat PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLES, David</td>
<td>Oxford University</td>
<td>IV-D Sat AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHELSTROM, Eric</td>
<td>State University of New York-Buffalo</td>
<td>GI-11 Thu AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHIAO, Vincent</td>
<td>Northwestern University</td>
<td>I-H Thu PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHIGNELL, Andrew</td>
<td>Cornell University</td>
<td>GI-13 Thu AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHOPRA, Samir</td>
<td>City University of New York-Brooklyn College</td>
<td>GI-10 Thu PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRISTIANO, Thomas,</td>
<td>University of Arizona</td>
<td>I-B Thu PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAPP, Leonard</td>
<td>Illinois Wesleyan University</td>
<td>V-F Sat PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COFFMAN, E. J.</td>
<td>University of Notre Dame</td>
<td>V-H Sat PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COGAN, John</td>
<td>Southern Illinois University-Carbondale</td>
<td>GIII-7 Thu PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COGBURN, Jon M.</td>
<td>Louisiana State University</td>
<td>IV-I Sat AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COHEN, Jonathan D.</td>
<td>University of California-San Diego</td>
<td>II-F Fri AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COHEN, Ted</td>
<td>University of Chicago</td>
<td>Presidential Address Introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLINS, Robin</td>
<td>Messiah College</td>
<td>III-B Fri PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMESAÑA, Juan</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin-Madison</td>
<td>I-I Thu PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCES, Rory J.</td>
<td>University of Nebraska-Omaha</td>
<td>V-I Sat PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONEE, Earl</td>
<td>University of Rochester</td>
<td>I-I Thu PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COOKE, Elizabeth F.</td>
<td>Creighton University</td>
<td>GIV-7 Fri PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COOPER, Lee (Colorado State University) ........................................... GIV-1 Fri PM
COPLAN, Amy (California State University–Fullerton) ........... GIII-12 Thu PM
CRARY, Alice (The New School for Social Research) ................. IV-L Sat AM
CRASNOW, Sharon (Riverside Community College, Norco Campus) ............................................................... GV-1 Sat PM
CRAVER, Carl F. (Washington University in St. Louis) ............. V-A Sat PM
CRAWFORD, Sean (Lancaster University) ................................. G1-5 Thu AM
CRESPO, Mariano (Catholic University of Chile) ........................ III-J Fri PM
CRILEY, Mark (Illinois Wesleyan University) ............................... I-F Thu PM
CRISP, Oliver (University of Bristol) ........................................... GI-7 Thu AM
CRISP, Thomas M. (Biola University) ........................................ IV-B Sat AM, GI-7 Thu AM
CRIVELLI, Paolo (Oxford University) ........................................... IV-J Sat AM
CRONCE, Philip (Chicago State University) ............................... GV-6 Sat PM
CROSBY, John (Franciscan University–Steubenville) .............. GV-6 Sat PM
CULBERTSON, Carolyn (University of Oregon) ........................ GIV-13 Thu PM
CULLISON, Andrew M. (University of Rochester) ....................... I-H Thu PM
CUNEO, Terence (Calvin College) .............................................. V-J Sat PM
CUNNING, David R. (University of Iowa) ................................. III-G Fri PM
CURRAN, Angela (Carleton College) .......................................... III-H Fri PM
CUTROFELLO, Andrew (Loyola University Chicago) ............... II-G Fri AM

D

DAHLSTROM, Daniel (Boston University) ............................... GIII-10 Thu PM
DANCY, Jonathan (University of Reading/University of Texas–Austin) ............................................................ II-D Fri AM
DARDIS, Anthony (Hofstra University) ..................................... IV-I Sat AM
DAVENPORT, John (Fordham University) ................................. V-I Sat PM
DAVID, Marian (University of Notre Dame) ............................. I-A Thu PM
DAVIS, Zachary (Keene State College) ..................................... GIII-10 Thu PM
DE ROSA, Raffaella (Rutgers University–Newark) .................... I-G Thu PM
DEA, Shannon (University of Western Ontario) ....................... IV-K Sat AM
DECYK, Betsy (California State University–Long Beach) ....... GI-I Thu AM
DEGENEURGE, Richard T. (University of Kansas) ..................... I-J Thu PM
DESHONG, Scott (English, Quinebaug Valley Community College) ............................................................. IV-N Sat AM
DESLAURIERS, Marguerite (McGill University) ........................... V-G Sat PM
DETLEFSEN, Karen (University of Pennsylvania) ..................... V-C Sat PM
DETMER, David (Purdue University–Calumet) .......................... GIII-3 Thu PM
DEUTSCHER, Penelope (Northwestern University) .................... IV-J Sat AM
DEVER, Josh (University of Texas–Austin) ............................. IV-I Sat AM
DEXTER, Scott (City University of New York–Brooklyn College) ............................................................. GII-10 Thu PM
DI BELLA, Stefano (Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa) ............... GIII-5 Thu PM
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIXON, Nicholas</td>
<td>Alma College</td>
<td>GI-3</td>
<td>AM Thu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOLE, Andrew</td>
<td>Amherst College</td>
<td>GI-7</td>
<td>AM Thu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOPPELT, Gerald</td>
<td>University of California–San Diego</td>
<td>III-J</td>
<td>PM Fri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOWELL, Janice L.</td>
<td>Bowling Green State University</td>
<td>IV-I</td>
<td>AM Sat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOYLE, Tsarina</td>
<td>University College Dublin</td>
<td>GV-9</td>
<td>Sat PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRAPER, Paul</td>
<td>Florida International University</td>
<td>V-B</td>
<td>PM Sat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRETSKE, Fred</td>
<td>Duke University/Stanford University</td>
<td>I-E</td>
<td>PM Thu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DREGE, Paula J.</td>
<td>Pennsylvania State University</td>
<td>II-F</td>
<td>AM Fri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRURY, Shadia</td>
<td>University of Regina, Canada</td>
<td>GIV-1</td>
<td>PM Fri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUCKLES, Ian M.</td>
<td>Indiana University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>II-J</td>
<td>AM, PM Fri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EARMAN, John</td>
<td>University of Pittsburgh</td>
<td>III-B</td>
<td>PM Fri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBBS, Gary</td>
<td>University of Illinois–Urbana-Champaign</td>
<td>V-F</td>
<td>Sat PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDELBERG, Walter</td>
<td>University of Illinois–Chicago</td>
<td>III-F</td>
<td>Fri PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGAN, Andrew</td>
<td>University of Michigan–Ann Arbor</td>
<td>III-F</td>
<td>Fri PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EKSTROM, Laura</td>
<td>College of William and Mary</td>
<td>V-K</td>
<td>Sat PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLIOTT, Deni</td>
<td>University of South Florida</td>
<td>GIV-2</td>
<td>Fri PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLIS, Ralph D.</td>
<td>Clark Atlanta University</td>
<td>GII-3</td>
<td>Sat PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMMANUEL, Steven M.</td>
<td>Virginia Wesleyan College</td>
<td>II-J</td>
<td>Fri AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGEL, JR., Mylan</td>
<td>Northern Illinois University</td>
<td>I-F</td>
<td>Thu PM, PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPOSITO, Gary</td>
<td>Marquette University</td>
<td>GII-5</td>
<td>Sat PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTLUND, David</td>
<td>Brown University</td>
<td>I-B</td>
<td>Thu PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVANS, C. Stephen</td>
<td>Baylor University</td>
<td>II-G</td>
<td>Fri AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVANS, Daw-Nay</td>
<td>DePaul University</td>
<td>III-H</td>
<td>Fri PM, PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FENNELL, John</td>
<td>Grinnell College</td>
<td>V-F</td>
<td>Sat PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FERRERO, Luca</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee</td>
<td>II-I</td>
<td>Fri AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILICE, Carlo</td>
<td>State University of New York–Geneseo</td>
<td>GV-4</td>
<td>Sat PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINCH, Alicia</td>
<td>Saint Louis University</td>
<td>II-I</td>
<td>Fri AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FISHER, Justin C.</td>
<td>University of Arizona</td>
<td>II-F</td>
<td>Fri AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FITELSON, Branden</td>
<td>University of California–Berkeley</td>
<td>II-A</td>
<td>Fri AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLAMM, Matthew</td>
<td>Rockford College</td>
<td>GII-13</td>
<td>Thu PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORKA, Roger</td>
<td>Ursinus College</td>
<td>I-G</td>
<td>Thu PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORY, Dan</td>
<td>Montana State University</td>
<td>II-H</td>
<td>Fri AM, PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORCE, James</td>
<td>University of Kentucky</td>
<td>V-M</td>
<td>Sat PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORMAN, David</td>
<td>University of Nevada–Las Vegas</td>
<td>II-G</td>
<td>Fri AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORST, Rainer</td>
<td>Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität</td>
<td>V-D</td>
<td>Sat PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORSTER, Malcolm</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin–Madison</td>
<td>I-K</td>
<td>Thu PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FORTIN, Sophie (Washington University in St. Louis) ............... GIV-4 Fri PM
FOX, Craig (University of Illinois–Chicago) ............................. IV-L Sat AM
FRASER, Nancy (New School for Social Research) ................. IV-J Sat AM, V-D Sat PM
FRIEDMAN, Marilyn (Washington University in St. Louis) ....... GV-1 Sat PM
FRINGS, Manfred (Depaul University (Emeritus)) ................... GV-6 Sat PM
FRIQUEGNON, Marie (William Paterson University) ............... GIV-14 Fri PM
FROME, Jonathan (University of Wisconsin–Madison) ........... GIII-12 Thu PM
FRY, Jeffrey P. (Ball State University) ..................................... GI-3 Thu AM
FURTAK, Rick (Colorado College) ........................................ GIV-10 Fri PM

G

GARFIELD, Jay L. (Smith College, University of Massachusetts, Melbourne University, Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies) .......... I-M Thu PM, GV-12 Sat PM
GARTHOFF, Jon (Northwestern University) .............................. III-K Fri PM
GAUKROGER, Stephen (University of Sydney) ........................... IV-A Sat AM
GAY, William (University of North Carolina–Charlotte) ............ GII-2 Thu PM, GV-4 Sat PM
GERSON, Lloyd (University of Toronto) ................................. I-C Thu PM
GERT, Heather J. (University of North Carolina–Greensboro) .... IV-L Sat AM
GERTLER, Brie (University of Virginia) ................................. I-K Thu PM
GIANCOLA, Donna (Suffolk University) .................................... GIII-13 Thu PM
GILSON, Greg (University of Texas–Pan American) ................. III-L Fri PM
GILLETT, Carl (Illinois Wesleyan University) ............................ II-M Fri AM, IV-F Sat AM
GLENNAN, Stuart (Butler University) ...................................... V-A Sat PM
GONZALEZ DE ALLEN, Gertrude James (Spelman College) ....... II-L Fri AM
GORDON, Lewis (Temple University) ...................................... GIII-2 Thu PM
GOSWAMI, Namita (DePaul University) .................................. GIV-8 Fri PM
GRACIA, Jorge (University at Buffalo) ................................. IV-M Sat AM
GRAHAM, Andrew (Acadia University) .................................... IV-L Sat AM
GRAHAM, Kevin (Creighton University) ................................. III-J Fri PM
GREEN, Christopher R. (University of Notre Dame) ............... I-I Thu PM
GREEN, Jeffrey H. (University of Notre Dame) ......................... III-G Fri PM
GREENE, Gordon (University of Hawaii–Manoa) ....................... V-K Sat PM
GREENWALT, Kent (Columbia University) .............................. V-L Sat PM
GREGOIRE, Stephanie (St. Jerome’s University) ....................... V-G Sat PM
GRENBERG, Jeanine M. (St. Olaf College) .............................. IV-H Sat AM
GRIMM, Stephen R. (University of Notre Dame) ....................... I-K Thu PM
GRUSH, Rick (University of California–San Diego) ................. IV-F Sat AM
GRUZALSKI, Bart (Pacific Center for Sustainable Living) ........ GII-3 Thu PM
GUPTA, Bina (University of Missouri–Columbia) ..................... GIII-13 Thu PM
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HALWANI, Raja</td>
<td>(School of the Art Institute of Chicago)</td>
<td>GII-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HANKS, Peter W.</td>
<td>(University of Minnesota–Twin Cities)</td>
<td>V-F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARE, John</td>
<td>(Yale University)</td>
<td>V-J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARPER, Sarah</td>
<td>(Boston College)</td>
<td>I-J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARTER, Thomas D.</td>
<td>(University of Tennessee)</td>
<td>II-G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HASKER, William</td>
<td>(Huntington College)</td>
<td>III-G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HASKINS, Casey</td>
<td>(State University of New York–Purchase College)</td>
<td>GIV-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HATCHER, Donald L.</td>
<td>(Baker University)</td>
<td>GII-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAUG, Matthew</td>
<td>(Cornell University)</td>
<td>I-F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAUSMAN, Daniel M.</td>
<td>(University of Wisconsin–Madison)</td>
<td>IV-G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAVAS, Randall</td>
<td>(Willamette University)</td>
<td>GII-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HELD, Jacob</td>
<td>(Marquette University)</td>
<td>III-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HELDKE, Lisa M.</td>
<td>(Gustavus Adolphus College)</td>
<td>GII-8,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GIII-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HELLIE, Benj</td>
<td>(University of Toronto)</td>
<td>II-F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HENDRICKSON, Noel E.</td>
<td>(James Madison University)</td>
<td>II-I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HETER, T. Storm</td>
<td>(East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania)</td>
<td>GIV-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HICKMAN, Larry</td>
<td>(Center for Dewey Studies, Southern Illinois</td>
<td>GIII-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University–Carbondale)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HILDEN, Amy Beth</td>
<td>(College of St. Catherine)</td>
<td>GI-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HILL, JR., Thomas E.</td>
<td>(University of North Carolina–Chapel Hill)</td>
<td>III-D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HINCHMAN, Edward S.</td>
<td>(University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee)</td>
<td>II-I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOGAN, Desmond</td>
<td>(Princeton University)</td>
<td>GI-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOLLOWAY, Travis</td>
<td>(Boston College)</td>
<td>GIV-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HONG, Chang-Seong</td>
<td>(Minnesota State University–Moorhead)</td>
<td>I-M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HORGAN, Terence</td>
<td>(University of Arizona)</td>
<td>III-C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUBNER, Karolina</td>
<td>(University of Chicago)</td>
<td>IV-K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUENEMAN, Charles</td>
<td>(Utah State University)</td>
<td>IV-K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUGGETT, Nick</td>
<td>(University of Illinois–Chicago)</td>
<td>III-G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUTTO, Daniel</td>
<td>(University of Hertfordshire)</td>
<td>GV-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INGRAM, David B.</td>
<td>(Loyola University Chicago)</td>
<td>IV-J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRWIN, William</td>
<td>(King’s College)</td>
<td>GIII-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JACKMAN, Henry</td>
<td>(York University)</td>
<td>II-F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JACOBSON, John</td>
<td>(University of California–San Diego)</td>
<td>II-F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAKUBOWSKI, Dawn</td>
<td>(University of Central Arkansas)</td>
<td>GI-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
JAMES, Christine A. (Valdosta State University) ...................... IV-N Sat AM
JAUERNIG, Anja (University of Notre Dame) ....................... GI-13 Thu AM
JAWORSKI, William (Fordham University) .................. I-K Thu PM
JENKINS, Mark P. (Johns Hopkins University) ........... III-K Fri PM
JENKINS, Phil (Pennsylvania State University) .......... GV-2 Sat PM
JENSEN, Mark N. (University of Notre Dame) ......... V-I Sat PM
JESKE, Diane (University of Iowa) ............................. I-J Thu AM
JOHNSON, Ralph (University of Windsor) ..................... GI-1 Thu AM
JOLLEY, Kelly Dean (Auburn University) ................. IV-L Sat PM
JONES III, Joe Frank (Barton College) .................. GI-10 Thu AM
JOYCE, James (University of Michigan) .................. II-A Fri AM
JUHL, Cory F. (University of Texas–Austin) ............. V-H Sat PM

K
KAPLAN, David M. (University of North Texas) ............. II-K Fri AM
KATSAFANAS, Paul (Harvard University) ..................... GII-11 Thu PM
KAUFMAN, Gordon D. (Harvard Divinity School) ....... GIII-7 Thu PM
KELLNER, Douglas (University of California–Los Angeles) GIV-2 Fri PM
KELLY, Eugene (New York Institute of Technology) ....... GIII-10 Thu PM
KENNEDY, Chris (University of Chicago) ................. V-F Sat PM
KESTENBAUM, Victor (Boston University) ...................... GII-13 Thu PM
KING, Jaegwon (Brown University) .......................... II-M Fri AM
KIRKLAND, Frank (Hunter College) ...................... II-L Fri AM, III-L Fri PM
KIRKLIN, Jackson T. (University of Chicago) .......... GIV-15 Fri PM
KISNER, Matthew J. (University of South Carolina) ......................................................................... I-G Thu PM, IV-K Sat AM
KITCHER, Patricia (Columbia University) ....................... GII-4 Thu PM
KLAGGE, James C. (Virginia Tech) ............................. IV-L Sat AM
KMENT, Boris (University of Michigan–Ann Arbor) .... V-F Sat PM
KNAPPE, Ulrich (University of Copenhagen) ............... GIV-10 Fri PM
KNELLER, Jane (Colorado State University) ................. IV-H Sat AM
KOLERS, Avery (University of Louisville) ...................... III-D Fri PM
KOOLAGE, John (University of Wisconsin–Madison) .... IV-G Sat AM
KOONS, Robert (University of Texas–Austin) ............... I-D Thu PM
KOUKAL, David (University of Detroit Mercy) .......... GV-4 Sat PM
KOVACH, Adam A. (Marymount University) ............... I-H Thu PM
KOWALSKI, Dean A. (University of Wisconsin–Waukesha) II-J Fri AM
KREINES, James (Yale University) ............................. IV-H Sat AM
KREMER, Michael (University of Chicago) .................. III-F Fri PM
KRUSE, Felicia (Xavier University) .............................. GI-8 Thu AM
KUNKEL, Joseph C. (University of Dayton)................................. GII-14 Thu PM
KUSINA, Jeanne Marie (Bowling Green State University)...... GIII-8 Thu PM

L
LACKEY, Jennifer (Northern Illinois University)................. I-I Thu PM
LADEN, Anthony S. (University of Illinois–Chicago).......... IV-J Sat AM
LAFONT, Cristina (Northwestern University)............................ I-B Thu PM
LANDINI, Gregory (University of Iowa).............................. III-F Fri PM
LANGO, John W. (Hunter College)......................................... GII-14 Thu PM
LASUSA, Danielle (Temple University)............................... GI-11 Thu AM
LAVIN, Douglas (Harvard University)......................... IV-E Sat AM
LAWSON, Bill E. (University of Memphis)............................. I-L Thu PM
LEAR, Gabriel Richardson (University of Chicago).............. V-G Sat PM
LEBUFFE, Michael (Texas A&M University)........................... IV-K Sat AM
LEE, Nan-Nan (St. Xavier University at Chicago)......... GII-12 Thu PM
LEE, Sukjae (Ohio State University).............................. V-C Sat PM
LEIJTE, Adam J. (Indiana University–Bloomington)............. III-I Fri PM
LEMOS, Noah (College of William and Mary).................. III-I Fri PM
LENZI, Mary (University of Wisconsin–Platteville)............ GV-4 Sat PM
LEWIS, Stephanie (Municipal Capital Management, LLC)...... IV-I Sat AM
LITTLE, Margaret (Georgetown University)................... II-D Fri AM
LOLORDO, Antonia (University of Virginia).................... I-G Thu PM
LOOK, Brandon (University of Kentucky).......................... GII-5 Thu PM
LOTZ, Christian (Michigan State University)..................... II-K Fri AM
LUCAS, George (United States Naval Academy)............... GII-14 Thu PM
LUGO-LUGO, Carmen R. (Washington State University)....... GII-2 Thu PM

M
MACAVOY, Leslie (East Tennessee State University)........... II-K Fri AM
MACDONALD, Chris (Saint Mary’s University).................. GV-8 Sat PM
MACOMBER, Michael (New School for Social Research)...... GI-11 Thu AM
MACHAMER, Peter (University of Pittsburgh (HPS))......... V-A Sat PM
MAGNELL, Thomas (Drew University)............................. GI-9 Thu AM
MAITZEN, Stephen (Acadia University)............................ III-I Fri PM
MALM, Heidi (Loyola University Chicago)........................... III-K Fri PM
MALLOY, Daniel P. (Appalachian State University)..... II-K Fri AM
MANIS, R. Zachary (Baylor University)............................. II-J Fri AM
MANN, Anika M. (Morgan State University).................... GIII-2 Thu PM
MANNINEN, Tuomas (University of Iowa)............................ GIV-15 Fri PM
MANNING, Richard N. (Georgetown University)............... GII-5 Thu PM
MANSON, Neil A. (University of Mississippi).................... III-B Fri PM
MARCHBANKS, Paul R. (English, University of North Carolina–Chapel Hill)........................................ IV-N Sat AM
MARINA, Jacqueline (Purdue University) ........................................ II-H Fri AM
MARCHALL, Eugene J. (University of Wisconsin–Madison) ........ IV-K Sat AM
MARTIN, Clancy (University of Missouri–Kansas City) ................. III-H Fri PM
MARTIN, Christopher (Purdue University) ................................ IV-K Sat AM
MARTINICH, Al (University of Texas–Austin) ............................... V-M Sat PM
MATHENY, Gaverick (Dept. of Agriculture and Resource Economics, University of Maryland) .................. GII-3 Thu PM
MCBRIDE, Lee (Georgia Institute of Technology) ........................ GII-8 Thu PM
MCCANN, Hugh J. (Texas A&M University) ................................. II-J Fri AM
MCCARTHY, Thomas (Northwestern University) .......................... II-K Fri AM
MCEVOY, Adrianne (Mansfield University) .................................. GI-1 Thu AM
MCGREW, Timothy (Western Michigan University) ....................... III-B Fri PM
MCKAUGHAN, Daniel (University of Notre Dame) ....................... II-A Fri AM
MCKEEVER, Sean D. (Davidson College) ..................................... II-D Fri AM
MEDINA, José (Vanderbilt University) .......................................... V-D Sat PM
MEIBOM, Heidi Lene (Carleton University) ................................ I-H Thu PM
MELE, Alfred R. (Florida State University) ..................................... I-E Thu PM
MELNYK, Andrew (University of Missouri–Columbia) .............. I-F Thu PM
MENARY, Richard (University of Hertfordshire) ......................... GV-3 Sat PM
MENN, Stephen (McGill University) ............................................. I-C Thu PM
MENSCH, Jennifer A. (Villanova University) ................................. IV-H Sat AM
MERRICKS, Trenton (University of Virginia) ............................... I-A Thu PM
MEYER, Matthew (Boston University) .......................................... GV-9 Sat PM
MEYER, Ulrich (Colgate University) ............................................ GIV-11 Fri PM
MEYERS, Diana Tietjens (University of Connecticut) ................... GV-1 Sat PM
MILKOV, Nikolay (Universität Bielefeld) ................................... GI-5 Thu AM
MILLÁN-ZAIBERT, Elizabeth (DePaul University) ....................... III-L Fri PM
MILLER, Christian (Wake Forest University) .............................. V-J Sat PM
MILLER, Jr., Fred D. (Bowling Green State University) ............... IV-D Sat AM
MILLS, Charles (University of Illinois–Chicago) ....................... II-L Fri AM
MINEAU, André (University of Quebec–Rimouski) ..................... GII-11 Thu PM, GIV-12 Fri PM
MIRZA, Omar (St. Cloud State University) ................................. IV-M Sat AM
MITTAG, Daniel M. (University of Rochester) .............................. III-I Fri PM
MODRÁK, Deborah (University of Rochester) .............................. IV-D Sat AM
MOHANTY, J. N. (Temple University) .......................................... GII-13 Thu PM
MONAHAN, Michael (Marquette University) ............................. GII-2 Thu PM
MONTERO, Barbara G. (City University of New York) ............... I-F Thu PM
MONTON, Bradley (University of Kentucky) ............................... IV-G Sat AM
MORAN, Dermot (University College Dublin) ............................. II-K Fri AM
MORAN, Richard (Harvard University) ........................................ IV-C Sat AM
MORGAN, Michael (Indiana University–Bloomington) ............... GI-3 Thu AM
MOZERSKY, M. Joshua (Queen’s University (Ontario)) .......... GIV-11 Fri PM
MOZUR, Gerald (Lewis and Clark Community College) .......... III-M Fri PM
MUMFORD, Stephen (University of Nottingham) ....II-E Fri AM, GI-5 Thu AM
MURPHY, Colleen (Texas A&M University) .........................III-J Fri PM
MYERS, Charles R. (Okaloosa-Walton College) ................... III-M Fri PM
MYERS, William T. (Birmingham Southern University) .................. GlI-10 Thu AM, GIV-7 Fri PM

N
NAILS, Debra (Michigan State University) ......................... GII-5 Thu PM
NANCE, Richard (Independent Scholar) .......................... GIII-6 Thu PM
NATHANSON, Stephen L. (Northeastern University) ................. V-I Sat PM
NELSON, Eric S. (University of Massachusetts–Lowell) .... GIV-5 Fri PM
NETO, Jose Maia (Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais) ....... V-M Sat PM
NEWLANDS, Samuel (Yale University) ............................... IV-K Sat AM
NEWTON, Natika (Nassau Community College) ..................... GV-3 Sat PM
NICHOLS, Craig M. (University of Rhode Island) .................. GI-6 Thu AM
NOBIS, Nathan (University of Alabama–Birmingham) .......... V-J Sat PM
NOË, Alva (University of California–Berkeley) .................. IV-B Sat AM
NORCROSS, Alastair (Rice University) .................. III-D Fri PM, GII-3 Thu PM
NORMORE, Calvin (University of California–Los Angeles) ........ III-A Fri PM
NORTON, Bryan (Georgia Institute of Technology) ............ GIII-4 Thu PM
NUCCETELLI, Susana (University of Texas–Pan American) .......... III-L Fri PM, IV-M Sat AM
NULTY, Timothy J. (University of Massachusetts–Dartmouth) .................. GlI-12 Thu AM
NUSSBAUM, Martha (University of Chicago) ...................... V-G Sat PM

O
O’CONNELL, Daniel (Institute for Cusanus Research, Trier University) ................................. GIII-3 Thu PM
O’CONNOR, David K. (University of Notre Dame) ................. III-H Fri PM
O’CONNOR, Timothy (Indiana University–Bloomington) .......... II-E Fri AM
O’HARA, David (Augustana College) ................................. GI-8 Thu AM
O’NEILL, Eileen (University of Massachusetts) .................. V-C Sat PM
O’SULLIVAN, Brendan (Rhodes College) ....................... V-F Sat PM
OAKLANDER, L. Nathan (University of Michigan–Flint) ....... GIV-11 Fri PM
OH, Onyoung (Medgar Evers College/City University of New York–Graduate Center) ................... IV-M Sat AM
OKRENT, Mark (Bates College) ........................................ GlI-12 Thu AM
OLECHNOWICZ, Joseph Quinn (Florida State University) .......I-H Thu PM
OLSON, Alan M. (Boston University) ................................. GIV-1 Fri PM
ONGLLEY, John (Edinboro University) ............................... GlIII-14 Thu PM
OSLER, Margaret (University of Calgary) ......................................... V-M Sat PM
OPPY, Graham (Monash University) ............................................. I-D Thu PM

P
PALMER, Daniel E. (Kent State University–Trumbull) ..................... III-M Fri PM, GV-8 Sat PM
PANACCIO, Claude (University of Quebec–Montreal) ................... II-C Fri AM
PANAGOPoulos, Anastasia (University of Minnesota) ................. V-J Sat PM
PARKER, Kelley A. (Grand Valley State University)............... III-I-4 Thu PM
PARSONS, Josh (University of Otago) ........................................ IV-B Sat AM
PARSONS, Terence (University of California–Los Angeles) .... III-C Fri PM
PASNAU, Robert (University of Colorado–Boulder) ................... III-A Fri PM
PAUL, L. A. (University of Arizona) ............................................. IV-B Sat AM
PAYNE, Andrew (St. Joseph’s University) ............................... V-J Sat PM, GIV-3 Fri PM
PEACH, Lucinda Joy (American University) ................................ V-L Sat PM
PELLAUER, David (DePaul University) ........................... GI-6 Thu AM, GIV-1 Fri PM
PENNER, Myron A. (Trinity Western University) ....................... II-K Fri AM
PERPICH, Diane (Vanderbilt University) .................................... IV-J Sat AM
PERRY, Michael (Emory University) ....................................... V-L Sat PM
PICCININI, Gualtiero (University of Missouri–St. Louis) .......... II-F Fri AM
PIERSON, Eric (University of San Diego) .................................. GIV-2 Fri PM
PINCOCK, Christopher (Purdue University) ........................ III-F Fri PM, GIII-14 Thu PM
PIPPIN, Robert B. (University of Chicago) .............................. IV-E Sat AM
PITTS, J. Brian (University of Notre Dame) ............................... III-G Fri PM
PLANTINGA, Alvin (University of Notre Dame) .............. I-N Thu PM
PLATZ, Jeppe (University of Tennessee) .................................. IV-H Sat AM
PLUG, Allen (Malone College) ............................................... I-I Thu PM
POJMAN, Paul (Towson University) .................................. GIII-14 Thu PM
POLGER, Thomas W. (University of Cincinnati) .................... II-M Fri AM
POSTON, Ted L. (University of Missouri) .............................. I-I Thu PM
POTTER, Nelson (University of Nebraska–Lincoln) .............. IV-H Sat AM
PRATT, Henry J. (Bucknell University) ................................... II-H Fri AM
PRESBEY, Gail M. (University of Detroit Mercy) ...................... GV-4 Sat PM
PRESTING, Kenneth A. (University of North Carolina–Chapel Hill) ...... I-F Thu PM
PRESTON, Aaron (Malone College) ........................... GIII-14 Thu PM
PREUS, Anthony (Binghamton University) ................................ GIV-3 Fri PM
PRICE, Terry L. (University of Richmond) ............................. I-J Thu PM
PRIEST, Graham (University of Melbourne) ........................... III-C Fri PM
PROOPS, Ian (University of Michigan–Ann Arbor) ................ IV-I Sat AM, GI-13 Thu AM
PRUSS, Alexander R. (Georgetown University) ..................... I-D Thu PM
PRYOR, Benjamin S. (University of Toledo) ........................... GIII-8 Thu PM
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSILLOS, Stathis</td>
<td>University of Athens</td>
<td>V-A Sat PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RADZIK, Linda</td>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University</td>
<td>I-J Thu PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RASHEED, Shaireen</td>
<td>Long Island University</td>
<td>GIV-8 Fri PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REA, Michael</td>
<td>University of Notre Dame</td>
<td>IV-B Sat AM, GI-7 Thu AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REED, Baron</td>
<td>Northern Illinois University</td>
<td>III-I Fri PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REHG, William</td>
<td>St. Louis University</td>
<td>IV-J Sat AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESCORLA, Michael A.</td>
<td>(University of California–Santa Barbara)</td>
<td>V-F Sat PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICH, Benjamin</td>
<td>University of California–Davis</td>
<td>V-K Sat PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARDSON, Robert</td>
<td>University of Cincinnati</td>
<td>V-A Sat PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARDSON, Robert</td>
<td>University of Cincinnati</td>
<td>V-A Sat PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHEY, Lance Byron</td>
<td>(Cardinal Stritch University)</td>
<td>GIII-6 Thu PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIDGE, Michael</td>
<td>University of Edinburgh</td>
<td>II-D Fri AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIPSTEIN, Arthur</td>
<td>University of Toronto</td>
<td>GII-4 Thu PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIVES, Brad</td>
<td>Union College</td>
<td>II-F Fri AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERTS, John T.</td>
<td>University of North Carolina–Chapel Hill</td>
<td>IV-G Sat AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERTS, Rodney C.</td>
<td>East Carolina University</td>
<td>I-H Thu PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCKNAK, Stefanie</td>
<td>Hartwick College</td>
<td>GIII-14 Thu PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROGERS, Katherin A.</td>
<td>University of Delaware</td>
<td>II-J Fri AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROGERSON, Kenneth F.</td>
<td>(Florida International University)</td>
<td>II-H Fri AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROHATYN, Dennis</td>
<td>University of San Diego</td>
<td>GIV-2 Fri PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROLAND, Jeffrey</td>
<td>Louisiana State University</td>
<td>IV-G Sat AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROOT, Michael D.</td>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
<td>IV-M Sat AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSEN, Gideon</td>
<td>Princeton University</td>
<td>II-B Fri AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSENBAUM, Stuart</td>
<td>Baylor University</td>
<td>GII-13 Thu PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSENKOETTER, Timothy J.</td>
<td>(Dartmouth College)</td>
<td>II-G Fri AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSS, Glenn</td>
<td>Franklin &amp; Marshall College</td>
<td>I-I Thu PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROTH, Abraham</td>
<td>University of Illinois–Chicago</td>
<td>II-I Fri AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROUTH, Sherrilyn</td>
<td>Rice University</td>
<td>II-B Fri AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROWE, William</td>
<td>Purdue University</td>
<td>I-D Thu PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROWLANDS, Mark</td>
<td>University of Hertfordshire</td>
<td>III-E Fri PM, GV-3 Sat PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROXBOROUGH, Craig</td>
<td>York University</td>
<td>GIV-15 Fri PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUPERT, Robert</td>
<td>University of Colorado–Boulder</td>
<td>IV-F Sat AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SABATÉS, Marcelo H.</td>
<td>Kansas State University</td>
<td>II-M Fri AM, V-H Sat PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACHS, Benjamin A.</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin–Madison</td>
<td>II-G Fri AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAKA, Paul</td>
<td>University of Houston</td>
<td>V-F Sat PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALERNO, Joe R.</td>
<td>St. Louis University</td>
<td>IV-I Sat AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAMAR, Vince</td>
<td>Loyola University of Chicago/Illinois Institute of Technology</td>
<td>GII-2 Thu PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANDLER, Ronald L.</td>
<td>Northeastern University</td>
<td>I-H Thu PM, GI-6 Thu PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SARTORIO, Carolina</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin–Madison</td>
<td>III-G Fri PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SASSOWER, Raphael (University of Colorado–Colorado Springs)........................................................................GV-2 Sat PM
SCURO, Jennifer (St. John’s University)...........................................................................................................GIII-11 Thu PM
SCHACHT, Richard (University of Illinois–Urbana-Champaign)................................................................GV-9 Sat PM
SCHAFFER, Jonathan M. (University of Massachusetts–Amherst)..............................................................II-E Fri AM
SCHICKEL, Joel A. (Hampton-Sydney College)........................................I-G Thu PM
SCHMALTZ, Tad M. (Duke University) ......................................................................................................V-C Sat PM
SCHMIDT, Claudia (Marquette University).....................................................................................................GII-7 Thu PM
SCHMITT, Frederick F. (Indiana University–Bloomington).................................................................V-H Sat PM
SCHMIDT, Claudia (Marquette University).....................................................................................................GII-7 Thu PM
SCHNITZLER, Tad M. (Duke University) ......................................................................................................V-C Sat PM
SCHWARTZ, Robert (University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee).................................................................II-F Fri AM
SCHWEICKART, David (Loyola University Chicago)....................................................................................GIII-1 Thu PM
SEAY, Gary (City University of New York).....................................................................................................IV-M Sat AM
SEDGWICK, Sally (University of Illinois–Chicago)........................................................................................II-G Fri AM
SEELEY, William P. (Franklin and Marshall College)..................................................................................II-H Fri AM
SEYMOUR, Melissa (Indiana University–Bloomington)..............................................................................II-G Fri AM
SCHNEIDER, Russ (University of Wisconsin–Madison).............................................................................II-D Fri AM
SCHAPIRO, Devora (University of Michigan–Ann Arbor)........................................................................GIV-4 Fri PM
SCHAPIRO, Larry (University of Wisconsin–Madison)................................................................................II-M Fri AM, III-E Fri PM
SCHAPIRO, Lisa (Simon Fraser University)...............................................................................................I-G Thu PM
SHAPSHAY, Sandra L. (Indiana University/Indiana University Center for Bioethics)...............................V-K Sat PM
SHARPE, Kevin (Purdue University)..............................................................................................................V-G Sat PM
SHELBY, Tommie (Harvard University).......................................................................................................I-L Thu PM
SHERBY, David (Northern Arizona University)...........................................................................................GII-1 Thu PM
SHEW, Melissa M. (University of Oregon)....................................................................................................GIV-13 Fri PM
SHIELDS, Ryan (Oxford University)..............................................................................................................III-A Fri PM
SHEFFER, Steven (Cornell University)..........................................................................................................V-L Sat PM
SHRADER, Warren E. (Indiana University–South Bend)..............................................................................I-K Thu PM
SIDERITS, Mark (Illinois State University)..................................................................................................I-M Thu PM
SILCOX, Mark (University of Central Oklahoma)......................................................................................IV-I Sat AM
SILINS, Nicholas L. (New York University)..................................................................................................V-H Sat PM
SIM, May (College of the Holy Cross)........................................................................................................... GIV-5 Fri PM
SINGPURWALLA, Rachel (Southern Illinois University–Edwardsville)..................................................GIV-3 Fri PM
SISTARE, Christine (Muhlenberg College).................................................................................................GII-6 Thu PM
Main and Group Meeting Participants

SKIPPER, Robert (University of Cincinnati) ................................... I-F Thu PM
SKOW, Bradford (University of Massachusetts–Amherst) .............. III-G Fri PM
SKULTETY, Steven (Northwestern University) ............................... GIV-3 Fri PM
SMITH, Robin (Texas A&M University) ....................................... IV-D Sat AM
SMITH, Tony (Iowa State University) .......................................... III-1 Thu PM
SNAPPER, John (Illinois Institute of Technology) ....................... GII-10 Thu PM
SNOW, Nancy E. (Marquette University) ..................................... GIII-2 Thu PM
SOAMES, Scott (University of Southern California) ....................... V-E Sat PM
SOBER, Elliott (University of Wisconsin) ..................................... III-E Fri PM
SOLON, Tom (Danville Area Community College) ....................... GII-1 Thu PM
SOMMERS, Tamler (University of Minnesota–Morris) .................... II-I Fri AM
SOSA, David (University of Texas at Austin) ............................... V-E Sat PM
SOUFFRANT, Eddy (University of North Carolina–Charlotte) ....... II-L Fri AM
SPADER, Peter H. (Marywood University) ................................... GV-6 Sat PM
SPEAK, Daniel (Azusa Pacific University) .................................... III-G Fri PM
SPEAR, Andrew D. (University at Buffalo) ................................... III-I Fri PM
SPIRO, Howard (Yale University) .............................................. V-K Sat PM
STALNAKER, Robert (Massachusetts Institute of Technology) .... V-E Sat PM
STAMPE, Dennis (University of Wisconsin) ................................ I-E Thu PM
STEINBERG, Diane (Cleveland State University) ......................... IV-K Sat AM
STERBA, James P. (University of Notre Dame) ............................. V-I Sat PM
STEWART, Roderick M. (Austin College) ................................... GIII-11 Thu PM
STIKKERS, Kenneth (Southern Illinois University–Carbondale) ............ GIII-10 Thu PM
STOCKER, Michael (Syracuse University) ................................ IV-E Sat AM
STONE, Jerome (William Rainey Harper College/Meadville Theological School) ... GIII-7 Thu PM
STRAYER, Jeffrey (Indiana University/Purdue University–Fort Wayne) ....... GV-2 Sat PM
STREVENS, Michael (New York University) ................................ II-A Fri AM
STUBBLEFIELD, Anna (Rutgers University) ............................... I-L Thu PM
STUMP, Eleonore (Saint Louis University) ................................. Presidential Address Fri PM
STURDEVANT, Molly (DePaul University) .................................. II-H Fri AM
SUPerson, Anita (University of Kentucky) .................................. GI-9 Thu AM
SUSSMAN, David (University of Illinois–Urbana-Champaign) ...... II-G Fri AM
SWAIN, Corliss (St. Olaf College) ............................................. GII-7 Thu PM
SWINBURN, Richard (Oxford University) .................................... V-B Sat PM
SWINDLER, James K. (Illinois State University) ........................... II-H Fri AM

TABER, John (University of New Mexico) ................................... I-M Thu PM
TALISSE, Robert (Vanderbilt University) ...................................... IV-J Sat AM
TAMMELLEO, Steve (Lake Forest College) ................................. IV-M Sat AM
TANKSLEY, Charlie (University of Virginia) ....................................III-H Fri PM
TASCHEK, William W. (Ohio State University) ......................... V-F Sat PM
TAYLOR, Dianna (John Carroll University) ......................... GI-6 Thu AM
TAYLOR, James S. (Louisiana State University) ....................GV-8 Sat PM
TAYLOR, James Stacey (St. Norbert College) .......................GI-9 Thu AM
TAYLOR, Paul C. (Temple University) .......................... I-L Thu PM, IV-M Sat AM
TEDESCO, Matthew A. (Beloit College) .......................... III-K Fri PM
THALOS, Mariam (University of Utah) .......................... III-K Fri PM
THIRUVATHUKAL, George (Loyola University Chicago) ......... GII-10 Thu PM
THOMPSON, Michael (University of Pittsburgh) ...................IV-C Sat AM
THOMPSON, Paul B. (Michigan State University) ..................GIIV-4 Thu PM
THUROW, Joshua (University of Wisconsin–Madison) .......... IV-G Sat AM
TIERNEY, Richard J. (University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee) ....V-G Sat PM
TIETJEN, Mark (Baylor University) .......................... GIV-10 Fri PM
TOLHURST, William (Northern Illinois University) .......... II-H Fri AM
TONER, Patrick (University of Virginia) .......................... III-G Fri PM
TONG, Rosemarie (University of North Carolina–Charlotte) ....III-L Fri PM
TRAIGER, Saul (Occidental College) .......................... GII-7 Thu PM
TRIPPLET, Timm (University of New Hampshire) ............. I-I Thu PM
TROUT, J. D. (Loyola University Chicago) ....................... I-K Thu PM
TUCKER, Chris (Purdue University) .......................... II-I Fri AM
TUNG, Toy (Padmasambhava Buddhist Center/Columbia University) .................GIV-14 Fri PM
TUOZZO, Thomas M. (University of Kansas) ...................... V-G Sat PM

V
VALLS, Andrew (Oregon State University) ......................... GII-14 Thu PM
VAN DER LINDEN, Harry (Butler University) ....................... GII-14 Thu PM
VAN DYKE, Christina (Calvin College) .......................... II-J Fri AM
VELLEMAN, J. David (University of Michigan) ................... IV-C Sat AM
VESSEY, David T. (University of Chicago) ....................... II-K Fri AM
VILHAUER, Ben (William Paterson University) ................... GIV-14 Fri PM
VINER, Steven E. (Washington University in St. Louis) ........ V-I Sat PM
VISION, Gerald (Temple University) .......................... III-F Fri PM
VOGLER, Candace (University of Chicago) ....................... IV-C Sat AM
VOLANDES, Angelo (Harvard University, Center for Bioethics,
Brigham and Women’s Hospital) .......................................V-K Sat PM
VRAZNAS, Peter B.M. (Iowa State University) ...................... V-J Sat PM

W
WAHMAN, Jessica (Dickinson College) .......................... GII-13 Thu PM
WARD, Barry M. (University of Arkansas) ........................ I-F Thu PM
WARREN, Paul (Florida International University) .............. GIII-1 Thu PM
WATSON, Charles (Earlham College) ........................................ GIII-9 Thu PM
WEINBERG, Jonathan (Indiana University–Bloomington) .......... V-H Sat PM
WEISS, Steven (Augusta State University) ............................ GIII-8 Thu PM
WEITHMAN, Paul (University of Notre Dame) ...................... III-J Fri PM
WELCHMAN, Jennifer (University of Alberta) ....................... GIII-4 Thu PM
WEST, Henry R. (Macalester College) ................................. GII-3 Thu PM
WESTLUND, Andrea (University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee) ...... I-H Thu PM
WESTPHAL, Kenneth R. (University of East Anglia) .............. IV-H Sat AM
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ABSTRACTS OF COLLOQUIUM PAPERS

MORGAN’S CANON REVISITED (I-K)
SEAN J. ALLEN-HERMANSON (FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY)
The famous ethological maxim known as “Morgan’s Canon” continues to be an object of interpretive controversy. I consider two reinterpretations of Morgan’s canon as offered by Dennett and Sober in light of two questions: First, what did Morgan intend? Second, is the re-interpretation useful within cognitive ethology? The short answers are, first, these do not capture Morgan’s intentions, and second, they do not offer anything useful to cognitive ethology. Whereas the Dennett-inspired principle implicitly leads us towards eliminativism, Sober’s canon implicitly leads to behaviorism.

EMPIRICISM AS STANCE AND EMPIRICISM NATURALIZED (IV-G)
MARC A. ALSPECTOR-KELLY (WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY)
Bas van Fraassen has recently argued that if empiricism is construed as a doctrine—so that to be an empiricist is to believe that doctrine—it will be self-refuting. He offers instead empiricism-as-stance: to be an empiricist is to embrace a constellation of attitudes, which are not to be reduced to the endorsement of any particular doctrine. I argue that the dilemma he has identified applies to empiricism-as-stance as much as it does to doctrinal empiricism. But I also argue that the dilemma is not as devastating against doctrinal empiricism as he thinks. The lesson to learn from it is that empiricism must itself be an empirical doctrine, that is, that empiricism must be naturalized. I then briefly sketch what a naturalized empiricism would look like.

WHAT DO SPLIT-BRAIN CASES SHOW ABOUT THE UNITY OF CONSCIOUSNESS? (I-K)
TORIN ALTER (UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA)
What do split-brain cases show about the unity of consciousness? Do they show only that access unity (the joint accessibility of states of consciousness) can break down? Or do they also show that phenomenal unity (the joint experience of states of consciousness) can break down? Tye (2004) argues for the latter view and criticizes Bayne and Chalmers’ (2003) defense of the former. I raise two objections to Tye’s reasoning. First, an analogy to blindsight on which he relies is questionable. Second, even if the analogy works, this shows only that a single person can simultaneously have two separate sets of phenomenally conscious mental states. It does not follow that phenomenal unity can break down—at least not in any sense that would trouble those sympathetic to the idea that phenomenal consciousness is necessarily unified. Showing why there is no such implication may help to clarify this intriguing idea.
FACETS OF HONESTY (III-K)

JUDITH ANDRE (MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY)

What, if anything, unifies the various facets of honesty, so often defined negatively as the avoidance of lying, cheating, and stealing? How does avoiding self-deception fit into this moral picture? Answering these questions demands seeing honesty as a virtue, not just as the avoidance of vice. Seeing it as a virtue requires naming the particular goods that it protects, the conditions for success in achieving them, and noticing the space between avoiding vice and being virtuous—in this case, the possibility of avoiding clear dishonesty while failing to live an admirably honest life. This perspective explains why some have (mistakenly) argued that intellectual honesty is not a moral virtue, honors but challenges James Wallace’s useful explication of honesty as an exploitation of trust, and illuminates the role of being honest with oneself in being honest with others.

SENSE AND SENSIBILITIES (III-K)

MARIAM THALOS (UNIVERSITY OF UTAH)
CHRISOULA ANDREOU (UNIVERSITY OF UTAH)

We argue that having and acting on good impulses is an essential component of practical wisdom. If our reasoning is correct, then both of the following views are unacceptable: the Kantian view that practical reason is not expressed if one is ‘impelled into action’ because acting well (and not simply from luck, but from practical wisdom) involves acting from self-given laws of action; and the Humean view that one’s impulses—assuming they do not spring from reasoning—are not subject to rational evaluation at all (though they may be put aside if they conflict with one’s considered desires).

THE ETHICAL OBLIGATIONS OF CORPORATIONS CONCERNING GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE (I-J)

DENIS G. ARNOLD (UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE)

There is a consensus in the global scientific community that global climate change (GCC) is occurring and that it will have a dramatic and adverse impact on ecosystems, nonhuman species populations, and human populations. The philosophical literature on the ethics of GCC is surprisingly underdeveloped, and in that literature the primary subjects of ethical analysis are states, and the primary ethical issues are the fair distributions of burdens among states in reducing emissions. However, what ethical obligations, if any, the corporations that produce these emissions have concerning GCC remain unaddressed. The organization of this essay is as follows. First, the influential position that holds that free markets and responsive democracies relieve corporations of any special obligations to protect the environment is explained. Next, five objections to this “free market ‘solution’” to GCC are developed. Finally, the ethical obligations of business with regard to global climate change are identified.
OMISSIONS: RESPONSIBILITY AND CAUSATION (III-G)  
ROBERTA BALLARIN (SOUTHERN METHODIST UNIVERSITY)  
I present a counterexample to Sartorio’s *New Asymmetry* according to which one can cause by action, but not by omission, an outcome that would have occurred anyway in the absence of the action/omission. Based on the principle that causation transmits responsibility, Sartorio claims that one cannot be responsible by omission for an outcome that would have occurred also in the absence of the omission.  
On the contrary, I argue that exactly because one can be responsible by omission of an outcome that would have happened even in the absence of the omission, it follows that one can cause by omission an outcome that would have happened in the absence of the omission even in simple cases where only one threat is present. Since causation by omission is to be analyzed in terms of responsibility for the outcome, it does not have a counterfactual component requiring that the outcome be preventable.

UNDERDETERMINATION AND THE ARGUMENT FROM INDIRECT CONFIRMATION (IV-G)  
SORIN BANGU (UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO)  
Underdetermination of theory by evidence is one of the most intriguing problems facing epistemology and realism today. In this paper I criticize one of the most convincing attempts to resist the underdetermination thesis, Laudan’s argument from indirect confirmation. Laudan’s main point is to reject a tacit assumption of the underdetermination theorist, namely that theories can be confirmed only by empirical evidence that follows from them. He shows that once we accept that theories can also be confirmed indirectly, by evidence *not* entailed by them, the skeptical conclusion does not follow. I agree that Laudan is right to reject this assumption, but I argue that his explanation as how the rejection of this assumption blocks the skeptical conclusion is flawed. I conclude that the argument from indirect confirmation is not effective against the underdetermination thesis.

KORNBLITH ON THE VALUE OF KNOWLEDGE (V-H)  
JARED G. BATES (HANOVER COLLEGE)  
First, I examine Hilary Kornblith’s (2002) account of the normative source of knowledge, an account on which true belief has universal, pragmatic value. Then, I argue for the following two theses: (1) The account only explains the value of true belief in cost-benefit analysis; so the account does not secure the universal value of true belief. (2) Kornblith is mistaken that a cognitive system that uses true beliefs in its cost-benefit analyses will do better at satisfying its interests than a system that does not use true beliefs; so the account does not secure the pragmatic value of true belief, either.
NEGLECTING INDETERMINACY AND BEHAVIORISM: KIM’S CRITIQUE OF QUINE’S NATURALIZED EPISTEMOLOGY (V-H)

BENJAMIN BAYER (UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS–URBANA-CHAMPAIGN)

Jaegwon Kim’s influential argument against Quine’s naturalized epistemology is examined, and shown to neglect crucial aspects of Quine’s argument for the relevance of his project. Kim suggests that underdetermination of evidence by theory does not imply normative epistemology is dead, but ignores that Quine is concerned about not merely underdetermination, but indeterminacy of translation, i.e., meaning. Kim suggests that Quine ignores normative alternatives to Cartesianism, but ignores that Quine’s indeterminacy thesis may undermine them, as well. Finally, Kim suggests that Quine’s putative rejection of normativity is a problem for the evaluation of cognitive outputs, but Kim ignores Quine’s behaviorism, which obviates his need for a normative interpretive theory of beliefs. It is suggested that the real problems with Quine’s naturalized epistemology are to be found in his attempt to keep that behaviorism consistent with his overall project—but that Kim’s critiques obscure this.

BONJOUR’S ARGUMENTS AGAINST SKEPTICISM ABOUT THE A PRIORI (III-I)

JAMES R. BEEBE (UNIVERSITY AT BUFFALO)

Laurence BonJour’s (1998) recent defense of moderate rationalism includes two arguments against skepticism about the a priori. I reconstruct both of these arguments and discuss the assumptions about the justificatory limitations of a posteriori sources of epistemic justification that lie behind them. I then defend the arguments against the charge that they are question-begging. I show that BonJour’s arguments constitute a formidable challenge to philosophers who are skeptical about the a priori but not about knowledge in general.

FAVORING, POLARITY, AND PARTICULARISM (I-H)

JEFFREY C. BRAND-BALLARD (GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY)

We often assert general moral principles which, suitably qualified, we take as true. Moral particularists disagree. Jonathan Dancy’s particularism rests on holism—the claim that reasons can change valence or “polarity” with context. I defend a form of atomism (anti-holism) by presenting an alternative picture of the “poles” with respect to which reasons are polarized. Whereas Dancy understands atomism as the claim that a certain type of reason invariantly favors a certain type of action, I argue that a reason can be polarized with respect to an “action family,” rather than a particular action. I suggest that reasons are, indeed, invariantly polarized with respect to action families. This invariance is of a weaker kind than what Dancy challenges atomists to defend, but I think it is all atomists need to defend. Room remains for general moral principles.
QUANTIFYING OVER CASES (III-F)

BERIT BROGAARD (UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI–ST. LOUIS)

What do adverbs of quantification like “always,” “never,” and “seldom” quantify over? David Lewis famously argued that they quantify over cases, where, roughly, a case is an n-tuple of its participants. Lewis’s proposal has a striking implication often ignored by philosophers: it offends against Russell’s claim that descriptions are quantifiers. It has another drawback: it is unable to account for adverbial generalities without a conditional restrictor. In this paper I make a case for an alternative theory of adverbial quantification that remedies the defects of Lewis’s theory.

HOW STRUCTURALISM CAN SOLVE THE “ACCESS” PROBLEM (III-F)

OTÁVIO A. BUENO (UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA)

According to mathematical structuralism, the subject matter of mathematics is not the study of mathematical objects, but of mathematical structures. By moving away from objects, the structuralist claims to be in a position to solve the “access” problem: structuralism explains the possibility of mathematical knowledge without requiring any access to mathematical objects. In a recent paper, Fraser MacBride challenged the structuralist response and argued that the structuralist faces a dilemma in the attempt to solve that problem (MacBride [2004]). In the present paper, I argue that MacBride’s dilemma can be resisted, and that, particularly in the version articulated by Michael Resnik (Resnik [1997]), structuralism can solve the “access” problem. I show exactly how MacBride’s dilemma fails and argue that this failure provides an opportunity to highlight a significant feature of structuralism: the way in which it articulates a fundamentally different picture of mathematical epistemology than traditional epistemology would suggest.

DOES WISDOM MAKE YOU LUCKY? EUTHYDEMUS 279D-280B (III-H)

MATTHEW C. CASHEN (WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY IN ST. LOUIS)

It is notorious that Socrates sometimes slides by with arguments that don’t really work, sometimes even coaxing his interlocutor to assent to arguments that seem agonizingly bad. Euthydemus 279d-280b is often thought to supply such an argument, one M. A. Stewart dismisses as “disastrous,” and whose apparent faults T. H. Irwin calls “recurrent, gross, and obvious.” Socrates’ aim there is to prove that wisdom (sophia) always makes people lucky (eutuchein), a claim that itself is just one step in a larger effort to prove that wisdom is the only good. My aim is to show not only that Socrates’ argument is right, but that it is uncontroversially right. After reconstructing the argument and showing why two prominent interpretations get Socrates’ meaning wrong, I advance an alternate interpretation with two advantages: it fits the text better than its competitors, and it spares Socrates of recurrent, gross, and obvious error.
WILLIAMSON’S EVIDENCE (V-H)

E. J. COFFMAN (UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME)

In *Knowledge and its Limits*, Timothy Williamson argues the thesis that only knowledge is evidence. This thesis conflicts with a view that pervades contemporary epistemology—viz., that certain mental items that *don’t* constitute knowledge (e.g., experiences, justified false beliefs, “Gettierized” justified true beliefs) qualify as evidence. In this paper, I assess Williamson’s two most promising attempts to establish that only knowledge is evidence. I reckon that both fail. The first argument considered depends on a claim that’s obviously false, while the second depends on two claims each of which is *at best* counterbalanced for us (i.e., such that our reasons for denying it are as strong as our reasons for accepting it). My assessment of the second argument includes an evaluation of the strongest argument for ‘Warrant Infallibilism’, the thesis that only true beliefs can have the feature that distinguishes knowledge from mere true belief.

MOORE PROBLEMS FOR THE ANTI-REALIST? (IV-I)

JON M. COGBURN (LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY)

Moorean validities are any in-general invalid inferences such as *P*; therefore I believe that *P*. While these are *prima facie* invalid, they have no counterexamples, since any assertion of the truth of the premise pragmatically forces the conclusion to be true. I first show that Dummettian anti-realists have a seemingly impossible time explaining why Moorean validities are not valid. Then I argue that the anti-realist could restrict application of Moorean validities to inferential situations outside of the scope of things assumed hypothetically for further discharge. In conclusion, I suggest that Berkeley and Davidson’s non-trivial Moorean arguments run afoul of this restriction.

THE MYTH OF CARTESIAN QUALIA (I-G)

RAFFAELLA DE ROSA (RUTGERS UNIVERSITY–NEWARK)

The standard view of Cartesian sensations is that they lack intrinsic intentionality because they present themselves as purely qualitative features of experience (or *qualia*). Accordingly, Descartes’s view would be that in perceiving the color red, for example, we are merely experiencing the subjective feel of redness rather than seeming to perceive a property of bodies. In this paper, I will show that the argument and the textual evidence offered in support of SV fail to establish that Descartes held SV. Indeed, I will argue that there are textual and theoretical reasons for believing exactly the opposite, that is, that Descartes held the negation of SV (section 3). Qualia aren’t Descartes’s legacy.

SPINOZA ON THE INDIVISIBILITY OF SUBSTANCE AND THE INCONCEIVABILITY OF EXTENSION (IV-K)

SHANNON DEA (UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN ONTARIO)

Spinoza famously maintained that substance—and hence, *extended* substance—is indivisible. However, it is not entirely clear how something
could be both extended and indivisible. It is perhaps for this reason that, while Spinoza’s account of substance as indivisible is often drawn upon as a foil for other positions, little scholarly attention has been devoted to Spinoza’s position in its own right. In what follows, I argue that Spinoza’s claim that substance is indivisible entails an oblique denial that extension is an attribute of substance. To this end, I give an account of Pierre Sylvain Régis’s criticism of Spinoza’s position, a criticism that helps to evince the possibility that, for Spinoza, extension is a mere mode, like time.

CAN POLITICAL LIBERALISM DELIVER EQUALITY IN THE SOCIAL-BASES OF SELF-RESPECT? (III-J)

GERALD DOPPELT (UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA–SAN DIEGO)

This paper examines Rawls’s important notion of equality in the social bases of self-respect and the pivotal role of his paradigm of self-respect as equal democratic rights. Can a Rawlsian respond to the objection that this paradigm ignores inequalities in economic position that can undermine self-respect (e.g. unemployment, demeaning conditions of work, unpaid domestic labor)? I examine reformulations of Rawls’s principles that seem to accommodate the objection. I argue that the more promising approach is to treat his paradigm of self-respect as a normative notion concerning the proper social bases of self-respect in an ideally just society. Rawls’s political liberalism succeeds in justifying such a notion based on a democratic ideal of free and equal persons implicit in our fundamental institutions. But it ignores rival political ideals of persons implicit in these institutions, which political liberalism needs to reconcile in order to deliver equality in the proper bases of self-respect.

MEANING, REASON, AND MODALITY (IV-I)

JANICE L. DOWELL (BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY)

One issue that has arisen over how best to interpret the two-dimensional framework is whether there is an interpretation that would ground an a priori-accessible, extension-fixing component of content for very many of our terms and sentences. David Chalmers in a series of recent papers aims to defend just such an interpretation and in so doing restore what he calls the “golden triangle” between meaning, reason, and modality. Chalmers’s strategy turns on finding an interpretation that makes his Core Thesis come out true. That thesis says that for any sentence S, S is a priori iff S has a necessary I-intension. I’ll argue here that Chalmers’s interpretation fails to meet his requirements. That’s because Chalmers’s I-intensions are either only a posteriori-accessible after all or there are no instances of the Core Thesis or the interpretation needed to avoid either of the former results will presuppose, rather than ground, an a priori-accessible component of content.

TIME AND THE OBSERVER REDUX (II-F)

PAULA J. DROEGE (PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY)

Daniel Dennett (1991) had the right idea when he used the vehicle/content distinction to separate time of representing from time represented. But
Dennett drew the wrong conclusion. He thought that the separation of represented time (content) from the time of its vehicle meant that conscious content floats free, anchored only by subjective report. I believe this conclusion overlooks an alternative anchor for conscious contents. If conscious states have the function of representing the present moment, conscious contents are determined according to which elements best represent “now.” Though the demonstrative function threatens to collapse the hard-won distinction between vehicle and content, I argue the contrary: the demonstrative reveals the essential functional relation between content and object as distinct from the vehicle of representation. This theory both reinforces and undermines Daniel Wegner’s (2002; 2004; Wegner and Wheatley 1999) claim that conscious will is illusory.

KIERKEGAARD, MACINTYRE, AND THE LIMITS OF REFLECTION IN ETHICS (II-J)

IAN M. DUCKLES (INDIANA UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA)

Among Kierkegaard scholars, there is a great deal of concern regarding how to deal with Alasdair MacIntyre’s treatment of Kierkegaard in his seminal work After Virtue. In this essay I seek to respond to the criticism MacIntyre levels against Kierkegaard’s Either/Or and its pseudonymous author, Judge William. I argue that MacIntyre criticism of the ethical is accurate, but that his attribution of this position to Kierkegaard is mistaken. In particular, I argue that a close examination of another work in which Kierkegaard employs the Judge William pseudonym, Stages on Life’s Way, reveals that Kierkegaard himself intended that the ethical be criticized in exactly the way MacIntyre does. In this way, Kierkegaard himself anticipates MacIntyre’s criticism of Enlightenment ethics.

NIETZSCHE’S DÉCADENT: A READING OF “THE PROBLEM OF SOCRATES” IN TWILIGHT OF THE IDOLS (III-H)

DAW-NAY EVANS (DEPAUL UNIVERSITY)

Twilight of the Idols is one of the few places in Nietzsche’s oeuvre where he offers a sustained analysis of both Socratic philosophy and the psychological characteristics of the historical figure known as Socrates. In this paper I show how Nietzsche’s fierce ad hominem attack against Socrates in “The Problem of Socrates” conceals a rigorous and logically sound argument that explains how Socrates’ décadence is a symptom of his over-reliance upon reason.

COLOR REPRESENTATIONS AS HASH VALUES (II-F)

JUSTIN C. FISHER (UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA)

The goal of this paper is to answer the following question:

When we have mental states that represent certain things as being colored, what properties are our mental states representing these things as having?

I first state three presumptions about the notion of representation presupposed in this question. I then present a simple overview of potential
answers to this question. In that presentation, several puzzles arise that any successful theory of color must solve. With these puzzles in mind, I present the position that I favor. I argue that color representation systems work upon the same basic principles as hashing schemes employed by computer scientists, and I explain how this observation enables us to answer the question with which we began and to solve the puzzles that face other approaches.

THE TRANSIENT PARAGRAPH: AN UNDERSTANDING OF PI §43 AIDED BY AN ANALYSIS OF A LATE STAGE OF COMPOSITION OF THE PHILOSOPHICAL INVESTIGATIONS (IV-L)

CRAIG FOX (UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS–CHICAGO)

Around 1944, Wittgenstein contemplated supplementing what we know as §43 of the Philosophical Investigations with an additional paragraph. In this paper, my suggestion is that attention to this additional paragraph reveals something about the role that Wittgenstein saw §43 as playing. It becomes apparent that he did not see §43 as providing anything like a definition of meaning, nor even an account of what meaning consists in.

WITTGENSTEIN AND KRIPKE ON THE STANDARD METRE (IV-L)

ANDREW GRAHAM (ACADIA UNIVERSITY)

In Philosophical Investigations, Wittgenstein claims that it makes no sense to say of the standard metre in Paris that it is one metre long or that it is not one metre long. This claim has provoked its fair share of commentators, among whom Kripke is especially notable given his rejection of the claim in arguing for the existence of contingent a priori truths. I contend that Kripke and others misinterpret Wittgenstein, and I illuminate Wittgenstein’s remarks by connecting them to his other writings, particularly On Certainty. Although Kripke mistakenly attacks a position that Wittgenstein never asserts, Kripke’s response (particularly the concept of the contingent a priori) does offer some intriguing parallels with Wittgenstein’s ideas.

CAN WOMEN BE PHILOSOPHERS FOR ARISTOTLE? (V-G)

STEPHANIE GREGOIRE (ST. JEROME’S UNIVERSITY)

In this paper, I ask what Aristotle thinks is possible for women to achieve in terms of speculative and philosophical reasoning. Arguing that the corpus furnishes us only with passages affirming the inferiority of the feminine practical intellect, I suggest an interpretation of the most important of these passages, i.e. the one of Politics Book One Chapter 13 which justifies the exclusion of women from the political sphere on the grounds that her deliberation lacks authority. I then comment on where we are left as to Aristotle’s opinion about speculative matters and women, concluding that even if Aristotle seems to think that women are less apt than men for speculative reasoning, one cannot affirm that he excludes them from achieving it.
THE SENSE OF UNDERSTANDING (I-K)

STEPHEN R. GRIMM (UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME)

In a recent pair of papers J. D. Trout argues that the sense of understanding that we seem to enjoy of the world around us is deeply unreliable. In other words, he argues that our sense that we understand why things are one way rather than another is poorly connected with the truth about why things are one way rather than another. I claim that Trout dramatically exaggerates the de facto unreliability of our sense of understanding, a view that is borne out by recent research in cognitive psychology. Rather than conclude that the sense of understanding simply is reliable, however, I argue that a more nuanced view is required.

REFLEXIVE CONTENT AND THE MODAL ARGUMENT (V-F)

PETER W. HANKS (UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA–TWIN CITIES)
BRENDAN O’SULLIVAN (RHODES COLLEGE)

Defenders of the mind-body identity thesis have responded to Kripke’s modal argument either by providing a real possibility to explain away the apparent conceivability of the mental without the physical, or by denying that in the mental/physical case conceivability provides a reliable guide to possibility. In his recent book Knowledge, Possibility, and Consciousness John Perry defends a version of the first strategy by applying his general distinction between subject matter content and reflexive content. Here we argue that Perry’s appeal to reflexive content does no useful work and that his response to the modal argument depends on strong and implausible views about concepts.

WHAT’S SO SPECIAL ABOUT SPECIAL RESPONSIBILITIES? (I-J)

SARAH HARPER (BOSTON COLLEGE)

Though we tend to think and act as though our special responsibilities are grounded in our special relationships, or roles, a special responsibility is, by definition, one that falls differentially on one agent rather than another and that it is held with respect to one person rather than another. This suggests several ways in which our special, purportedly role-relative responsibilities might stand in relation to those that we think of as general, or role-independent: In the first place, our purportedly role-relative responsibilities may, in reality, be reducible to role-independent ones, having their source in something outside of special relationships. Alternatively, there may be both genuinely role-relative and genuinely role-independent responsibilities. Finally, our purportedly role-independent responsibilities may, in reality, be reducible to role-relative ones. In this paper, I will argue that problems with the first two views merit further exploration of the third.

DYING TO BE GOOD: KANT AND THE PERMISSIBILITY OF SUICIDE (II-G)

THOMAS D. HARTER (UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE)

Kant argues that acts of suicide are immoral because they destroy a person’s rationality, which is the source of both one’s moral being and moral obligations. I argue, however, when one’s duty of beneficence, which is a
duty to one's moral being, conflicts with one's duty of self-preservation or one's duty not to commit suicide, both of which are duties to one's animal nature, that Kant's system of ethics permits and may require rational beings to commit suicide. In demonstrating how duties to one's moral being are more primary than duties to one's animal nature, I show how a suicide taking as its end a duty of beneficence aims at perfecting one's moral nature. I then address two objections to this view: that it is contradictory for a rational being to willingly destroy itself, and that suicide for the sake of others is not suicide, but an act of martyrdom.

**Natural Selection as a Realized Causal Process (I-F)**

*Matthew Haug (Cornell University)*

Recently, some philosophers have argued against the dynamical interpretation of natural selection, according to which it is a force acting on individual organisms. They propose that selection is a formally characterized, statistical phenomenon and not a causal process. I argue that both the dynamical and statistical interpretations are mistaken. Natural selection is not a force, but it is a causal process that is realized by other physical processes. Proponents of the statistical interpretation commit two errors. First, they conflate two notions of "population." Second, they assume that realization is a purely formal, as opposed to causal, phenomenon. This paper shows how metaphysical issues about realization normally discussed in the philosophy of mind apply to debates in philosophy of biology. Thus, it is a first step toward fleshing out the oft-noted similarities between debates in these areas.

**Receptivity and the Will (II-I)**

*Edward S. Hinchman (University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee)*

The task of an internalist approach to agency is to explain how an agent's all-things-considered judgment has necessary implications for action. The approach faces its chief obstacle in the possibility of two species of akratic break: between judgment and intention, and between intention and action. I argue that the two are not importantly different: in each case akrasia manifests a single species of irrational self-mistrust. I aim to vindicate internalism by showing how rational agency rests on our capacity for trusting receptivity to the verdict of judgment. To call the relation receptivity is to characterize it as fundamentally passive. To call it trusting receptivity is to ensure that the passivity is not incompatible with agency, since trust retains a crucial degree of control. I'll argue that the best way to meet the externalist argument from akrasia is to abandon the assumption that the will must be a locus of activity.

**Fodor on Concepts and Modes of Presentation (II-F)**

*Henry Jackman (York University)*

Jerry Fodor is well known for his criticisms of non-atomistic theories of concepts and intentional content, but it has recently been argued that Fodor's theory of concepts is ultimately subject to precisely the same objection that he finds fatal to holistic theories. I'll argue here that while
there is a way for Fodor to avoid this charge, the same strategy can be employed by defenders of some of the holistic theories that he attacks.

THE LOGIC OF POLITICAL LIBERALISM: A CRITIQUE OF ESSLUND'S ACCEPTANCE CRITERION (IV-J)

CHRISTOPHER KING (VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY)

It is commonly thought that political propositions made legitimate through a majoritarian procedure are only weakly justified. There exists a minority for whom such proposals are not acceptable. Democracy, then, seems to entail pluralism. Philosophers have tried to accommodate both pluralism and the apparent need for stronger measures of political justification in a single theory. Some of these, like Rawls, have made this accommodation by minimizing the cognitive requirements of liberal principles. In response, Estlund has argued that weakening cognitive value diminishes the normative capacity of a political liberalism by failing to isolate the group to whom justification is addressed. Political principles, then, must be true at least minimally. I will argue that conceived in this way, Estlund’s proposal results in a normative problem comparable to that in Rawls’s version of political liberalism; and should be reformulated or abandoned.

DESCARTES AND THE LIMITS OF REASON (I-G)

MATTHEW J. KISNER (UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA)

It is common to regard Descartes as exceedingly optimistic about the powers of reason. This interpretive line culminates in the claim that Descartes conceives of reason as a kind of divine power, occupying a God’s-eye perspective. This paper examines Descartes’s view on the limits of reason. I show that Descartes conceives of human reason—in opposition to divine reason—as part of the natural world, dependent on, and thus limited by other things, namely bodies and the will. I address an urgent epistemic question which arises from this view: if we cannot know the world as God knows it, then how can we claim to possess absolutely certain knowledge? An answer to this question is found in a controversial passage from the Second Replies. There Descartes argues that knowledge only requires justification from the perspective of human reason, thereby rejecting the God’s-eye perspective.

ALSTON’S EVALUATIVE PARTICULARISM AND EUTHYPHRO’S DILEMMA (II-J)

DEAN A. KOWALSKI (UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN–WAUKESHA)

William Alston uniquely argues that adopting evaluative particularism—the doctrine that God himself is the supreme standard of moral goodness—can resolve Euthyphro’s dilemma in a beneficial way for the divine command theorist. Taking only one aspect of Alston’s rich and complex view to task, it will be argued that even if Alston successfully resolves Euthyphro’s dilemma about moral obligation, he leaves the divine command theorist a new dilemma about moral goodness. Although this new dilemma deserves further exploration, it initially seems just as thorny as the original.
BETWEEN HUMAN EXPERIENCE AND DIVINE INTUITION: HEGEL’S RESPONSE TO KANT’S LIMITATION OF OUR KNOWLEDGE (IV-H)

JAMES KREINES (YALE UNIVERSITY)

Hegel’s theoretical philosophy aims for results which are supposed to conflict with Kant’s denial of the possibility of knowledge of things-in-themselves. Some see Hegel as aiming to surpass the limitations imposed by the conditions which mediate human knowledge. Others see Hegel as aiming more to undercut the limit by questioning the very idea that our knowledge might fall short of divine, unmediated access to reality. As we would expect with Hegel, the truth is somewhere in between Or so I argue. Hegel concentrates on Kant’s account of reason and on metaphysical and epistemological issues concerning explanation. And this allows him to separate out two different Kantian limits; Hegel aims to surpass one limit in order to undercut the other; he aims to show that, because we can have explanatory knowledge beyond the bounds of experience, we need not worry that our knowledge might be limited relative to divine, unmediated intuition.

WAS FREGE’S ORIGINAL LOGICISM A SUCCESS? (III-F)

GREGORY LANDINI (UNIVERSITY OF IOWA)

It is rarely appreciated that prior to his contradictory theory of courses-of-values Frege’s had a theory of cardinal numbers as second-level concepts. This paper argues that this “original” logicism of Frege must be regarded as a successful—if one accepts the ontology of functions and senses. The paper next investigates the possibility of forming a theory which couples Wittgenstein’s exclusive quantifiers with Frege’s original logicism.

ACCUSING BEING: HEIDEGGER’S CONCEPT OF CATEGORIES IN BEING AND TIME (II-K)

DANIEL P. MALLOY (APPALACHIAN STATE UNIVERSITY)

There is a distinction that is vital to Being and Time and yet has been relatively ignored in the literature: the distinction between existentials and categories. Existentials, characteristics of the structure of the being of Dasein, have been studied in great detail. Categories have hardly been touched on. A few articles have appeared that explicitly discuss the categories identified in it, but these have been uninterested in the concept of categories. The goal of this paper is to remedy some of these oversights. The thrust will be to come to an understanding of what Heidegger means by the term “category.”

ON MORAL AND RELIGIOUS OBLIGATIONS: SOME PROBLEMS FOR METAETHICAL DIVINE COMMAND THEORIES (II-J)

ZACH R. MANIS (BAYLOR UNIVERSITY)

In the contemporary literature on divine command theory, Adams and Evans have argued for a metaethical divine command theory of moral obligation (DCT) that fits within a broader, social theory of the nature of obligation. I argue that such versions of DCT are problematic, because they
are forced to classify as “pre-moral” obligations that are paradigmatically moral. In such cases, the obligations in question possess all of the properties used to distinguish moral obligations from pre-moral obligations: namely, they are objective, overriding, and universal. Accounting for the obligation to obey God proves especially difficult for metaethical versions of DCT. Its proponents must claim that this obligation either (1) is not a moral obligation, (2) is a moral obligation whose ground is the same as other moral obligations, or (3) is a moral obligation whose ground is different from other moral obligations. All three options, I argue, are highly problematic.

SPINOZA ON AKRASIA (IV-K)
EUGENE J. MARSHALL (UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN–MADISON)

In the Ethics, Part IV, Spinoza gives an account of akrasia, or weakness of will, in which our rational desires are overcome by passions. In Part V, however, Spinoza offers an affect, the love of God, that cannot be overcome. So, in one’s love of God, one is immune to akrasia. Further, as we can unite this affect to other adequate ideas, those ideas gain this immunity as well. In this way, we may render ourselves incapable of suffering akrasia. Thus, though our universal knowledge of good and evil, or the second kind of knowledge, is vulnerable to being overthrown by the passions, our love of God is not. Finally, I argue that this love of God is the third kind of knowledge. So, in the second kind of knowledge, we may suffer akrasia, but in the third kind of knowledge, we are immune.

RETHINKING SPINOZA’S CONCEPT OF IDEAS OF IDEAS (IV-K)
CHRISTOPHER MARTIN (PURDUE UNIVERSITY)

One of the significant strands of thought in Book II of Spinoza’s Ethics is his concept of ideas of ideas.1 Many scholars agree that this notion commits Spinoza to the claim that for each mode of substance there is an idea of that mode, an idea of that idea, an idea of the idea of that idea and so on ad infinitum. I argue that this interpretation is mistaken, and that a more coherent reading falls out of the text. After critiquing the standard interpretation, I argue that an idea and the idea of it constitute one idea, i.e., an idea of an idea is just an idea’s awareness of itself—its self-awareness. This interpretation accords with Spinoza’s explicit discussion of this concept, avoids the absurdity of an infinite regress for each mode and makes sense of a later and difficult proposition in EII.

12p1, 2p3, 2p11, 2p20-22 and 2p43 are the principally relevant propositions here.

PHYSICALISM IN AN INFINITELY DECOMPOSABLE WORLD (I-F)
BARBARA G. MONTERO (CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK)

Might the world be structured, as Leibniz thought, so that every part of matter is divided ad infinitum? The physicist David Bohm accepted infinitely decomposable matter, and even Steven Weinberg, a staunch supporter of the idea that science is converging on a final theory, admits the possibility of an endless chain of ever more fundamental theories.1 However, if there
is no fundamental level, physicalism, thought of as the view that everything is determined by fundamental phenomena and that all fundamental phenomena are physical, turns out false, for in such a world, there are no fundamental phenomena, and so fundamental phenomena determine nothing. While some take physicalism necessarily to posit a fundamental level, here I show how a correct understanding of physicalism, that is, one that expresses what is at stake in the debate between physicalists and anti-physicalists, allows for its truth even in an infinitely decomposable world.


TERRORISM AND THE ETHICS OF WAR (V-I)

STEPHEN L. NATHANSON (NORTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY)

My aim in this paper is to explain why moral condemnations of terrorism lack credibility and what is required to remedy this problem. One obvious reason for the lack of credibility is the selective and hypocritical use of both the word “terrorism” and the moral principles appealed to in condemning terrorism, especially by political leaders. But the problem is deeper than this.

I argue that all of the standard views about the ethics of war—commonsense morality, political realism, Walzer’s theory in Just and Unjust Wars, and traditional just war theory—approve some terrorist acts or their moral equivalents. Hence, none of these views provides a solid, principled basis for condemning all terrorist acts. Finally, I argue that moral credibility requires accepting a very rigorous form of the principle of noncombatant immunity that condemns both terrorist acts and many collateral damage killings.

R. M. HARE, NON-MORAL “OUGH”S AND THE VALUE OF REASON AND CONSISTENCY (V-J)

NATHAN NOBIS (UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA–BIRMINGHAM)

R. M. Hare developed a much discussed morally irrealist position called “universal prescriptivism.” I argue, however, that Hare’s arguments in favor of universal prescriptivism are unsound. I argue (1) that premises in Hare’s arguments for moral universal prescriptivism suggest analogous arguments for epistemic universal prescriptivism, (2) that view is false and is reasonable to reject—since epistemic evaluations, including claims about the value of reason and consistency, are not prescriptions—and so (3) the arguments for moral prescriptivism are not sound, since they have false major premises. Thus, Hare’s views should not be seen as a serious rival to moral realisms. Since, elsewhere, I have argued that moral expressivisms are vulnerable to this same kind of objection, these combined results put moral realism on a more secure basis.
REFLEXIVE CONTENT AND THE MODAL ARGUMENT (V-F)

Peter W. Hanks (University of Minnesota–Twin Cities)
Brendan O'Sullivan (Rhodes College)

Defenders of the mind-body identity thesis have responded to Kripke’s modal argument either by providing a real possibility to explain away the apparent conceivability of the mental without the physical, or by denying that in the mental/physical case conceivability provides a reliable guide to possibility. In his recent book Knowledge, Possibility, and Consciousness John Perry defends a version of the first strategy by applying his general distinction between subject matter content and reflexive content. Here we argue that Perry’s appeal to reflexive content does no useful work and that his response to the modal argument depends on strong and implausible views about concepts.

WHAT’S THE HARM IN A LITTLE SELF-DECEPTION? (I-H)

Joseph Quinn Olechnowicz (Florida State University)

Self-deception is harmful. Sometimes it is harmful in a way such that the harms incurred are not obvious or immediate. This might lead some to consider self-deception to a certain extent as either normal or healthy. I argue against this claim stating that self-deception is likely to be discovered, forcing the agent to choose between continued self-deception (and consequent loss of rational capacity), or realization of the harmful fact and her own capability for self-deception. Unless it can be shown that these costs will not be incurred the proponent of “healthy” self-deception has claimed normative ground that does not belong to him. Rather than being healthy or adaptive behavior, self-deception puts one in danger of entering a spiral of irrational behaviors accompanied by a loss of valuable rational capacity needed to escape this spiral.

GIBBARD ON THICK CONCEPTS AND NORMATIVE FACTS (V-J)

Andrew Payne (St. Joseph’s University)

Allan Gibbard has opposed the use of thick concepts to support the claim that there are normative facts. Thick concepts possess both descriptive and evaluative meaning, but Gibbard argues that moral judgments using thick concepts do not possess normativity in virtue of their representing facts in the world. Therefore the use of thick concepts does nothing to show that there are normative facts. A fuller account of moral judgments using thick concepts is presented to show that they do have normativity in virtue of their representing facts in the world. Thick concepts are specific ethical concepts which represent agents as exemplifying patterns of beliefs, desires, and intentions. When a judgment using thick concepts is normative, its normativity is explained in part by the judgment’s representation of the beliefs, desires, and intentions of an agent: those facts in the world which count as normative facts.
THE DOCTRINE OF THE HERMENEUTICAL CIRCLE AND TRADITIONAL EPISTEMOLOGY (II-K)

MYRON A. PENNER (TRINITY WESTERN UNIVERSITY)

It is often asserted that the “hermeneutical circle” raises problems for traditional Cartesian epistemology. Using Merold Westphal as a guide to the Doctrine of the Hermeneutical Circle, in the following paper I investigate how and in what sense the Doctrine could be problematic for Cartesian epistemology. It turns out that the Doctrine is consistent with Cartesian epistemology in its most robust form, where knowledge requires truth, certainty, and properly basic beliefs. The Doctrine, together with an additional and often implicit assumption that the world can neither determine nor dictate its own interpretation, does pose a problem for Cartesian epistemology. However, I show that the most plausible interpretation of the implicit assumption, together with the Doctrine of the Hermeneutical Circle, entails rejecting only the Cartesian certainty requirement for knowledge. The Doctrine poses no problem for other traditional epistemologies in which knowledge requires truth and properly basic beliefs.

THE EQUALITY-DIFFERENCE DILEMMA AND CONTEMPORARY FEMINIST POLITICS (IV-J)

DIANE PERPICH (VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY)

Legal scholar Martha Minnow has argued that if ignoring differences among groups is problematic, focusing on such differences may be equally so. Ignoring difference leaves us with a false neutrality harmful to socially subordinated groups, while insisting on group difference can lead to re-stigmatization and entrenched prejudice and disadvantage. If the difference no less than equality, then, brings us to an impasse, can social groups such as women, Blacks, or gays effectively articulate a political identity without giving new purchase to already prevailing stereotypes? This paper considers recent proposals by Nancy Fraser and Joan Scott to move beyond the binary opposition between equality and difference then sketches a third possibility that looks beyond differences rooted in identity as the primary basis for claims to unjust treatment or unequal status, focusing instead on reciprocal and asymmetrical capabilities and vulnerabilities as the source for such claims.

ON KANT’S DISTINCTIONS BETWEEN PERFECT AND IMPERFECT AND NARROW AND WIDE DUTIES (IV-H)

JEPE PLATZ (UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE)

In the community of Kant scholars it is widely assumed that we can treat Kant’s distinctions between perfect and imperfect and narrow and wide duties as synonymous. In this essay I argue (a) that Kant meant these distinctions to capture different divisions of duties, hence it’s an exegetical mistake to assume synonymy; and (b) that these distinctions captures aspects of duty that make sense beyond the framework of Kant’s ethical philosophy, hence we have pragmatic reasons to attend to them.
INTERNALISM AND THE PROBLEM OF SCATTER (I-I)

Ted L. Poston (University of Missouri)

Ernest Sosa, in his recent book with Laurence Bonjour Epistemic Justification (2003), presses the problem of scatter for internalism as a reason to favor externalism. I diagnose the scatter problem and argue that it does not provide a reason for externalism. The scatter problem is significant and highlights a fundamental disagreement between internalist and externalist theories of justification. The foundational divergence, I argue, is whether to formulate the most basic epistemic principles with intentional concepts or concepts that occur in the natural sciences. It may be thought that formulating a basic epistemic principle with intentional concepts gives rise to the scatter problem. One of my aims is to argue that this is mistaken. Another aim is to suggest that the most basic epistemic principles should be formulated using intentional concepts.

FORMULA AND COMPARISON: AGAINST THE UNIQUENESS OF ART (II-H)

Henry J. Pratt (Bucknell University)

Proponents of the claim that artworks are, by nature, immune to evaluative comparison tend to pay special attention to formulae. They argue that formulaic creation and evaluation of artworks is impossible, that artworks can only be made and judged as unique objects, and that this precludes comparison. Some artworks, notably those made by Komar and Melamid, seem to play into this argument. However, I suggest that more plausible interpretations of these artworks lead to the opposite conclusion. Surprisingly, formulaic techniques can have an important role to play in artistic practices, and hence cannot be used to inveigh against art’s comparability.

LANGE ON STABILITY (I-F)

Kenneth A. Presting (University of North Carolina—Chapel Hill)

A recent paper by Marc Lange, “Laws and Their Stability” (Synthèse 2005, v. 144 pp. 415-432), brings into sharp relief the complexities which can arise from taking human language and intuition as a source of information about metaphysics. Lange presents an interesting thesis—that certain sets, such as the logical or physical necessities, may be identified as stable by testing the logical relations between the sentences in the set, as compared to the sentences excluded from the set, using certain counterfactual conditionals.

I will argue that Lange’s definition of stability is circular, despite some strenuous work on his part to avoid that problem. Along the way, I will show that the acceptance and correctness of counterfactuals in several fields has more to do with our human need to discuss possibilities we need not (or cannot) fully describe than with the laws that necessarily govern our practical lives.
Epistemic Circularity Squared? Skepticism about Common Sense (III-I)

Baron Reed (Northern Illinois University)

Epistemic circularity occurs when a subject forms the belief that a faculty $F$ is reliable through the use of $F$. Although this is often thought to be vicious, externalist theories generally don’t rule it out. For some philosophers, this is reason to reject externalism. However, Michael Bergmann defends externalism by drawing on the tradition of common sense in two ways. First, he concedes that epistemically circular beliefs cannot answer a subject’s doubts about her cognitive faculties. But, he argues, subjects usually don’t have such doubts, so epistemically circular beliefs are rarely called upon to play this role. Second, following Thomas Reid, Bergmann argues that we have noninferential, though epistemically circular, knowledge that our faculties are reliable. I argue, however, that Bergmann’s view is undermined by doubts a subject should have and that there is no plausible explanation for how we can have noninferential knowledge that our faculties are reliable.

Assertion and Its Constitutive Norms (V-F)

Michael A. Rescorla (University of California–Santa Barbara)

William Alston, John Searle, Timothy Williamson, and many other philosophers advocate the restrictive model of assertion, according to which certain constitutive assertoric norms restrict what propositions one may assert. I advocate the dialectical model of assertion, which treats assertion as constituted by the dialectical obligations one undertakes in asserting a proposition. On my view, constitutive norms of assertion constrain how one must react when a fellow conversationalist challenges one’s assertion, but they do not constrain what one should assert in the first place. I argue that various linguistic phenomena commonly taken to support the restrictive model actually support the dialectical model.

Kant, Free Harmony, and Aesthetic Ideas (II-H)

Kenneth F. Rogerson (Florida International University)

I want to consider a particularly troublesome problem internal to Kant’s theory of beauty. In the “Critique of Aesthetic Judgment” Kant argues that an object is beautiful if and only if it is able to give us pleasure, the source of which is a mental state similar to cognition called the “free harmony of the imagination and the understanding.” The problem for Kant scholars is how to make sense of a harmony between the faculty of sense perception (the imagination) and the faculty of rules for organization of those perceptions (the understanding) which is nonetheless “free” of any conceptual rule ordering. I argue that Kant’s doctrine of aesthetic ideas solve this problem.

Kitcher and the Obsessive Unifier (IV-G)

Jeffrey Roland (Louisiana State University)

According to Philip Kitcher’s account of scientific progress, one of the two basic ways science progresses is explanatorily—by increasing unifying
A natural worry about this view is that too enthusiastically seeking unification will lead us to impose structure where there is none, thus yielding a less accurate rather than more accurate picture of the world. Kitcher has addressed this worry under the heading obsessive unifier. In this paper, I argue that his response to the obsessive unifier worry is unsatisfactory. I further suggest that the worry can be answered by adopting a causal realism more robust than Kitcher is in a position to accept.

AMBIGUITY BEYOND NUMBER (V-F)

PAUL SAKA (UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON)

The recent republication of Brendan Gillon’s work on ambiguity (its re-republication, actually), following the outline sketched by Davidson and Harman, continues to promote dubious views about ambiguity: that all ambiguity is either structural or lexical; that structural ambiguity can be represented by means of brackets; that lexical ambiguity can be represented by subscripts; and that ambiguity poses no principled difficulties for semantic theory in general, or for Davidsonian semantics in particular. I argue, first, that Gillon’s subscripts do not succeed in treating lexical ambiguity, they only label or defer the problem. Second, there are other kinds of ambiguity that subscripts do not even purport to treat, including polysemy, figurative language, speech-act ambiguity, and indexicality and vagueness. (Indexicality and vagueness, contrary to usual classifications, must count as varieties of ambiguity according to truth-conditional semantics, or so I argue.)

MORAL WORTH AND COMMON SENSE: KANT’S USE OF EXAMPLE (II-G)

CYNTHIA A. SCHOSBERGER (SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY—EDWARDSVILLE)

The aim of this essay is two-fold: in the first part I argue that, contrary to popular interpretation, Kant does not—indeed, cannot—intend to give an example of moral worth at all in Groundwork I; and in the second part I argue that the role of common sense, although not much commented upon, is central to Kant’s moral philosophy. In the remainder of the text I examine specific examples and try to make sense of Kant’s claim that common sense understanding of morality can suffice for producing sound moral judgments. I close by noting that there is a connection between Kant’s early views about common sense and example and his later introduction (in the third Critique) of judgment as a faculty for moral decision-making.

CAN THE MERE PASSAGE OF TIME JUSTIFY A BELIEF? A DEFENSE OF MEMORY FOUNDATIONALISM (I-I)

ROBERT W. SCHROER (ARKANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY)

According to memory foundationalism, seeming to remember that $P$ is prima facie justification for believing that $P$. There is a common objection to this theory: If I previously believed that $P$ without justification, and then later seem to remember that $P$, it appears that the mere passage of time has somehow allowed me to acquire justification for a previously unjustified belief. Indeed, this holds true even if I remember that my previous belief that $P$ was not justified!
In this paper, I explore and respond to this objection. In doing so, I recast memory foundationalism: Instead of maintaining that seeming to remember that \( P \) is *prima facie* justification for believing that \( P \), I maintain that it is *prima facie* justification for believing that in the past I believed that \( P \) with justification. This, in turn, gives the memory foundationalist the resources necessary to properly handle the aforementioned objection.

**Consumer Choice and Moral Responsibility (I-J)**

**David Schwartz (Randolph Macon Woman's College)**

While much has been written under the rubric of business ethics, this work has focused mostly on the ethical practices of corporations and other collective entities. While the emphasis on corporate responsibility is understandable, it has left unexamined a source of significant ethical interest—the moral responsibilities of consumers. This essay offers some rudimentary observations and analyses regarding consumer responsibility and the ethics of consumer choice. It surveys several ways consumer products can raise ethical concerns, and it presents three normative views concerning the consumer's relation to these moral concerns. With this background in place, the paper then focuses critically on one of the three normative views, namely that the act of purchasing a product can render a consumer complicit in—and hence morally culpable for—wrongdoing associated with that product.

**Kant's Later Argument for a Duty of Beneficence (II-G)**

**Melissa Seymour (Indiana University—Bloomington)**

Kant offers at least three nonequivalent derivations for a duty of beneficence. Two of these derivations are found in the *Groundwork* and correspond to the first and second formulations of the categorical imperative, the *Formula of Universal Law* and the *Formula of Humanity*. While most readers of Kant are familiar with these arguments, far less attention has been paid to a third argument offered by Kant in his later writings (*The Critique of Practical Reason* and the *Doctrine of Virtue*). My aim in this paper is to demonstrate that only this later argument is capable of sustaining a duty of beneficence understood as a duty to make the happiness of others one's end. To this end I begin by examining the deficiencies of Kant's two *Groundwork* arguments and then consider how Kant's later argument is able to succeed where his earlier accounts failed.

**A Neglected Premise in Aristotle's Argument for the Unity of the Virtues (V-G)**

**Kevin Sharpe (Purdue University)**

Aristotle's argument for the unity of the virtues in Book VI of the *Nicomachean Ethics* relies on the following two premises: (i) the instantiation of any virtue requires the possession of wisdom and (ii) wisdom requires the instantiation of every virtue. While (i) has received extensive attention, (ii) is generally left undeveloped by commentators. The aim of this paper is to offer an original interpretation of Aristotle's argument for (ii). I argue that
Aristotle’s argument relies on his account of deliberation and in particular his conception of *boulēsis*, or rational wish. I show how Aristotle employs wish within his moral psychology to connect the agent’s moral character with the intellectual process of deliberation in such a way that only the morally virtuous can be wise.

ON THE CONCEIVABILITY OF AN OMNISCIENT INTERPRETER (IV-I)

MARK SILCOX (UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL OKLAHOMA)

This paper presents a re-examination of the “omniscient interpreter” argument against global skepticism that Donald Davidson first published in the 1970s, only to repudiate it some twenty years later. I argue that the argument’s persuasiveness has been largely underestimated. I defend it against the charge made by Richard Fumerton and Richard Foley that Davidson assumes the actual existence of an omniscient interpreter. I also criticize Bruce Vermazen’s proposal that some of Davidson’s more general philosophical commitments are incompatible with the very conceivability of an omniscient being. I suggest that if the argument does have a flaw, it is only that the methodology of belief attribution Davidson endorses makes it difficult to understand how an omniscient being could engage in the interpretation of human speech and thought.

SOPHISTICATED SUBSTANTIVALISM AND SPACETIME SYMMETRIES (III-G)

BRADFORD SKOW (UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS—AMHERST)

Substantivalists believe in space and time. Sophisticated substantivalists agree but reject the existence of possibilities that differ merely non-qualitatively. This allows them to block modal arguments against substantivalism that turn on substantivalism’s commitment to such possibilities. I argue that sophisticated substantivalism is untenable, because it is incompatible with the standard way of thinking about the relationship between time-reversal invariance and the direction of time. We think that if (1) a theory is time-reversal invariant— if, according to that theory, anything that can happen forward can happen backward—then (2) there is no intrinsic difference (according to that theory) between the future and the past. But (1) and (2) entail the existence of possibilities that differ merely non-qualitatively. So they are incompatible with sophisticated substantivalism.

THE COHERENCE OF RATIONALISM (III-I)

ANDREW D. SPEAR (UNIVERSITY AT BUFFALO)

Albert Casullo has provided a compelling analysis of three major arguments against empiricism: the “generality argument,” the “meta-reasons argument,” and the “revisability argument.” Casullo maintains that each of these arguments has an alternative formulation that is equally effective against rationalism, leaving rationalism and empiricism stalemated. I argue that the central element in Casullo’s case for a stalemate is the generality argument. The meta-reasons and revisability arguments are not compelling against rationalism unless the generality argument is. It is not. The generality argument affects rationalism only if an account of general mental content is impossible, and this has not been established. Consequently, the
other two arguments are not compelling against rationalism. Further, the
generality argument is a principled objection to empiricism. In light of this,
these arguments retain their original force against empiricism. There is no
stalemate.


*Molly Sturdevant (DePaul University)*

This essay is a contribution to the philosophical study of the sublime, taking
for its subject matter Kant's account of sublime feeling as occasioned
by nature in the *Critique of Judgment*. To focus only on sublime feeling
aroused by nature is a focus which Kant himself does not always appear
to estimate highly. Adorno has observed similar doubt historically cast over
the choice of *nature* rather than art in aesthetic judgment. Despite Kant's
apparently threadbare recommendation of the sublime as subject matter,
and conscious of Adorno's observations of a historical prejudice against
nature in aesthetic judgment, this paper is a sustained investigation of
what Kant means by “sublime feeling,” with a view towards showing its
significance for aesthetic judgment in Kant's philosophy in general, and
finally towards proposing a Kantian response to the historical prejudice
observed by Adorno.


**Why Pragmatists Must Be Perfectionists (IV-J)**

*Robert Talisse (Vanderbilt University)*

The author sketches a version of deliberative democracy based in a Peircean
pragmatist epistemology and then argues that deliberative democracy so
construed must adopt a stance called epistemic perfectionism. Like all
perfectionisms, epistemic perfectionism is at odds with neutralist varieties of
liberalism. So, the conclusion is that if the pragmatist conception of deliberative
democracy is correct, then proper democracy cannot be liberal.

**The Third Man, Resemblance Regress, and Parmenides: A New Interpretation (III-H)**

*Charlie Tanksley (University of Virginia)*

The Third Man Argument has drawn the lion's share of the attention paid
the *Parmenides* since Vlastos's seminal paper; this has led to a tendency to
misread and misrepresent the second regress argument—the Resemblance
Regress. The second regress builds on the idea that forms are paradigms
in order to show a staggering conclusion: that particulars cannot be like
forms or vice versa. Here I offer a new interpretation of the argument
that draws on what comes both before and after it in the dialogue. This
new interpretation stands apart from extant interpretations in its ability
to explain how Socrates might have thought suggesting that forms are
paradigms would avoid the regress of the TMA and in its emphasis on the
Resemblance Regress as an integral part of a build up to the final argument
of the first section of the *Parmenides*.
INDIRECT CONSEQUENTIALISM, SUBOPTIMALITY, AND FRIENDSHIP (III-K)
MATTHEW A. TEDESCO (BELoit COLLEGE)

One familiar challenge to consequentialism is that it leads to alienation in our friendships. Indirect consequentialism attempts to answer this challenge by understanding consequentialism as a criterion of rightness rather than as a decision-making procedure. Elinor Mason’s defense of the theory focuses on the optimality of the pro-friendship disposition as the proper target of consequentialist evaluation, rather than the optimality of any particular friendship. Robert F. Card has charged that this reading underscores a fatal flaw in indirect consequentialism—its inability to reject seriously problematic friendships for their suboptimality. I argue that Card’s criticism, considered more carefully, not only fails to undermine Railton’s and Mason’s indirect consequentialism, but in fact provides considerations that both help us to better understand the theory, and ultimately weigh in favor of it over Card’s own brand of sophisticated consequentialism.

SENSE AND SENSIBILITY (III-K)
MARIAM THALOS (UNIVERSITY OF UTAH)
CHRISOULA ANDREOU (UNIVERSITY OF UTAH)

We argue that having and acting on good impulses is an essential component of practical wisdom. If our reasoning is correct, then both of the following views are unacceptable: the Kantian view that practical reason is not expressed if one is “impelled into action” because acting well (and not simply from luck, but from practical wisdom) involves acting from self-given laws of action; and the Humean view that one’s impulses—assuming they do not spring from reasoning—are not subject to rational evaluation at all (though they may be put aside if they conflict with one’s considered desires).

EMERGENT SUBSTANCE (III-G)
PATRICK TONER (UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA)

I present a theory of substance that allows me to entirely avoid a number of otherwise pressing philosophical difficulties; namely, the Problem of Material Constitution, the Problem of the Many, the Overdetermination Argument, the Vagueness Argument for Unrestricted Composition, the Unity of Consciousness Argument, and the Problem of Individuation. People say some very striking things in response to these problems. I will solve all of them by saying only one striking thing. I am unaware of any other ontological view that can solve all of them in one fell swoop. Further, I will show that even that one striking thing is not really difficult to believe. It also has a most impressive pedigree, since it is derived from the work of St. Thomas Aquinas.

THE ROLE OF CERTAINTY (I-I)
TIMM TRIPLETT (UNIVERSITY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE)

I argue that both foundationalists and their critics have misunderstood the proper role epistemically certain beliefs play in a person’s epistemic system.
All sides in this debate have assumed that, if there are any epistemically certain contingent propositions in one’s belief system, their role must be to serve as the foundational or basic propositions which ultimately provide the justification for all other justified empirical beliefs. I propose an alternative account according to which epistemically certain beliefs are not basic, but they help explain how nonconceptual sensory contents that are basic can bridge the divide between the nonconceptual and the conceptual, and thereby provide justification for our beliefs. This account removes an important difficulty faced by strong versions of foundationalism.

**Agent Causation and the Alleged Impossibility of Rational Free Action (II-I)**

*Chris Tucker (Purdue University)*

Galen Strawson has claimed that “the impossibility of free will and ultimate moral responsibility can be proved with complete certainty.” Strawson, I take it, thinks that this conclusion can be established by one argument which he has developed. In this argument, he claims that rational free actions would require an infinite regress of rational choices, which is, of course, impossible for human beings. In my paper, I argue that agent causation theorists need not be worried by Strawson’s argument. For argument causation theorists are able to deny a key principle which drives the regress. Oversimplifying things a bit, the principle states that if one is responsible for her rational actions, then she was antecedently responsible for the reasons on which she acted.

**A Reductionist Account of Aristotelian Powers to Cause Change (V-G)**

*Thomas M. Tuozzo (University of Kansas)*

The question of whether in Aristotle’s view the potentials involved in change are irreducible, or whether they admit of a more fundamental metaphysical characterization that makes no reference to change, has been the subject of debate. But this debate has generally concerned the potential to undergo change; the reducibility question has not been discussed with reference to the equally important potential to cause change. My purpose here is to complete the reductionist interpretation of Aristotle’s analysis of change by defending a reductionist account of Aristotelian potentials to cause change. The interpretation I offer maintains that, at the fundamental metaphysical level, there is, in fact, nothing “potential” about potentials to cause change. They are as actual as they can be, and do not increase in actuality with they bring about change.

**Disconnecting Intersubjectivity and Ethics (II-K)**

*David T. Vessey (University of Chicago)*

Axel Honneth has criticized Hans-Georg Gadamer’s account of intersubjectivity as failing to provide the critical resources necessary for a satisfactory ethical theory. According to Honneth, Gadamer inherits from Martin Heidegger the view that reflection can only distort and never inform authentic relations to others and, as a result, he fails to appreciate the constructive role of a third or generalized other. I argue that Honneth has misinterpreted Gadamer, treating a discussion of hermeneutic experience
as an account of intersubjectivity when in fact Gadamer explicitly rejects I-Thou accounts of intersubjectivity. In general, though, Honneth makes the common mistake of arguing that the conceptual resources of one’s ethical theory is limited by the conceptual resources provided by one’s theory of intersubjectivity, a mistake Gadamer does not make.

ON STATE SELF-DEFENSE AND GUANTANAMO BAY (V-I)

STEVEN E. VINER (WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY IN ST. LOUIS)

In this paper, I contend that the current policy of indefinitely imprisoning “enemy combatants” in detention facilities like those at Guantanamo Bay cannot be morally justified according to a right of state self-defense. I first argue that current international laws directly pertaining to state self-defense, i.e., immediacy, necessity, and proportionality, need to be supplemented with what I term the “accountability limitation.” The accountability limitation requires states to take the best measures available to ensure that innocent persons or non-threats are not directly targeted by any defensive use of force. The accountability limitation is a necessary addition to international law because any right of state self-defense would not justify the direct targeting of persons who are not threats or not engaged in an attack. I then argue that the current policy of indefinite imprisonment fails to meet the accountability limitation.

I OUGHT, THEREFORE I CAN (V-J)

PETER B. M. VRANAS (IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY)

I defend 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 that agent at that time has the ability and opportunity to do. In short, obligations correspond to ability plus opportunity. My argument has three premises: (1) obligations correspond to reasons for action; (2) reasons for action correspond to potential actions; (3) potential actions correspond to ability plus opportunity. In the bulk of the paper I address two objections to OIC based on putative counterexamples.

ANGER, PAIN, AND FORGIVENESS (I-H)

ANDREA WESTLUND (UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN–MILWAUKEE)

Recent philosophical literature on forgiveness has, with a few exceptions, converged on the view that to forgive is to overcome resentment for moral reasons. Running through much of this literature is a largely unexamined presumption about the emotional texture of forgiveness itself: it is typically taken for granted that overcoming (that is, eliminating) resentment and/or other negative emotions is a necessary condition for genuine forgiveness. The view that forgiveness requires overcoming resentment has sometimes been mistakenly attributed to Joseph Butler. Drawing on Butler’s own view, along with Robin Dillon’s recent work on self-forgiveness, I argue that forgiveness does not in fact require overcoming anger at the wrongdoer, at least not in all its forms. To forgive is to gain control over one’s negative
emotions, accepting them as now part of one’s life but reinterpreting them as compatible with genuine goodwill toward the wrongdoer.

**KANT’S TRANSCENDENTAL PROOFS OF MENTAL CONTENT EXTERNALISM (IV-H)**

*Kenneth R. Westphal (University of East Anglia)*

The *Critique of Pure Reason* provides two genuinely transcendental proofs for (not “from”) mental content externalism. “Mental content externalism” is the thesis that various putatively “mental” contents can be had or can be identified only due to features of our environment. Proving this thesis transcendentally provides powerful support for realism *sans phrase* regarding objects and events in our environs.

**INTER-GROUP FORGIVENESS IN MULTICULTURAL DEMOCRACIES: SELF-RESPECT AND SELF-ESTEEM AS EVALUATIVE CRITERIA (III-J)**

*Kai Chong Wong (Washington University in St. Louis)*

Communities frequently disagree about when forgiving is acceptable. Some victimized communities refuse to forgive even after the offending communities have made ample amends, whereas others forgive without demanding the wrongdoers to change their ways. These different understandings of forgiveness are attributed to communities’ different historical, cultural, or religious backgrounds. But if forgiveness depends only on a community’s own view, intergroup forgiveness would not be productive due to the absence of overarching evaluative criteria.

In this paper, I maintain that self-respect and self-esteem, in both individual and collective senses, provide the evaluative criteria for assessing intergroup forgiveness in multicultural democracies. Specifically, I discuss the social and political bases of these values and their grounding in basic democratic institutions. I argue that victimized communities can determine whether to forgive their perpetrators on the basis of whether the latter are committed to support the social and political bases of their self-respect and self-esteem.

**HOW TO DO THINGS WITH REASONS (II-I)**

*Wayne Wu (University of California—Berkeley/Carnegie Mellon University)*

The philosophy and moral psychology of rational action have often been guided by two claims argued for by Donald Davidson: (A) reason-explanation of action is a species of causal explanation and (B) reasons are causes. I argue against these claims, dealing briefly with (B) but focusing on (A). By closely examining how explanations of action work, specifically, how we pose and answer questions about agent’s and their actions, I show that these questions often do not behave like typical questions requesting causal-explanation. I conclude that it is doubtful whether reason-explanations are causal and outline an alternative conception of how we do things with reasons in explaining action: we use our own capacities
for practical reasoning to provide a non-causal justification of why people act.

**Will, Intellect, and Cartesian Virtue (I-G)**

*Andrew D. Youpa (Southern Illinois University—Carbondale)*

Descartes appears to maintain that the will is free in so far as the intellect is clear and distinct. The less clear and distinct the intellect is, the less freedom the will possesses. Conversely, the clearer the intellect, the greater the will’s freedom. Thus the will, it seems, is in an important sense subordinate to the intellect. Yet, Descartes also maintains that virtue involves resolution. Without resolution, there is nothing to prevent an individual from undertaking what he does not regard as the best alternative. Thus the intellect appears to be subordinate to the will. In this paper I attempt to reconcile these seemingly conflicting views. First, I briefly present a *moderate intellectualist* reading of Cartesian freedom. Second, I argue that his theory of will is best understood as involving higher and lower orders of motivation. Cartesian virtue, I conclude, is a higher-order motivational disposition allied with reason.
ABSTRACTS OF INVITED AND SYMPOSIUM PAPERS

DELIBERATIVE DEMOCRACY AND THE EUROPEAN UNION: THE AIMS OF TRANSNATIONAL CONSTITUTIONALISM (I-B)
JAMES BOHMAN (ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY)

The European Union is often described as having a “democracy deficit.” This deficit goes deeper than even its harshest critics suppose. Its current treaties fail to provide a way in which “the peoples of Europe” can be the source of democratic renewal and change. Lacking a constitution (for the foreseeable future) to solve this problem, a paradox ensues: the EU may not be democratically legitimate enough to initiate its own democratic reform. I argue that there are three necessary conditions for legitimate institutions for such reform: these include formal, deliberative, and popular conditions. Even in the absence of fully constitutionalized conditions of formal legitimacy, it is still possible for the European Union to initiate democratic reform with deliberative and popular legitimacy, first and foremost in addressing the need for a democratic constitution. Second, I argue that the fundamental reflexive aim of any transnational constitution must be to create fuller conditions of legitimate democratic reform. Central to the reform of the EU is the development of a more robustly deliberative citizenship, in which citizens have the minimum normative powers necessary for genuine democratization. Even if there are abundant reasons why any EU constitution should concern itself with the complex organization of democratic authority across its various levels and iterated institutions, these formal issues cannot be addressed until the vicious circle of the democratic illegitimacy of the European Union is overcome. Finally, I suggest some ways in which these deliberative and popular deficits can be overcome through the process and aims of constitution making itself. The aim of this argument is to show the central importance of deliberative democracy in emerging transnational polities.

ON MAKING THE FINE-TUNING DESIGN ARGUMENT RIGOROUS (III-B)
ROBIN COLLINS (MESSIAH COLLEGE)

One important version of the design argument for theism is based on the fine-tuning of the cosmos for life. The central claim of this version is that the smallness of the life-permitting range for the values of the fundamental constants of physics provides significant evidence for theism. This argument is commonly cast into a broadly quasi-Bayesian inference pattern, in which it is claimed that the existence of a life-permitting universe is much more epistemically probable under theism than under the hypothesis that the
universe exists as an inexplicable brute fact. In this paper, I will propose a resolution to two major difficulties that quasi-Bayesian versions of the argument face. The first difficulty is that the claim that the life-permitting range is small only makes sense relative to some comparison range. Thus, a non-arbitrary method is needed to specify a sensible comparison range of possible values for the constants. The second difficulty involves justifying an epistemic probability measure—or some other measure that serves the same function—over this comparison range. This is needed to ground the claims of epistemic probability.

PARTISANSHIP AND INQUIRY IN PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION (V-B)

Paul Draper (Florida International University)

It is widely believed, especially by philosophers of religion, that philosophy of religion is flourishing. This paper challenges that belief, exploring how partisanship pervades and impedes inquiry in philosophy of religion. The paper has two main parts. In the first part, a sub-discipline of philosophy of religion called “philosophy of theism” is described. The distinction between philosophy of theism and natural theology is emphasized and the special value of the former is explained. The second part of the paper argues that philosophy of theism does not currently exist, partly because partisanship is deeply entrenched in contemporary philosophy of religion. In so-called “analytic” philosophy of religion, this partisanship manifests itself in two very different ways, depending on which of two epistemological frameworks plays host to it: internalist evidentialism or externalist perspectivalism (aka Reformed Epistemology). Evidentialist philosophers of religion who investigate the coherence and justification of theistic belief are typically not philosophers of theism although they should be, while Reformed Epistemologists not only are not but cannot be philosophers of theism.

DEMOCRACY AND THE JURY THEOREM: NEW SKEPTICAL REFLECTIONS (I-B)

David Estlund (Brown University)

Condorcet’s Jury Theorem establishes that individual voters that are better than random at making good or correct decisions will, under majority rule, be much better as a group than the average (or even the best) individual. As intriguing as this is for theories of democratic legitimacy or authority that emphasize the quality of democratic decisions, it turns out to be of very little use. One well-known difficulty is that the theorem is classically proven with only two alternatives. I critically discuss recent efforts to apply it to three or more alternatives. I introduce a new difficulty, the disjunction problem. Political alternatives, such as whether to build a system of roads, often (even normally) comprise a disjunction of more specific alternatives, such as which exact system of roads to build. This indeterminacy about the number of alternatives ruins the easy assumption that voters are better than random, since that means better than 1/n where n is the number of alternatives. Finally, there are Bayesian methods that seem to establish results similar to the Jury Theorem. I briefly argue that the disjunction problem applies equally to these. Some have thought that epistemic approaches to democracy must stand or fall with these formal approaches.
This often seems to be based on the assumption that these methods are our most promising way of understanding the way in which democratic discussion might bring differing perspectives to bear on a problem. It is important to see that this is a mistake, as can be made clear by emphasizing the utter absence of deliberation or communication from these statistical models. If there is epistemic value to democratic arrangements, it must be owing to communication and reasoning together, a set of mechanisms the Jury Theorem and the Bayesian approach do not begin to explore.

**ENÇ ON ACTION (I-E)**

*Fred Dretske (Duke University/Stanford University)*

Enç identifies actions with external changes (e.g., bodily movements) caused by reasons. I have argued that actions should be understood not as the movements reasons cause, but as a temporal (causal) process—reasons causing such movements. I discuss the relative merits of these two conceptions.

**INDUCTIVE LOGIC AND PROBABILISTIC EXPLANATION (II-A)**

*Branden Fitelson (University of California–Berkeley)*

In this paper, I will aim to do three things: (1) review two well-known “Hempelian” accounts of single-case probabilistic explanation due to Peter Railton and James Fetzer, (2) discuss David Lewis’s reasons for preferring Railton’s account over Fetzer’s, and (3) explain how something similar to Fetzer’s account can be salvaged (and even seen to be superior to Railton’s) by adopting a different (non-Lewisian) standard for the “goodness” (or strength) of an inductive argument. The main upshot of this paper will be that working with a proper conception of inductive logic opens the door to more plausible “Hempelian” accounts of single-case probabilistic explanation.

**TRUTH SUPERVENES ON BEING (I-A)**

*Trenton Merricks (University of Virginia)*

Truthmaker says that, for each truth, there is something or other that-by its mere existence-makes that truth true. Truthmaker is controversial, most obviously because of negative existentials. A claim like that there are no hobbits does not seem to be made true by the existence of anything.

Truth Supervenes on Being (TSB) says, roughly, that any two possible worlds alike with respect to what their contents are like are alike with respect to what is true. TSB has been defended by David Lewis, among others, as a way to capture the intuitions behind Truthmaker without inheriting Truthmaker’s problems.

I argue that TSB is no better than Truthmaker. That is, I argue that if TSB is to accommodate the motivations that drive Truthmaker, it must be recast in such a way that it inherits virtually all of Truthmaker’s problems. While I think this means that we should reject both Truthmaker and TSB, this paper argues only that the two stand or fall together.
POLYGENY AND PLEIOTROPY: HOW TO GET CAUSES FROM POWERS (II-E)

STEPHEN MUMFORD (UNIVERSITY OF NOTTINGHAM)

One advantage of a causal powers ontology is a possible solution to, or dissolution of, the problem of causation. At its most radical, the powers ontology suggests a radical re-conceptualization of the problem. Hume had unconnected existences that required a connecting causal relation, which was contingent and external. The powers ontology accepts necessary connections between distinct existences. Instead of contingent cause and effect, we have power and manifestation with a necessary connection between. Powers need not, however, show themselves in paradigmatic Humean events. Following Bhaskar, we can think of powers sometimes acting transfactually. I will be attempting to make sense of this claim.

Does a theory of causation fall unproblematically from the theory of powers? Not quite. The simple theory is that causation is a universal instantiated whenever a power is manifested. But it is implausible that every event is the manifestation of a power. Powers sometimes work with each other, and sometimes against each other, to produce an event.

Events are polygenic, produced by many powers with small additive effects. Powers are pleiotropic, contributing to many events. How then can the identity of a power be determined by its manifestation if a power’s manifestation varies in different contexts? Molnar’s solution: a power always makes exactly the same contribution to any event for which it is a part of the generative mechanism. Such a contribution is not usually to be found at the factive level of Humean events but at the underlying level of generative mechanisms.

I offer the following as new paradigms of causation:

(a) Two books lean against each other at 60º angles.

(b) A planet maintains a regular orbit around a star.

(c) A fridge magnet sits on a fridge, motionless.

Although there is little going on in the world of events, much is going on transfactually.

COSMOLOGICAL ARGUMENTS (I-D)

GRAHAM OPPY (MONASH UNIVERSITY)

In this paper, I start from the assumption that no cosmological argument that has been produced thus far is successful. The aim of my paper is to explain why it seems to me to be most unlikely to be that case that there is some other successful cosmological argument that remains to be discovered.

MATERIAL COINCIDENCE (IV-B)

L. A. PAUL (UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA)

Material constitution and coincidence are widely discussed but poorly understood. This paper is an attempt to make progress on understanding material coincidence by developing an account of how numerically distinct
material objects coincide when one constitutes the other. I address two central issues: first, do material coincidents A and B share their proper spatiotemporal parts, and if so, do they share all of them? Second, how can A and B share their spatiotemporal location and matter, so share material properties such as having mass m, shape s, and location l, but not share all their qualitative properties? My answers provide a map of the spatiotemporal mereological landscape and explain the underlying ontology of coincidence. This is important, since if we can adequately explicate coincidence, we can begin to answer questions about material constitution and related questions about de re modality, persistence, supervenience, redundant causation, event individuation, personal identity, nonreductive materialism in mind, and reference.

EXTENDED COGNITION AS A FRAMEWORK FOR EMPIRICAL PSYCHOLOGY: THE COSTS OUTWEIGHT THE BENEFITS (IV-F)

ROBERT RUPERT (UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO–BOULDER)

The hypothesis that human cognition extends into the environment can be understood as a claim about the subjects of cognitive states or, instead, as a claim about the implementation or realization of cognitive states. In this paper, I argue that neither approach offers a promising theoretical framework within which to pursue empirical psychology.

Considered as a theory of the subjects of cognitive states—i.e., as a claim about the systems that instantiate cognitive properties—the extended framework does substantial violence to productive research programs and methods in cognitive psychology. Fruitful psychological research compares systems’ reactions across different experimental conditions, constructs theories to account for subjects’ various responses, and designs new experiments to test those theories. Such methods require that the same systems (or the same kinds of system) be present through variations in conditions and experiments. The extended approach, however, treats each instance of the organism-plus-stimulus as a distinct cognitive system and offers no reason to think that the human organism plus one type of stimulus is of the same kind of system as the human organism together with a different type of stimulus.

The extended view fares no better as a theory concerning the realizers of cognitive states. Not just anything causally related to a cognitive state can count as part of the realizer of that state. The causal role of the realizer of a personal-level cognitive state must mirror the causal profile of the personal-level state so realized. Extended realizers typically do not satisfy this requirement, and for principled reasons.

In the final portion of the paper, I respond to arguments in favor of the extended framework, showing how the systems-based critique outlined above either outweighs or belies the benefits of adopting the extended view.
IN PRAISE OF INSTANCE CONFIRMATION (II-A)

MICHAEL STREVENS (NEW YORK UNIVERSITY)

The idea that the source of confirmation in science is the instantiation relation—that hypotheses are confirmed by their instances, and that everything else is confirmed indirectly by way of transmission rules such as Hempel’s Consequence Condition—is now considered utterly inadequate. It is therefore time to revive it. I will argue that the relation of instance confirmation has a role to play in scientific methodology that complements, rather than competing with, a modern account of inductive support such as Bayesian confirmation theory. When an instance confirms a hypothesis, it provides inductive support, but it also provides two things that other inductive supporters normally do not: first, a connection to ‘empirical data’ that makes science epistemically special, and second, inductive support not only for the hypothesis as a whole, but for its parts. On top of this, the importance of instance confirmation provides the foundation for an appealing account of the connection between scientific inference and explanation.

I then show that, when it is conceived in the right way, instance confirmation can duck the arguments most often thought to refute it, and I conclude by suggesting a causal account of instantiation, thus of instance confirmation, that looks to deliver on all of the foregoing promises.

JUSTIFICATION OF RELIGIOUS BELIEF (V-B)

RICHARD SWINBURNE (UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD)

Philosophy of religion in the 21st Century should continue to investigate more fully not merely the coherence and justification of the claim that there is a God, but also the coherence and justification of the detailed credal and moral claims of particular religions including Christianity. In recent years there has emerged a crucial division among epistemologists generally and philosophers of religion in particular between internalist (evidentialist) theories and externalist theories of justification. The practice of religion has certain goals—salvation for oneself and others and (for many religions) the worship of the true God. True beliefs about religion will help us attain these goals, or show them to be unattainable. So we should aim at beliefs with as high a degree of probability as we can attain. The higher the probability, the better justified the beliefs. But only on an internalist theory is there a procedure by which we can set about getting better justified beliefs. So it is the internal justification of beliefs which matters for the pursuit of religion. 21st Century Philosophy of Religion should seek to articulate the criteria of internalist justification and apply them to beliefs about religion.

THE IMPORTANCE OF DE-CENTERING DELIBERATIVE DEMOCRACY (I-B)

IRIS MARION YOUNG (UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO)

Conceptions of deliberative democracy frequently assume a centered conception of deliberation. That is, theories frequently assume that processes of deliberative democracy involve a single body deliberating together in a single encounter. This paper reviews arguments by Jurgen
Habermas and James Bohman that a centered understanding of deliberative democracy is problematic, and it offers additional reasons why this is so. Centered conceptions of deliberative democracy fail to theorize the mediations of politics and they tend to take insufficient critical distance from existing liberal democratic practice.
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North American Kant Society, **Thu, 5:15-7:15 p.m., Private Dining Room 4**

North American Nietzsche Society, **Thu, 5:15-7:15 p.m., Private Dining Room 18**

North American Nietzsche Society, **Sat, 12:15-2:15 p.m., Private Dining Room 16**

North American Society for Social Philosophy, **Thu, 7:30-10:30 p.m., Wabash Parlor**

North American Spinoza Society, **Thu, 5:15-7:15 p.m., Private Dining Room 5**
Group Sessions

North American Spinoza Society, Fri, 7:00-10:00 p.m., Parlor B

P
Personalist Discussion Group, Thu, 9:00 a.m.-Noon, Private Dining Room 17
Philosophers for Social Responsibility, Fri, 7:00-10:00 p.m., Wabash Parlor
Philosophy of Religion Group, Thu, 9:00 a.m.-Noon, Private Dining Room 7

R
Radical Philosophy Association, Thu, 9:00 a.m.-Noon, Wabash Parlor
Radical Philosophy Association, Thu, 7:30-10:30 p.m., Crystal Room

S
Society for Analytical Feminism, Fri, 7:00-10:00 p.m., Private Dining Room 18
Society for Analytical Feminism, Sat, 12:15-2:15 p.m., Private Dining Room 7
Society for Ancient Greek Philosophy, Fri, 7:00-10:00 p.m., Private Dining Room 9
Society for Asian and Comparative Philosophy, Thu, 7:30-10:30 p.m., Parlor B
Society for Asian and Comparative Philosophy, Fri, 7:00-10:00 p.m., Private Dining Room 5
Society for Bioethics and Classical Philosophy, Sat, 12:15-2:15 p.m., Crystal Room
Society for Business Ethics, Sat, 12:15-2:15 p.m., Private Dining Room 8
Society for Lesbian and Gay Philosophy, Thu, 5:15-7:15 p.m., Wabash Parlor
Society for Philosophy and Public Affairs, Thu, 5:15-7:15 p.m., Private Dining Room 6
Society for Philosophy and Technology, Thu, 7:30-10:30 p.m., Private Dining Room 4
Society for Philosophy and Technology, Sat, 12:15-2:15 p.m., Private Dining Room 5
Society for Philosophy in the Contemporary World, Sat, 12:15-2:15 p.m., Private Dining Room 9
Society for Realist-Antirealist Discussion, Thu, 9:00 a.m.-Noon, Parlor A
Society for Student Philosophers, Thu, 9:00 a.m.-Noon, Private Dining Room 18
Society for Student Philosophers, Fri, 7:00-10:00 p.m., Parlor D
Society for Systematic Philosophy, Fri, 7:00-10:00 p.m., Private Dining Room 4
Society for Systematic Philosophy, Fri, 7:00-10:00 p.m., Private Dining Room 4
Society for the Advancement of American Philosophy, Thu, 9:00 a.m.-Noon, Private Dining Room 8
Society for the Advancement of American Philosophy, Thu, 5:15-7:15 p.m., Parlor B
Society for the Metaphysics of Science, Thu, 5:15-7:15 p.m., Private Dining Room 16
Society for the Philosophic Study of Genocide and the Holocaust, Thu, 7:30-10:30 p.m., Private Dining Room 18
Society for the Philosophic Study of Genocide and the Holocaust, Fri, 7:00-10:00 p.m., Parlor A
Society for the Philosophic Study of the Contemporary Visual Arts, Thu, 7:30-10:30 p.m., Parlor A
Society for the Philosophic Study of the Contemporary Visual Arts, Sat, 12:15-2:15 p.m., Wabash Parlor
Society for the Philosophy of Creativity, Thu, 7:30-10:30 p.m., Private Dining Room 7
Society for the Philosophy of History, Thu, 7:30-10:30 p.m., Private Dining Room 8
Society for the Philosophy of History, Fri, 7:00-10:00 p.m., Private Dining Room 8
Society for the Study of Ethics and Animals, Thu, 5:15-7:15 p.m., Private Dining Room 9
Society for the Study of Husserl's Philosophy, Fri, 7:00-10:00 p.m., Private Dining Room 6
Society for the Study of Indian and Tibetan Buddhist Philosophy, Fri, 7:00-10:00 p.m., Private Dining Room 17
Society for the Study of Indian and Tibetan Buddhist Philosophy, Sat, 12:15-2:15 p.m., Parlor A
Society for the Study of Process Philosophy, Thu, 9:00 a.m.-Noon, Private Dining Room 17
Søren Kierkegaard Society, Fri, 7:00-10:00 p.m., Parlor C

W
William James Society, Thu, 9:00 a.m.-Noon, Parlor C
APA Placement Service

Lindsay Palkovitz will be the Coordinator for the APA Placement Service at the 2006 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 26:  Placement Information, 5:00 – 10:00 p.m., Salon 1 (3rd Floor (S))
Placement Interviewing, 5:00 – 10:00 p.m., Salon 3 (3rd Floor (S))

Thursday, April 27:  Placement Information, 9:00 a.m. – 7:00 p.m., Salon 1 (3rd Floor (S))
Placement Interviewing, 9:00 a.m. – 7:00 p.m., Salon 3 (3rd Floor (S))

Friday, April 28:  Placement Information, 9:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m., Salon 1 (3rd Floor (S))
Placement Interviewing, 9:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m., Salon 3 (3rd Floor (S))

Saturday, April 29:  Placement Information, 9:00 a.m. – Noon, Salon 1 (3rd Floor (S))
Placement Interviewing, 9:00 a.m. – Noon, Salon 3 (3rd Floor (S))

APA Placement Service Locations

The Placement Services will be located in Salon 1 (3rd floor (S)) of The Palmer House Hilton Hotel as outlined below. For your convenience, maps of the hotel appear at the back of this issue.

Job Candidates – Salon 1 (3rd Floor (S))

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 – SALON 1 (3RD FLOOR (S))**

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 – SALON 3 (3RD FLOOR (S))**

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) 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 in Salon 1 (3rd floor (S)) to receive one.

JOB CANDIDATES’ AREA – SALON 1 (3RD FLOOR (S))

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 29, 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 located in Salon 3 (3rd Floor (S)). 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 INTERVIEWS

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 (Salon 2 (S)) 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, 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 (Salon 1, 3rd Floor (S)). 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. 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 located in Salon 1 (3rd Floor (S)). 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 located in Salon 1 (3rd Floor S), 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.*
Placement Service Registration for Interviewing Departments
APA 2006 Central Division Meeting
Palmer House Hilton, Chicago, Illinois
April 26-29, 2006

Only one form is required for each interviewing department. Fax to (302) 831-8690.

Institution: ___________________________ Department: ___________________________
Contact: _____________________________ Phone: _____________________________
City, State: ___________________________ Email: _____________________________

All persons conducting interviews should be registered** for the Central Division Meeting as well as the department being registered with the Placement Service.

**Registered members of the department who will be conducting interviews:

Our department will: (Please Check)
___ need interviewing table(s) ______ Quantity of Tables
___ conduct interviews in a hotel suite (you must contact Linda Smallbrook to reserve a suite)

Our department will: (Please Check)
___ provide suite # and list of prearranged candidates to whom suite information may be given
–or–
___ bring suite # and allow service to give to anyone who requests it

Our department will: (Please Check)
___ conduct prearranged interviews only
–or–
___ accept interview requests on-site

Position advertised in (circle those that apply): Oct. JFP, Nov. JFP, Feb. JFP, Web ONLY Ad, or On-Site

Registration Fees (Please Check One): ______ Pre-Registration, By April 7: $50.00
                                                *Regular Registration, After April 7: $75.00

Credit Card Type: (Circle One) VISA / MASTERCARD

Credit Card #: __________________________ Phone #: __________________________
Exp. Date: _______ Last 3 Digits on back of card: _______
Name on Card: ___________________________ Phone #: __________________________
Signature: ___________________________ Email: ___________________________

***Check #: _______ Check Date: _______ Check Amount _______

***Payable to: The American Philosophical Association. The APA only accepts checks drawn on
U.S. banks in U.S. funds, or Int’l. Money Orders in U.S. funds. There is a $20 charge for all returned
checks. **If PAYMENT is not received in our office by April 7, 2006 you MUST pay the on-site fee!
Please mail form and payment to: Attn: Lindsay Palkovitz, Placement, The American Philosophical Association, 31 Amstel Avenue, University of Delaware, Newark, DE 19716.
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.
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AMERICAN PHILOSOPHICAL ASSOCIATION
CENTRAL DIVISION
DRAFT MINUTES: 2005 BUSINESS MEETING

PALMER HOUSE HILTON HOTEL, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
WABASH PARLOR
FRIDAY, APRIL 29, 2005

1. Call to Order: President Karl Ameriks called the meeting to order at 12:15 p.m. and appointed William Tolhurst parliamentarian.

2. Approval of Minutes: The draft Minutes of the 2004 meeting, as printed in Proceedings and Addresses of the APA, Vol. 78 #4 (February 2005), pp. 141-145, were approved without correction.

3. Report on the 2005 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.]

Following this report, Richard DeGeorge asked whether it was wise for the Division to continue to meet in Chicago for successive years. Secretary-Treasurer Smith responded that the two most recent non-Chicago meetings had seen problematic attendance and led to annual deficits for the Division and that the Palmer House was providing enhancements to the existing 2006 contract in return for the extension to following years. DeGeorge also asked about the question of changing the time of the annual meeting to the fall, a matter that had been the subject of considerable discussion within the Division in past years. Smith responded that many practical obstacles have become apparent for a fall meeting, including the difficulty of finding a suitable time that does not conflict with beginnings of academic terms in late August and September and is not too close to the Eastern Division meeting. A further issue is the role of the Central Division meeting, at its present late-April time, in the Placement Service operations of the Association (primarily for temporary and replacement positions). Finally, research has shown that except for the Labor Day weekend (which is not favored by members), convention room rates are likely to be significantly higher for a fall meeting in Chicago and most other likely cities.
4. **Report of the Nominating Committee:** Vice President Eleonore Stump presented the Report of the 2004-2005 Nominating Committee, as printed in *Proceedings and Addresses of the APA*, Vol. 78 #4 (February 2005), p. 153, on behalf of Past President and Nominating Committee Chair Stephen Darwall, who was absent. President Karl Ameriks 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. None were proposed. The list of nominees as prepared by the Nominating Committee is therefore to be sent to mail ballot.

5. **Reports from the Board of Officers, the National Office, APA Committees:** Stephanie Lewis, Treasurer of the Association, gave a report on behalf of Acting Chair of the Board Karen Hanson, who was unable to attend. She noted that the current Executive Director had announced his resignation effective June 30, 2005, and that the Acting Chair’s term also ended June 30 (unless it is extended). The Board is currently negotiating for an interim Executive Director to serve during a search for a new Executive Director.

A number of questions were raised from the floor concerning this report and the current state of the Association. George Leaman said that he did not feel he had access to sufficient information concerning the operations of the Association and that he wanted to know more in particular about the costs associated with recent Executive Director searches and transitions. Stephanie Lewis said that she did not have detailed cost information at hand and added that many things in the operations of the Association were proceeding smoothly. Alison Jaggar said that she did not have a clear understanding of what the fundamental issues of governance are concerning the Association and especially whether there are any issues of principle involved. William McBride said that he dissented from the claim that many things are going smoothly in the operations of the Association. Responding to the question of details of costs of Executive Director transitions, Stephanie Lewis said that there were confidentiality issues concerning some of those and that she would undertake a study of the budget reports.

6. **Recognition of Graduate Student Travel Stipend Winners:** President Karl Ameriks read the names of those who had received Graduate Student Travel Stipend Awards, as printed on pages 5-6 of the *Proceedings and Addresses of the APA*, Vol. 78 #4 (February 2005).

7. **New Business:** Under New Business, Alison Jaggar proposed the following resolution:

“The Central Division expresses its concern about reported problems in the operations of the APA National Office and requests the Board of Officers to sponsor a session concerning the governance and structure of the Association at the next Divisional meeting.”

This was seconded by Eleonore Stump. In response to a question of order, Parliamentarian William Tolhurst ruled that the motion was in order as an item of New Business. In the lengthy discussion that
followed, Allan Gibbard said that passing such a motion would not preclude members of the Executive Committee present at the meeting from adding more information if they wished. George Leaman spoke in favor of the motion and said that he did not have enough information about the finances of the APA. Vivian Weil said that perhaps those at the Business Meeting were not knowledgeable enough to know what questions should be asked of the Board. Richard Fumerton said that there were varying perspectives on the APA's operations and that it would be helpful if there were a way to establish a single story. Allan Gibbard asked the members of the Executive Committee present to give their impressions concerning these issues. In response, Divisional Representative Margaret Atherton commented briefly on the ongoing process of considering changes to the Association's Bylaws and Robin Smith reviewed the history of that process. Vice President Eleonore Stump said that she was considering moving that the Division request the Board of Officers to establish procedures for the collection of information about the opinions of members, but she did not make a motion. George Leaman said that it would be important for Board members to be present at the meeting which is the subject of the motion on the floor. Allan Gibbard said that issues currently confronting the Association included personnel issues and that confidentiality obligations in this connection legitimately impeded some flow of information to members generally. He also expressed the view that some officers of the Association had behaved “heroically” in dealing with recent issues and said that he feared it would be difficult to secure this sort of commitment from others in the future. Treasurer Stephanie Lewis asked whether the publication of Minutes of the meetings of the Board of Officers provides sufficient transparency. William McBride responded that this was not sufficient because the Minutes usually record only actions taken and not also the views of those who dissent. Vivian Weil said that she would like to see more candor in public discussions concerning the Association’s operations and structure. Following discussion, the motion passed by a vote of 10 in favor, 0 opposed.

8. **Memorial:** President Karl Ameriks read the names of those members of the Association who had died since the last meeting of the Central Division:

Nora K. Bell
Francis Willard Brush
James T. Culbertson
Robert Denoon Cumming
Paul Edwards
Alan Gewirth (Central Division President 1973-74)
Jonathan Gold
Lewis E. Hahn
Stuart Newton Hampshire (Eastern Division President 1969-70; Pacific Division President 1990-91)
Carl F. H. Henry
Alvin Jacob Holloway
W. Murray Hunt
Robert H. Hurlbutt
Dominick A. Iorio
Milton R. Konvitz
Louis H. Mackey
Stanley Malinovich
Mario Mignucci
Robert J. Mullins
Stanley Paluch
Francis H. Parker
Philip L. Quinn (Eastern Division Secretary-Treasurer 1970-73; Central Division President 1994-95; Acting Chair of Board of Officers 1995-96; Chair of Board of Officers 1996-1999)
Robert J. Roth
Vernon M. Root
W. Richard Schubart
Robert G. Shoemaker
Erling R. Skorpen
James F. Tomberlin*
Robert G. Turnbull (Central Division President 1977-78; Chair of Board of Officers 1988-1992)
Henry M. Walton
Douglas Weber
Richard Wisan
Warren C. Young

*James E. Tomberlin died in Oct. 2002; the APA was notified of his death in Nov. 2004.

9. **Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned at 1:36 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Robin Smith, Secretary-Treasurer
APA Central Division
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AMERICAN PHILOSOPHICAL ASSOCIATION
CENTRAL DIVISION
DRAFT MINUTES OF THE 2005 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
CRESTHILL ROOM, PALMER HOUSE HILTON HOTEL
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
APRIL 27, 2005

Present: Karl Ameriks, Margaret Atherton, Stephen Darwall, Daniel Farrell, Richard Fumerton, Eleonore Stump, Joan Weiner. Guest: Karen Hanson, Acting Chair of the Board of Officers.

1. Call to Order: President Karl Ameriks called the meeting to order at 7:14 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes: The Minutes of the 2004 meeting, as printed in the Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association 78.4 [February 2005], pp. 147-151, were approved as printed.

3. Approval of Agenda: The proposed agenda was approved by consensus.

4. Discussion with the Acting Chair: Karen Hanson reviewed the recent history of events concerning the position of Executive Director of the APA and the current situation with respect to the choice of an Interim Executive Director, the search for a new Executive Director, and the election of a new Chair of the Board of Officers. A lengthy discussion of these issues with members of the Executive Committee followed. Following the discussion, the Executive Committee unanimously adopted the following resolution, on motion by Eleonore Stump:

“The Executive Committee of the American Philosophical Association, Central Division, expresses its most profound gratitude to Karen Hanson for her willingness to take on the demanding job of Acting Chair of the Board of Officers and working tirelessly, selflessly, and skillfully in discharging the duties of that office.”

5. John Dewey Lecture Proposal: Karen Hanson presented a proposal from the John Dewey Foundation to underwrite the costs of organizing a session each year at the Central Division’s annual meeting at which distinguished American philosophers would discuss their own work.
Each session is to be followed by a reception open to all those attending the meeting, to permit further informal discussion. The Dewey Foundation will provide funding for the lecturer’s travel expenses, an honorarium, and the costs of the reception. In discussion, Hanson said that the Dewey Foundation would leave the choice of philosopher for each session and the organization of the session up to the Central Division Program Committee for that year and that the session is not expected to be scheduled as a plenary session. Following discussion, the Executive Committee unanimously adopted the following motion:

“The Executive Committee of the American Philosophical Association is pleased to accept with thanks the generous offer from the John Dewey Foundation to establish a John Dewey Lecture as a regular event at Central Division annual meetings and refers the choice of a lecturer and organization of the session for 2006 to the 2006 Program Committee.”

6. **Report of the 2004-2005 Nominating Committee:** Past President Stephen Darwall, Chair *ex officio* of the 2004-2005 Nominating Committee, reported the nominees for Central Division officers to be elected in the 2005 elections as follows:

   **For Vice-President and President-Elect:**
   - Ted Cohen (University of Chicago)
   - Alison Jaggar (University of Colorado)
   - Thomas McCarthy (Northwestern University)

   **For Member-at-Large of the Executive Committee, term 2004-2007:**
   - Marilyn Friedman (Washington University)
   - Louise Antony (Ohio State University)
   - Daniel M. Hausman (University of Wisconsin)

   **For the 2005-2006 Nominating committee (4 to be elected):**
   - Frederick Beiser (Syracuse University)
   - John Deigh (University of Texas–Austin)
   - Justin D’Arms (Ohio State University)
   - Marilyn Frye (Michigan State University)
   - Richard Grandy (Rice University)
   - Charles Mills (University of Illinois–Chicago)
   - Janet Kourany (University of Notre Dame)
   - Candace Vogler (University of Chicago)

7. **Report on Plans for the 2006 Meeting:** Secretary-Treasurer Smith reported on the state of planning for the 2006 meeting, including the tentative plan to allow electronic submission of papers, following the procedure used by the Eastern Division for its 2005 meeting (see below; Item 11).

that registration income for 2004 fell short of projections, though still much improved over 2003. He projected a budget for 2005 with revenues (including transfers from the pooled advertising revenues of the Divisions) essentially equalling expenses (the actual revenue and expenses for 2005 will not be known until after the 2005 meeting). For 2006, he again projected a budget with expenses approximately equal to revenues. After discussion, Stephen Darwall proposed that the Secretary-Treasurer’s annual stipend be increased from $6600 (at which figure it was set in 1997) to $10,000. Secretary-Treasurer Smith noted that he would of course be required to abstain from voting on this measure but expressed his opinion that this was an unnecessary expense and stated that he would not accept the increase if it were approved. With the Secretary-Treasurer not voting, the increase was approved as proposed.

9. Expansion of Graduate Student Travel Stipends: Stephen Darwall moved that the Division expand the awards of Graduate Student Travel Stipends to include all graduate students who have papers accepted for presentation at the annual meeting. In discussion, Secretary-Treasurer Smith indicated that the number of accepted papers by graduate student authors had in recent years typically been about 15 and that increasing the program to include all graduate students would therefore, at the current rate of $300 per award, add a cost of about $1500 to the Division’s annual budget. The proposal was approved unanimously.

10. Accessibility of Meetings: Secretary-Treasurer Smith called the Executive Committee’s attention to the legal obligations of the Division, under the Americans with Disabilities Act, to take all reasonable measures to make meetings accessible to attendees with disabilities. He noted that this is now a standard provision of any meeting contract. The Executive Committee directed the Secretary-Treasurer to consult with the National Office and the Secretary-Treasurers of the other two Divisions in working to assure that the annual meetings of the Division are accessible to all members.

11. Electronic Submission of Papers: On motion by Eleonore Stump, seconded by Stephen Darwall, the Executive Committee voted unanimously to permit electronic submission of papers to the annual meeting, using the system maintained by the National Office.

12. Report on Newly Affiliated Groups: Secretary-Treasurer Smith reported that he had received and approved requests for affiliation from the following groups since the 2003 meeting:

- History of Early Analytic Philosophy Society
- International Association for Computers and Philosophy
- International Association for the Philosophy of Sport
- Josiah Royce Society
- Society of Humanist Philosophers
13. **Proposal for 2007 and 2008 Meetings:** The Executive Committee considered a proposal from the Palmer House to host the 2007 and 2008 meetings in addition to the 2006 meeting as currently contracted. The proposal included a lock of the room rate through 2007, with a small increase for 2008, and a reduction in the room block for 2006 with no reduction in contracted meeting room space (this is a benefit since it reduces the number of sleeping rooms that must be sold to avoid paying attrition charges). The Palmer House will also extend a preferential rate to the Association for the 2005 and 2006 meetings of the Board of Officers. Noting the consistent pattern of higher attendance at Chicago meetings than at other sites and the problems with low attendance in recent meetings in Minneapolis and Cleveland, the Executive Committee voted to accept the proposal.

14. **Report of Actions Taken Since the 2003 Meeting:** Secretary-Treasurer Smith reported that the following actions were taken by the Executive Committee through email discussion and vote since its 2003 meeting:

   July 29: Discussed whether to adopt a policy concerning the deadline for submitted papers similar to the Eastern Division’s policy (absolutely no papers received with a postmark after the deadline will be considered whatever) or the Pacific Division’s policy (exceptions can be made for extreme circumstances such as natural disasters, strikes, etc.). After considerable discussion, no explicit policy was adopted and the subject was deferred for later discussion.

   October 21: In response to a request from the 2005 Program Committee to extend the number of Graduate Student Travel Stipends from ten to thirteen for this year, the Executive Committee agreed by consensus to extend the number and also placed on the agenda for its 2005 meeting the question whether to adopt the policy for future years of providing a Stipend to every graduate student whose paper is accepted.

15. **Adjournment:** The meeting adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

   Respectfully submitted,

   Robin Smith

   Secretary-Treasurer, APA Central Division
REPORT OF THE 2005-2006 NOMINATING COMMITTEE

The 2005-2006 Central Division Nominating Committee, composed of Karl Ameriks (Chair), John Deigh, Marilyn Frye, Charles W. Mills, and Candace Vogler, proposes the following nominations for 2005:

FOR VICE-PRESIDENT AND PRESIDENT-ELECT:

Alison M. Jaggar (University of Colorado)
Robert B. Pippin (University of Chicago)
James 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)

*Note: Marilyn Friedman is currently Member-at-Large of the Executive Committee, term 2005-2008. If she is elected as Divisional Representative, 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 her term.

FOR EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBER-AT-LARGE, TERM 2006-2009:

Charlotte Brown (Illinois Wesleyan University)
Thomas McCarthy (Northwestern University)
Timothy McCarthy (University of Illinois–Urbana-Champaign)

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)

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 2005 APA CENTRAL DIVISION ELECTIONS

In the May-June 2005 Central Division mail ballot, the following Central Division members were elected to Divisional offices:

Ted Cohen was elected Vice President for 2005-2006 (and thus President for 2006-2007).

Marilyn Friedman was elected Member at Large of the Executive Committee for 2005-2008.

John Deigh, Marilyn Frye, Charles Mills, and Mark Kaplan were elected to the 2005-2006 Nominating Committee.)
LIST OF BOOK EXHIBITORS

A complete list of book exhibitors will be available online (www.apaonline.org) and at the Central Division Meeting.
LIST OF ADVERTISERS

BEDFORD/ST. MARTIN’S (A-178)
BLACKWELL PUBLISHING (A-162-164)
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS (A-171)
CONTINUUM PUBLISHING (A-165)
LONGMAN PUBLISHERS (A-170)
McGRAW-HILL HIGHER EDUCATION (A-176-177)
Norton (A-179)
OPEN COURT PUBLISHING (A-179)
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS (A-166-167)
PENN STATE PRESS (A-168-169)
PHILOSOPHY DOCUMENTATION CENTER (A-OUTSIDE BACK COVER)
PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS (A-180)
PROMETHEUS BOOKS (A-173)
ROUTLEDGE (A-174-175)
SUNY PRESS (A-INSIDE FRONT COVER)
THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF PHILOSOPHY TEACHERS (A-INSIDE BACK COVER)
WADSWORTH, THOMSON LEARNING (A-172)
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)


*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)


**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)
Members who need childcare during the 2006 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.

Please check at Registration or on the APA's website prior to the meeting for additional information concerning child care.
HOTEL DIAGRAMS

THE PALMER HOUSE HILTON - THIRD FLOOR

LOWER EXHIBIT HALL - SALONS 4 - 12
BOOK EXHIBITS
REGISTRATION AND PLACEMENT
CRYSTAL ROOM
HALLWAY
PDR = PRIVATE DINING ROOM

WABASH PARLOR