

# Indiana Philosophical Association

## *Fall Meeting*

**Saturday, 1 November 2003**

**At Ball State University  
Muncie, Indiana  
Pittenger Student Center**

### ***Program Announcement***

- 9:30            Coffee
- 10:00            *Aristotelian Egoism and Richard Kraut's Argument from Ostracism*  
Erik Weilenberg, Depauw University  
Commentator: Greg Sadler, Ball State University
- 11:00            *Lucretius on Fear of Death*  
Charles Hobbs, Southern Illinois University  
Commentator: Tom Howaldt, Franklin College
- 12:00            Lunch
- 1:30:            Business Meeting
- 2:00            *Gareth Evans vs. Walker Evans: Photography and Thought*  
Nat Hansen, University of Chicago  
Commentator: Jared Bates, IU Southeast
- 3:00            *Not Every Cell is Sacred: A Reply to Charo*  
Russell DiSilvestro, Bowling Green State University  
Commentator: Bradley Sickler, Purdue University

Driving to Ball State: From I-69, take Exit 41 (Muncie/Frankton) at State Highway 332. Follow Highway 332 East for approximately 8 miles until you come to Tillotson Avenue (it will be the 4th stop light). Turn right onto Tillotson. Proceed on Tillotson until you come to the 4th stoplight, which will be West University Avenue. Turn left onto University Avenue. The Student Center will be on your right at the second pedestrian crossing light. Parking is available west, south, and east of the Student Center. For directions to I-69, see: [www.bsu.edu](http://www.bsu.edu). Click on the button for perspective students. There will be a button on the left for directions to campus.

***Aristotelian Egoism and Richard Kraut's Argument from Ostracism***  
**Erik Weilenberg, Depauw University**

(AE) An ethically virtuous person always chooses a course of action that he believes promote his own eudaimonia at least as much as any other course of action he could have chosen. In his important book *Aristotle on the Human Good*, Richard Kraut argues against the view that Aristotle is an egoist. One of his arguments, which I call "the argument from ostracism", would, if sound, prove that Aristotle does not hold (AE). After making the case that Aristotle does indeed hold (AE), I rebut Kraut's argument from ostracism.

***Lucretius on Fear of Death***  
**Charles Hobbs, Southern Illinois University**

In this essay I discuss Lucretius' position on the fear of death, as found in Book III of his *De Rerum Natura* ("On the Nature of Things"). After some preliminary remarks, I examine Lucretius' so-called symmetry argument, which is a device meant to persuade us that death should not be feared. As part of this, I defend his view against Thomas Nagel's attack on it. While the discussion is largely one of mortality and death, I suggest that a significant corresponding issue here is that of the appropriate attitude toward life.

***Gareth Evans vs. Walker Evans: Photography and Thought***  
**Nat Hansen, University of Chicago**

This paper offers a counter-example to Russell's Principle, the foundation of Gareth Evan's theory of sense in *Varieties of Reference*. By explaining and challenging Evans's peculiar view of how we direct our thought at objects in photograph, I show that the requirement of individuating knowledge (the standard set by Russell's Principle) cannot be met in the case of reference to objects in photographs. Because Evans is committed to providing a theory of the adequacy of our thoughts (where adequate thoughts are thoughts that satisfy Russell's Principle), he must explain what form our thoughts about objects in photographs take. His explanation cannot capture the sense in which we can refer to object is photographs. I suggest some possible alternative explanations open to Evans, but none of these succeed in showing how our thought about objects in photographs can be adequate. Our ability to successfully refer to objects in **photographs**, therefore, is a counter-example to Russell's Principle.

***Not Every Cell is Sacred: A Reply to Charo***  
**Russell DiSilvestro, Bowling Green State University**

Recently, Massimo Reichlin presented a clarification and defense of the "argument from potential" to the conclusion that the human embryo should be protected from the moment of conception. But in her clever essay title "Every Cell is Sacred: Logical Consequence of the Argument from Potential in the Age of Cloning," R. Alta Charo claim that versions of the argument from potential like Reichlin's are vulnerable to a rather embarrassing problem. I shall argue that Charo has failed to make her case because she does not distinguish between the sort of potential possessed by the somatic cell and the sort of potential possessed by the early human embryo.