

**INDIANA PHILOSOPHICAL ASSOCIATION**

**SPRING MEETING**

**BUTLER UNIVERSITY  
INDIANAPOLIS**

**Atherton 326**

**Saturday, April 7, 2001**

**Schedule:**

9:30-10:00    **Coffee and Refreshments**

10:00-11:00    **Reasoning from this Universe to Many: Cosmic Fine-Tuning and Total Evidence**  
Michael Thrush, University of Notre Dame

11:00-12:00    **Genetic Manipulation: A Utilitarian Perspective**  
James Hudson, Northern Illinois University

Noon:            **Lunch**

1:30-2:00      **IPA Business Meeting**

2:00-3:00      **What Is Knowledge? Getting beyond Gettier**  
Stephen Crowley, Indiana University (Bloomington)

3:00-4:00      **Derrida, Sartre, and the Event: Two Takes on the Death of Marx**  
Peter Gratton, DePaul University

Accompanying this announcement are abstracts of the papers and two maps; on the campus map the Atherton Union, where the meeting will be held, has been indicated with an arrow.

Paper Title: *Derrida, Sartre, and the Event: Two Takes on the Death of Marx*

Abstract:

This paper will take up a number of connections between the texts of Derrida and Sartre with regard to the work of Karl Marx. In this paper, I take up two tropes common to both Sartre and Derrida's reading of Marx: the possibility of the event and a detour through Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. For Sartre and Derrida, our responsibility to Marx, may never be fulfilled; our future is not foretold in the last chapter of a new secular Bible of Marx. Like Hamlet, though, we are cursed with a responsibility to justice. Whatever the tragedies of Marxism, it is this responsibility, for Sartre and Derrida, which still remains.

**ABSTRACT:** From the time of Plato until the 1960's, the characterization of knowledge as justified true belief was regarded as essentially correct. This state of affairs however did not survive Edmund Gettier's 1963 paper, 'Is Justified True Belief Knowledge?'. Initial responses to Gettier attempted to 'patch' the 'classic' view, lack of success with this approach led to more radical responses. The goal of this paper is to reveal a new way of thinking about what knowledge is that retains what is of value in the 'classic' view while avoiding the difficulties I will identify with the 'patch' accounts.

# Reasoning From This Universe to Many: Cosmic Fine-Tuning and Total Evidence

## ABSTRACT

Some argue that intelligent design is the best explanation for the physical constants taking life-permitting values. However, physicists typically suggest that there are many universes, each having its constants determined randomly. One will very probably be life-permitting just by chance. Roger White argues that the physicists can't explain why *this* universe is life-permitting, since any attempt violates a principle he calls the total evidence requirement. This requirement is too strong, and would invalidate much statistical reasoning based on sampling. When the requirement is corrected the physicist's reasoning is vindicated, provided that if there are other universes, we could have been born into any of them. We could.

Word Count: 4000

Title: Genetic Manipulation: A Utilitarian Perspective

Author: James Hudson  
Associate Professor of Philosophy  
Northern Illinois University  
DeKalb, IL 60115  
Email: [jhudson@niu.edu](mailto:jhudson@niu.edu)  
Tel.: (815) 753-6414

Abstract: I briefly review and endorse the argument that techniques of genetic engineering ought to be used, as they become available, to enhance human beings, especially to increase their intelligence. I then focus on the apparently more problematic use of biotechnology to produce subordinate or inferior life-forms of novel sorts, including (perhaps) degenerate forms of human beings. I list the ordinary practical motives that might lead one to want to do this are, along with simple scientific curiosity, which would be the main motive for producing a human-chimpanzee hybrid (probably technically possible). I fail to discover any broad philosophical objection to the creation of novel inferior life-forms, including the human-chimp hybrid. Neither utilitarianism nor a Kantian principle of respect for rational natures provides the basis for any such objection.