

## **ABSTRACTS**

### **Putting the Screws to Retributivism and the Utilitarian Deterrence Theory**

Vince Luizzi

This essay investigates the possibility of replacing the approach of doing bad to the offender as a response to crime with one of requiring the offender to do good.

---

### **Kant and Dewey on Aesthetic Feeling**

Phillip Seng

The purpose of this paper is to explicate the central tenets of Kant's aesthetic theory and then place Dewey's instrumental aesthetics in contrast to it. An understanding of the crucial roles of knowledge and the way in which experience is given in both philosophies will be the result of this endeavor. A brief sketch of relevant aspects of Dewey's ideas serves as a jumping off point to begin the explication of Kant's system. After that work is completed, we will again revisit Dewey's philosophy to highlight the essential differences between the two thinkers.

In short, Kantian aesthetics differs from Dewey's instrumental views in their conception of knowledge and its role in aesthetic experience. Kant placed aesthetic pleasure apart from cognition, at arm's length, as a tantalizing propellant to copy nature's innate beauty. In his description of cognition in general, purposiveness without a purpose and the supersensible substrate of humanity, Kant kept the object of aesthetic pleasure separate and distinct from something known. Dewey placed aesthetic experience as the most intense form of human understanding, an experience that could be utilized to transform one's life. As such, it must of necessity be known, engaged, and utilized to allow or effect a transformation of one's self. Dewey believed that experience only immediately felt could give no pleasure at all, for pleasure was the result of acknowledgment and enjoyment of experience.

---

## Darwin and the Golden Rule

Joe Barnhart

We may acknowledge three separate elements of morality: (1) *content*, (2) *sources*, and (3) *motives*. At the heart of moral content, promise keeping both solicits and elicits the trust essential to community life. This may be called the objective and universal center of morality. Without it, language could not have evolved.

The sources of morality seem so numerous that no one has discovered them all. They are like the thousands of tributaries to the Mississippi River. One major source is those human desires and interests that require group participation for their satisfaction. By seeing more clearly how morality has emerged and developed, however, we better understand how *ought* is rooted in *is* and is empty if cut off from it. The divine command hypothesis makes no progress toward resolving the *is/ought* question.

Morality has deep roots in strict cooperation in the pursuit of *common interests*. The human body came about and has survived because of genetic cooperation. Common goals draw individuals together; and as people carry out the essential duties in pursuit of the common interests, the social bond strengthens.

For David Hume, sympathy was a significant element of morality, and benevolence (or what he called “humanity”) was a special original instinct. Learning from Darwin, Herbert Spencer argued that in the struggle for survival, feelings of sociality and sympathy were selected because they strengthened the cooperativeness required for success in the struggle. Nevertheless, he coined the phrases “the code of amity” and “the code of enmity” in exploring Darwin’s paradox: natural conscience requires allegiance to a dual code that enforces (1) the duty of hostility toward outsiders perceived as encroachers and (2) the duty to favor insiders.

Kant’s ideal of goodwill toward all, of regarding no one as a means only, may be viewed as the attempt to expand amity by, paradoxically, encroaching on the territory of enmity and thus including everyone within the Kingdom of Ends. Darwin believed the noblest of all human attributes was “summed up in that short but imperious word *ought*.” He thought his special contribution was that of approaching the question of the moral sense “exclusively from the standpoint of natural history. . . . I have so lately endeavored to show that the social instinct

Abstract

the prime principle of man’s moral constitution with the aid of active intellectual powers and the effects of habit, naturally lead to the golden rule, ‘As ye would that men should do to you, do ye to them likewise;’ and this lies at the foundation of morality” (*The Descent*).

---

## Jews and the Resurrection

Gil Fulmer

Some Christian apologists argue that the Resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth is supported by the alleged fact that the Jews of his day did not disprove it. That is, they claim, the Jews were motivated to disprove the Resurrection, they were in a position to do so, and yet they did not. Since they would have done so if the Resurrection had *not* occurred, the argument runs, it must in fact have occurred.

I argue in this paper that this reasoning is unsound. It fails to recognize the historical, cultural, political and psychological situation occupied by the Jews of Jerusalem at the time—their *sitz im leben*.

In particular, the Christian argument above attributes to the first-century Jews the same appreciation of Jesus’ significance that later thinkers would recognize, in the light of the subsequent development of Christianity. The Jews of that time had no reason to attach any great importance to Jesus or his doings. Therefore, they had no reason to conduct any thorough investigation into the events surrounding his death; any “refutation” that might have taken place would likely have been just casual conversation, leading them to conclude that the claims for the Resurrection were without basis. In other words, the “refutation” would probably have been the same sort that we conduct of claims made for contemporary cults. Moreover, this sort of “refutation” would almost certainly never have made it into any formal historical records. Therefore, the fact that we have no knowledge of any refutation by the Jews does not show that the Resurrection occurred.

---

## Isaac Newton as Religious Scholar

Bill Austin

Newton devoted more time and effort to studies related to theology and the history of religions than he did to the investigations that made him famous. His executors found a great mass of unpublished manuscripts, some of the highlights of which are briefly surveyed in this paper, along with some of the reasons he left them unpublished. Topics discussed include his anti-trinitarian polemics, his attempts to recover the synthesis of scientific and religious knowledge that he thought the ancients had possessed, and his interpretations of biblical apocalyptic prophecies.

## CONTRIBUTORS

**Bill Austin** is Professor of Philosophy at The University of Houston. His specializations are philosophy of religion, philosophy of science, inductive logic, and decision theory. He holds a B.D. and a Ph.D. from Yale University.

**Joe Barnhart** has published in numerous journals and is the author of six books. He is Professor of Philosophy and Religious Studies at the University of North Texas in Denton, Texas, and his fields of specialization are metaphysics, Karl Popper, and the philosophy of religion.

**Martin Coleman** received his Ph.D. in philosophy from Southern Illinois University where he wrote on John Dewey. He has held appointments at Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis and at the Santayana Edition. Presently he is Assistant Professor of Philosophy at St. Andrews Presbyterian College in Laurinburg, North Carolina.

**Robert Ferrell**, a graduate of the University of North Texas and the University of Texas at El Paso, is a member of the philosophy department at El Paso Community College. His interests are multi-disciplinary and range from ancient to contemporary and comparative philosophy.

**Gilbert Fulmer** is Professor of Philosophy, Texas State University-San Marcos. His specializations are philosophy of religion, ethics, and evolutionary metaphysics. His Ph.D. is from Rice University.

**C. Lynne Fulmer** did her graduate work at Rice University. She is on the faculty of Texas State University-San Marcos where she pursues her interests in ethics, critical thinking, Wittgenstein, Whitehead, and linguistic philosophy.

**Charles Harriman** is Professor of Philosophy at the College of Santa Fe. His expertise is in theories of language and in the divisions and connections between art and science.

## NEW MEXICO/WEST TEXAS PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY

### 2001 PROGRAM

Host Institution – New Mexico Highlands University  
Las Vegas, New Mexico

**Friday, April 20:** 7:30 – 10:00 p.m. **Registration and Social Hour**

**Saturday, April 21**

**Session 1A:** Lee Stauffer (New Mexico Highlands University), Chair

8:30– 9:05 **Graciela O. Martinez** (Tucson, AZ), Simulated Environmentalism.

9:05– 9:40 **William Springer** (University of Texas-El Paso), Technology and the Human Spirit.

9:40– 10:15 **Joe Barnhart** (University of North Texas), Darwin and the Golden Rule.

**Session 1B:** Gary Cesarz (Auburn University), Chair

8:30– 9:05 **Phil Seng** (Southern Illinois University-Carbondale), Kant and Dewey on Aesthetic Feeling.

9:05– 9:40 **Thomas Urban** (Lamar University), Pleasure and Freedom.

9:40–10:15 **Robert Ferrell** (University of Texas-El Paso), The Critical Realism of Hans Albert.

**Coffee Break** 10:15- 10:30

**Session 2A:** Joe Barnhart (University of North Texas), Chair

10:30– 11:05 **Joe Stamey** (McMurry University), Guilt and Punishment in Heidegger, Jaspers, and Sartre.

11:05- 11:40 **Joseph Kallo** (Southern Illinois University-Carbondale), Fate & Skepticism: Emerson's Threnody.

**Glenn C. Joy**, Professor of Philosophy at Texas State University-San Marcos, received his Ph.D. from The University of Texas at Austin. His interests and publications are in the areas of philosophy of science, logic, ethics, philosophy of religion, Lewis Carroll studies, and mechanical puzzles.

**Joseph Kallo** received his doctorate in philosophy from Southern Illinois University in Carbondale. He is currently Technology Coordinator, Department of Curriculum & Instruction, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.

**Vincent Luizzi** is Professor and Chair of the philosophy department at Texas State University-San Marcos. He holds a J.D. from Boston University School of Law and a Ph.D. from the University of Pennsylvania. His specialization is philosophy of law.

**Phillip Seng** is a Visiting Lecturer at the University of Maryland, Baltimore County. He is an ABD candidate for a Ph. D. from Southern Illinois University at Carbondale where he studied John Dewey's philosophy in particular and film theory and aesthetics more generally.

**Dan Stiver** is Professor of Theology at the Logsdon School of Theology, Hardin-Simmons University, Abilene, Texas. He has written *The Philosophy of Religious Language: Sign, Symbol, and Story* and *Theology after Ricoeur: New Directions in Hermeneutical Theology*.

**Rui Zhu's** doctorate is from Tulane University. He has been on the faculty at Texas State University-San Marcos and currently teaches philosophy and Asian studies at Lake Forest College, Lake Forest, Illinois.

11:40- 12:15 **Matthew Williamson** (Illinois State University), Nietzsche's Intention:  
A Historical View.

**Session 2B:** Gil Fulmer (Southwest Texas State University), Chair

10:30- 11:05 **Charles Harriman** (College of Santa Fe) Stephen Pinker and Communication with Extraterrestrials.

11:05- 11:40 **Houghton Dalrymple** (University of Texas-Arlington), Perception, Consciousness and Objective Knowledge.

11:40-12:15 **Glenn C. Joy** (Southwest Texas State University), Ballots in the Belfry: Lewis Carroll and Voting Fairness.

**LUNCH** —————12:15- 1:30

**Session 3A:** Charles Harriman (College of Santa Fe), Chair

1:30– 2:05 **Martin Coleman** (Southern Illinois University–Carbondale), John Dewey Wrote For You and Me.

2:05– 2:40 **Anthony Palasota** (Texas Southern University), Dewey's Theory of Legal Reasoning & Judicial Decision Making

2:40– 3:15 **Vince Luizzi** (Southwest Texas State University), Putting the Screws to Retributivism and The Utilitarian-Deterrence Theory.

**Session 3B:** William Springer (University of Texas-El Paso), Chair

1:30– 2:05 **Gil Fulmer** (Southwest Texas State University), The Jews and the Resurrection.

2:05– 2:40 **William Austin** (University of Houston), Issac Newton as Religious Scholar.

2:40– 3:15 **Dan Stiver** (Hardin-Simmons University), A Warranted Interpretation of Plantinga.

**Coffee Break** 3:15- 3:30

**Session 4A:** Scot Miller (Hardin-Simmons University), Chair

3:30– 4:05 **Rui Zhu** (Southwest Texas State University), Fallacy of Property Causation.

4:05– 4:40 **Gary Cesarz** (Auburn University), Becoming and Time: A Modest Reinterpretation of the Concepts in Heraclitus, Parmenides, and Aristotle.

**Session 4B:** Anthony Palasota (Texas Southern University) Chair

3:30- 4:05 **John Haddox** (University of Texas-El Paso), An Integrated Philosophy of Education.

4:05- 4:40 **Kenneth Smith** (University of North Texas) Will and Necessity from Kant to Hegel.

---

**Business Meeting: 5:00-6:00**

**C. Lynne Fulmer** (Southwest Texas State University), **President**  
**Joe Barnhart** (University of North Texas), **Vice President**  
**Gary Cesarz** (Auburn University), **Secretary/Treasurer**  
**Scot Miller** (Hardin-Simmons University), **Editor, *Southwest Philosophical Studies***

---

**Banquet & Presidential Address: 7:00 p.m.**

**“Deadly Subversion: The Real Beef About Advertising”**  
**C. Lynne Fulmer** (Southwest Texas State University), **President, NMWTPS**

---