

Date: Tue, 02 Sep 1997 14:54:12 -0500 (EST)  
From: Don Gotterbarn <gotterba@Access.ETSU-Tn.Edu>  
To: Vivian Weil <weil@charlie.cns.iit.edu>  
Subject: Re: your mail

Vivian,

Thanks for your comments. I will make the suggested changes, unfortunately the October-November version (version 3) is already at the publisher so your suggestions will make it into the final(?) version.

Please explain your crytic remark -"you use normative in a distinctive, unusual way" ? Should I or the code expect some basing from philosophers?

Don

```

)))))) New Email and Phone Number (((((((
----> Please Update Your Records <-----

```

Don Gotterbarn gotterba@etsu-tn.edu 001 (423) 439-6849  
 ^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^ ^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^

Professor, Computer and Information Sciences  
East Tennessee State University  
Box 70711  
Johnson City, TN 37614-0711  
USA  
Fax 001 (423) 461-7119

Sent  
9-3-97 RN

Don: Philosophers use the Term  
'normative' for 'what should be' -  
How things ought to be, contrasted  
with how they are. You ~~are~~ appear to give  
it a narrower use. That's OK as long  
as you say you are stipulating  
this more restricted ~~use~~ reference for the  
term. Ditto for your three-part distinction  
among codes. If you read Stuart Shapiro  
of Brunel University, you will find he is  
interested in these matters but does not make  
that ~~three~~ three-fold division. Best, Vivian