

Week 5 Agenda

EMPIRICISM – John Locke

Read: http://www.qcc.cuny.edu/SocialSciences/ppecorino/INTRO_TEXT/Chapter%205%20Epistemology/Empiricism.htm

Read: <http://philosophycourse.info/lecsite/lec-locke.html>

Good lecture on John Locke here:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=R9GuSA9HHgA>

See the Powerpoint link on Locke back on class web page.

**Use the above materials to answer the questions below. Due Tuesday 10 AM July 26
300 words. 5 points**

John Locke Study Questions

1. What is the tabula rasa?
2. What is Ockham's Razor?
3. What is a simple idea? Give three examples.
4. What is a complex idea? Give three examples.
5. What are primary qualities? Give three examples. 6
6. What are Secondary qualities? Give three examples.
7. Why is the notion of Substance a problem for Locke?

Empiricism - George Berkeley and David Hume

Watch the videos on Locke, Berkeley and Hume by Richard Brown

John Locke and George Berkeley (Berkeley starts at 26:17)

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=R9GuSA9HHgA&index=9&list=PL656A4EDA0320618D>

David Hume

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uWaY-h9bRt0&list=PL656A4EDA0320618D&index=10>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QiYGSR8xOec&list=PL656A4EDA0320618D&index=11>

Study Questions Berkeley and Hume - due Wednesday July 27 10 AM. Minimum 400 words. Submit to turnitin

1. Do Berkeley and Hume believe we can know there is an external world independent of our minds? Explain. How are they different from Locke on this point?
 2. What does Berkeley believe the cause of your experiences of the desk and other objects in front of you are?
 3. For Hume what is the difference between an idea and an impression? Explain the difference by using examples.
 4. For Hume is the idea of Unicorn traceable back to sense impressions? Explain. What would Hume think about Plato's forms? Explain
 5. Explain the difference between Relations of Ideas (RoI) and Matters of Fact (MoF).
 6. For Hume why don't RoI give us any information about the world or our experience of it?
 7. After listening to Brown's discussion of causality, explain why Hume thinks that you cannot really know that if you kick a soccer ball, it will move.
-

Philosophy of Mind

I. Skim read this overview

http://www.qcc.cuny.edu/SocialSciences/ppecorino/INTRO_TEXT/Chapter%206%20Mind-Body/MIND_BODY_PROBLEM.htm

II. View The Twilight Zone – The Lonely in class

A great discussion of the philosophical issues raised in The Lonely:

http://maverickphilosopher.typepad.com/maverick_philosopher/2009/01/philosophy-from-the-twilight-zone-the-lonely.html

III. Dualism See chapter 6

http://www.qcc.cuny.edu/SocialSciences/ppecorino/INTRO_TEXT/Chapter%206%20Mind-Body/DUALISM.htm

Descartes' Arguments For Dualism

The Doubt Argument

The clearest statement of the Doubt Argument occurs in Part Four of the Discourse on Method (1637) in which Descartes summarizes his reasoning in the Meditations.

I then considered attentively what I was; and I saw that while I could feign that I had no body, that there was no world, and no place existed for me to be in, I could not feign that I was not; on the contrary, from the mere fact that I thought of doubting (je pensais a douter) about other truths it evidently and certainly followed that I existed. On the other hand, if I had merely ceased to be conscious, even if everything else that I had ever imagined had been true, I had no reason to believe that I should still have existed. From this I recognized that I was a substance whose whole essence and nature is to be conscious (de penser) and whose being requires no place and depends on no material thing. Thus this self (moi), that is to say the soul, by which I am what I am, is entirely distinct from the body, and is even more easily known; and even if the body were not there at all the soul would be just what it is. [Descartes: Philosophical Writings, translated and edited by E. Anscombe and P. T. Geach (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1971), page 32.]

The Doubt Argument

- (1) I can doubt that my body exists.
 - (2) I cannot doubt that I exist as a thinking thing.
-
- (3) I, a thinking thing, am not identical with my body.

As it stands, the Doubt Argument is not valid since its conclusion does not follow logically from its premises. To turn it into a valid argument we need to add another statement to its premises. One popular choice for this missing premise which would make the argument valid is a metaphysical principle known as Leibniz's Law.

The Principle of the Indiscernibility of Identicals: If two things are identical, then they have exactly the same properties.

If two things are identical, they are one and the same thing; so, anything that is true of the first must be true of the second since there is really just one single thing that is being referred to in two different ways. It is important to remember that identical things are not just similar or closely alike (as are so-called "identical twins"), but the very same thing (e.g., George Bush and the 41st President of the United States).

With suitable revisions, the Doubt Argument now reads as follows.

(4) My body has the property of being such that I can doubt its existence.

(5) I, a thinking thing, do not have the property of being such that I can doubt my existence.

(6) If two things are identical, then they have exactly the same properties.

(7) I, a thinking thing, am not identical with my body.

There seems little doubt that while it is valid, this kind of argument is unsound. Premises (4) and (5) are false because the "properties" mentioned in them are bogus; they are not examples of the real properties that premise (6), Leibniz's Law, applies to.

Being an object of doubt (or belief, desire, fear) under a certain description is not a real property of a thing, for someone may recognize an object under one description but fail to recognize it under another. For example, many people who believe that Kareem Abdul Jabaar is a great basketball player do not also believe that Lew Alcindor is equally great; but Jabaar and Alcindor are the same person. Similarly, Oedipus desired to marry Jocasta, but he did not desire to marry his mother. Thus, even though my great aunt Nancy is a spiritualist who believes that she, but not her physical body, will survive death, this does not prove that she is not

identical with her body.

The Divisibility Argument

(1) All extended things are divisible.

(2) No minds are divisible.

(3) No minds are extended things.

The vulnerable premise here is (2). In defense of the mind's indivisible unity Descartes writes: "When I think about my mind—or, in other words, about myself insofar as I am just a thinking thing—I can't distinguish any parts; I understand myself to be a single, unified thing. Although my whole mind seems united to my whole body, I know that cutting off a foot, arm, or other limb would not take anything away from my mind." (p. 138, left) Unfortunately for Descartes' defense, we know that something will have been taken away from my mind if a portion of my physical brain is removed. Similarly, when the corpus callosum, the bundle of nerve fibers connecting the two hemispheres of the human brain, is completely severed in a cerebral commissurotomy, the mind seems to divide into two separate conscious awarenesses. See for example <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZMLzP1VCANo>

Forms of Dualism

A. Interactionism - minds and bodies exist and interact in some way

B. Epiphenomenalism - body acts on mind but minds do NOT act on bodies

C. Double Aspect Theory-there is one substance with two aspects (mind/body)

D. Parallelism -minds and bodies exist in separate dimensions and are coordinated

Problems with Dualism

1. Mind body Problem (Interaction Problem)

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bajOUNg9_ms

2. Ockam's Razor

3. Location Problem

4. Other minds

IV. . Monism - Idealism

http://www.qcc.cuny.edu/SocialSciences/ppecorino/INTRO_TEXT/Chapter%206%20Mind-Body/Monism-Idealism.htm

V. . Monism- Materialism

http://www.qcc.cuny.edu/SocialSciences/ppecorino/INTRO_TEXT/Chapter%206%20Mind-Body/Monism-Materialism.htm

Forms of Materialism

A. Behaviorism Issues: Is mind just behavior? Super Pretender, Super Spartan

B. Folklore (Identity Theory, Eliminativism) Criticisms: Frank Jackson, Chalmers, Mary the Blind neurophysiologist

C. Functionalism (Hard Artificial Intelligence)

Turing Test, Alice, Criticism: Searle's Chinese Room Analogy

D. Pluralism(We will classify logical and semantic behaviorism under this term). Category Mistake

Problems with Materialism:

Qualia

Intentionality

VI.

Optional resources that can help you understand the issues and positions, but not required.

A good lecture on the basic views: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LyzhEe4-nWo>

An excellent series of lectures by John Searle on The Philosophy of Mind.

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zi7Va_4ekko&list=PL553DCA4DB88B0408

Closer to Truth Series, Season 1, Episode 7, Parts 1, 2 and 3. http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pXHgeq9Qg4Q&feature=results_video&playnext=1&list=PL7B63F6339C4EF44A

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WFQ0Spu50Oc&feature=related>

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NK1Yo6VbRoo&feature=related>

Chalmers and Zombies

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=m0I4pmTvdiw&feature=related>

Richard Dawkins <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qYYFQiN052c&NR=1> Daniel Dennet