



STUDYDADDY

Get Homework Help From Expert Tutor

[Get Help](#)

Introduction to Philosophy

Philosophy of Mind 3

Recapitulation

- Mind-body Problem: how are our inner states (beliefs, desires, awareness, feeling) related to the body (including brain)?
- Overview of possibilities
- Dualism: mind and body are really different: two types of substances
- That conforms to our impression of them
- Problem: how causal interaction between them if they are so different?
- Argument for Dualism:
 1. Indubitability of inner states argument
 - did not work, because difference indubitable – dubitable between mind and body is not enough for non-identity
 - In properties involving being **about** something, referring to the same thing in different ways leads to very different statements

Arguments for Dualism II

- Descartes' argument from divisibility and extension:
 - (1) The mind cannot be divided into parts and does not have an extension or a place
 - (2) The body can be divided into parts and does have extension and a place
 - (3) Therefore, the mind $\neq$ the body.
- These are normal properties, so the argument is valid.

Problems with the Second Argument

- The weak spot of this argument is (1) – is it true?
- We seem to **experience** our mind/inner states as if (1) were true.
- Is that enough reason to accept (1)? Perhaps our experience of inner states is not reliable.
 - For example, we experience making a decision at a time later than measurements of our brain indicate that the decision has been made.
 - On the other hand, that our inner states do not have extension or place may be thought to be a very basic part of them.

Logical Behaviorism

- The core idea of Logical Behaviorism:
 - Mental states are not **inner** states which cause behavior
- The argument:
 - (1) If mental states **were** inner states causing behavior, we could not have knowledge of them in others.
 - (2) We do have knowledge of mental states of others.
 - (3) Therefore, mental states are not inner states causing behavior.

Can we know **inner** mental states of others?

- Argument by analogy:
 - (1) From my own perspective, I notice that inner mental states S cause behavior B.
 - (2) I see behavior B in others.
 - (3) Therefore, inner mental states S cause behavior B in others.
- Is this convincing?



STUDYDADDY

Get Homework Help From Expert Tutor

[Get Help](#)