

Homework Assignment #1

Instructions:

All work is to be computer printed with double-spacing, 1" margins, and 12 point font (if possible).

Be concise. Answers exceeding the specified length by much will be penalized.

Put your name on the back of the last sheet and not on the front anywhere (so I can grade blindly).

Put everything in *your own words* as much as possible — don't rely on extended quotes from articles to explain some point.

Try to spell things in terms that a non-philosopher could understand.

Make sure you answer the question!

Questions:

1. Ryle, a logical behaviorist, describes Cartesian Dualism as follows: "... mental happenings occur in insulated fields, known as 'minds', and there is ... no direct causal connection between what happens in one mind and what happens in another. Only through the medium of the public physical world can the mind of one person make a difference to the mind of another. The mind is its own place and in his inner life each of us lives the life of a ghostly Robinson Crusoe. People can see, hear and jolt one another's bodies, but they are irremediably blind and deaf to the workings of one another's minds and inoperative upon them." His objection to Dualism (which applies to Type Identity Theory and Functionalism as well) is that if we say that mental states are 'inner' (hidden) states and that there are no direct causal connections between your mind and mine (as there are between your behavior and my senses), then we would be unable to explain how it is that I can know about your mental states, e.g., how I know when you are happy or in pain. Spell out why this is or isn't a good argument. (½ page)

2. Logical Behaviorism is the thesis that mental states can be analyzed in terms of behavior. Spell this out more fully. That is, try to spell out to a non-philosopher what Logical Behaviorism is. (½ page)

3. Some object to Logical Behaviorism by pointing out counter-examples to behaviorists' attempts to spell out a mental state in terms of behavioral dispositions. For example, the behaviorist might

say that what it is to believe that it is raining is, among other things, to be such that if their boss tells them they should go home, then they will take their umbrella as they leave. But then we can bring up counter-examples: someone in this circumstance who wants to get wet will not take their umbrella, and someone who uses a raincoat instead of an umbrella will not take their umbrella. However, the behaviorist could reply that this just shows that they haven't spelled out the behavioral disposition correctly and that once they spell out the behavioral disposition in a fully complete and correct way, then there won't be any counter-examples. But there is reason to think that once the behaviorist addresses the counter-examples by more fully spelling out the conditions under which someone will take an umbrella, they still won't have an adequate behaviorist account of a mental state. Why not? (½ page)

4. Putnam (in "Brains and Behavior") imagines creatures he calls super-spartans and super-super-spartans. Give a short summary of this argument, making clear exactly *what* it is supposed to show and *how* it is supposed to show it. (½ page)