

# Conclusion

Phil 255

# In the beginning

---

- Philosophy of Mind (PoM), in its present form, is young
  - Present form: highly informed by sciences of the mind
  - Those sciences are young, especially neuroscience
  - Neuroscience is 'data rich and theory poor'
- 20th C. has been tumultuous for PoM, probably because of its changing face
- Lyon's analyzes this change using three dichotomies:
  - internalism/externalism
  - monism/dualism
  - reductionism/anti-reductionism

# Internalism/externalism & monism/dualism

---

- Internal theories assume minds are 'in the head'
- External theories assume minds are part of the observable world
- Dualist theories assume mind and matter are distinct substances
- Monist theories assume there is one substance (mind, matter, ?)
- Introspectionism: internal (dualist)
- Behaviourism: external (monist)
- Identity theory: internal (monist)
- Functionalism: internal ('theoretical' dualist)
- Lesson: monism, but how do psych. and physic. theories relate?

# Reductionism/anti-reductionism

---

- Most reductionist:
  - eliminative materialists
- Sort of reductionist:
  - Dennett/Davidson: instrumentalist/normative
- This is in contrast to Lyons
  - Lyons clearly misreads Dennett
  - Doesn't seem to realize explanations are for purposes
  - Or perhaps, doesn't realize he is uncritically preferring a particular kind of purpose.
  - Makes a poor case for claim that neural reduction is 'useless'

# Science & scientism

---

- Lyons mistakenly equates naturalism with the view that physics is the ultimate science
  - Fodor is a perfect counter-example (naturalist, anti-unity)
- Lyons makes more false claims:
  - neuroscience hasn't affected psychology
  - neurophysiology has had enough time to try
  - neuro. not shedding light on beliefs, etc. shows this
  - the most 'useful' explanations are psychological

# Consciousness

---

- The problem that won't go away
  - It had for a while (behaviourism)
  - Never left in continental philosophy
  - Nagel (& co.) brought it back
- Lyons is mistaken that analytic philosophers don't consider it special (epistemologically, at least)
- Lyons' solution is very odd
- Clearly, the problem won't go away

# Metaphysics & minds

---

- Lyons concludes by discussing Rorty
  - Rorty claims the mind/matter distinction should go
  - Then the mind/body problem goes two
  - Metaphysical point is generally accepted
  - Epistemological point is generally rejected
  - Why not have many descriptions? What's the replacement?
- From the metaphysical point it follows there is no 'essence' to mindfulness
  - Lyons gives descriptive, normative, authoritative criteria
  - Result: the category is metaphysically subjective
- Science: determine the 'kind of mind' and we make it 'real' or not

# Question

---