

Proposal for *Contemporary Debates in Philosophy of Mind*

Edited by Jonathan Cohen* and Brian McLaughlin†

This volume will introduce the central debates in contemporary philosophy of mind. The volume will include ten pairs of newly commissioned essays advocating opposing viewpoints — one for each of the ten topics listed below. In addition, the editors will provide a substantive introduction that will lay out the necessary background for the debates and locate the individual topics within philosophy of mind and in relation to one another.

The essays will each be around 6000 to 8000 words in length, and will be accessible to upper-level undergraduates and graduate students. Consequently, we expect that the volume could be used as text for advanced courses in philosophy of mind. However, the essays will also represent the state of play in the areas, and will contain original argumentation by eminent philosophers, so it will also be an important text for academics working in philosophy of mind and adjoining areas.

We have organized our questions under the three headings that, in our minds, structure the central debates in contemporary philosophy of mind: questions about the ontology of the mental, questions about the nature of mental content, and questions about the nature of consciousness.

For many of the questions on our list, we have suggested a number of backup authors in case our first choices are unable to write the essays. Although some names appear more than once on our list (including appearances as backup authors) we would not allow more than one piece by a single author in the volume. Of the editors, Jonathan Cohen will not write on any of the questions, and Brian McLaughlin will write on at most one of the questions, and only in the case that we can't find someone else. Finally, although we plan to use the questions on the list that follows, we may end up having to make cosmetic changes to the wording of some questions in order to recruit certain authors; however, we would make such changes only if necessary, and would not consider changes that altered the basic thrust of the questions.

*Department of Philosophy, University of California, San Diego, 9500 Gilman Drive, La Jolla, CA 92093-0119, joncohen@aardvark.ucsd.edu

†Department of Philosophy, Rutgers University, 26 Nichol Avenue, New Brunswick, NJ 08901-1411, brianmc@rci.rutgers.edu

1 The Ontology of the Mental

- (1) Status of folk psychological kinds (Should we preserve or reduce/eliminate propositional attitude states?)
 - pro: Georges Rey, John Perry, Adam Morton
 - anti: Paul Churchland, Daniel Dennett
- (2) Is there a viable form of non-reductive materialism?
 - pro: Louise Antony, Georges Rey, Tyler Burge, Colin McGinn, Kirk Ludwig
 - anti: Jaegwon Kim, Paul Churchland, John Bickle
- (3) Does the presumed causal efficacy of the physical preclude causal efficacy for the mental?
 - pro: Jaegwon Kim
 - anti: Stephen Yablo
- (4) Should the thesis of physicalism be construed as an a priori claim?
 - pro: Frank Jackson, David Chalmers, Jackson & Chalmers
 - anti: Ned Block, Robert Stalnaker, Block & Stalnaker, Brian McLaughlin

2 Mental Content

- (5) Something about inferential role and content to entice Fodor
 - pro: Christopher Peacocke
 - anti: Jerry Fodor
- (6) Should content be construed as a substantial notion, or is deflationism about content correct?
 - pro: Fred Dretske, Ruth Millikan, Jerry Fodor
 - anti: Hartry Field, Christopher Hill, Paul Horwich
- (7) Is intentionality intrinsically normative?
 - pro: John McDowell, Robert Brandom, Tyler Burge
 - anti: Jerry Fodor, Louise Antony, Georges Rey
- (8) Is externalism about the mental compatible with privileged access?
 - pro: Brian McLaughlin, Tyler Burge
 - anti: McKinsey, Paul Boghossian, Jessica Brown

3 Consciousness

(9) Is consciousness ontologically emergent?

- pro: David Chalmers, Martine Nida-Rumelin
- anti: Stephen Yablo, Brian McLaughlin, John Perry, Brian Loar, Christopher Hill

(10) Can consciousness be understood exclusively in terms of intentional content?

- pro: Michael Tye, Fred Dretske
- anti: Brian Loar, Ned Block, Christopher Peacocke, Joseph Levine