

Exam #2 Review Guide  
Philosophy of Mind

The second exam will take place in class on Monday, March 5th. It is worth 18% of the final grade (36 points). Notes or books may not be consulted during the examination. The exam will consist of two parts: (1) *Explanation*, in which you will be asked to explain approximately five technical terms, concepts, or arguments in about one paragraph each, and (2) *Evaluation*, in which you will be asked to write an essay. The question will be chosen from the list on page 2 of this review guide.

The following list of terms may help you as you begin to review for the exam. It is not an exhaustive list of important terms.

I. Some Things to Study:

1. Logical Behaviorism
2. Category Mistakes
3. Criticisms of Logical Behaviorism
4. Lewis's Analytical Functionalism
5. Lewis's Functionalist Argument for Token Identity Theory
6. Putnam's Machine Functionalism
7. Jackson's Knowledge Argument
8. Strong AI versus Weak AI
9. The Turing Test
10. Searle's Chinese Room Argument
11. Intentionality
12. Boden's Response to Searle's Biological Naturalism
13. Easy Problems vs. The Hard Problem of Consciousness
14. Patricia Churchland's Account of 'The Hard Problem' Characterization
15. Eliminative Materialism
16. Paul Churchland's Argument for Eliminative Materialism

II. Essay Questions: Some—but perhaps not all—of the following three questions (A, B, and C) will appear on the first exam. You will have to answer one of those questions. Here are the possible essay questions:

1. Explain Jackson's Knowledge Argument against physicalism. Critically evaluate Jackson's argument.
2. Explain Searle's Chinese Room Argument against Strong AI. Critically evaluate Searle's argument.
3. Explain Chalmers's argument for the claim that we should take experience as fundamental in our theory of consciousness. Critically evaluate Chalmers's argument.

Whichever essay topic you write about, I will ask you the following five questions:

1. What is this argument? Explain each part of it in detail and in your own words. (Don't just write what was on the handout or whiteboard during lecture.) Give examples to illustrate each premise. Make sure to define all fancy terms.
2. What is the weakest single premise of the argument? Give a reason to believe that this premise might be false. (Alternately, you may choose to object to the logical validity of the argument.)
3. What is the best way for a defender of the argument described in #1 to respond to the criticism just described in #2?
4. Do you agree with the criticism you described in #2? Or do you think that the response just described in #3 is adequate to meet the challenge? *Explain and justify your verdict.* (For example, if you agree with the criticism in #2, then explain why the response in #3 fails.)
5. Finally, explain the significance of this debate. Why might somebody care about the topic of the author's argument?