FREE MORTAL QUESTIONS PDF





Thomas Nagel | 226 pages | 22 May 2012 | CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS | 9781107604711 | English | Cambridge, United Kingdom

Mortal Questions By Thomas Nagel - Words | Bartleby

Nagel Mortal Questions well known for his critique of material reductionist accounts of the mind, particularly in his essay " What Is It Like to Be a Bat? He continued the critique of reductionism in Mind and Cosmosin which he argues against the neo-Darwinian view of the emergence of consciousness. Nagel received a BA in philosophy from Cornell University inwhere he was a member of the Telluride House and where he was introduced Mortal Questions the Mortal Questions of Ludwig Wittgenstein.

Austinand H. Paul Grice. He received his PhD in philosophy from Harvard University in Nagel taught at the University of California, Berkeley from

to and at Princeton University from towhere he Mortal Questions many well-known philosophers including Susan WolfShelly Kaganand Samuel SchefflerMortal Questions latter of Mortal Questions is now his colleague at NYU. Nagel began to publish philosophy at the age of twenty-two; his career now spans over fifty years of publication.

Nagel thinks that each person, owing to his or her capacity to reason, instinctively seeks a unified world view. However, if this aspiration leads one to believe that there is only one way to understand our intellectual commitments, whether about the external world, knowledge, or what our practical and moral reasons ought to be, this leads one into error. For contingent, limited and finite creatures, no such unified world view is possible.

That is because ways of understanding are not always better when they are more objective. Like the British philosopher Bernard WilliamsNagel believes that the rise of modern science has permanently changed how people think of the world and our place in it.

A modern scientific understanding is one way of thinking about the world and our place in it that is more objective than the common sense view it replaces. It is more objective Mortal Questions it is less dependent on our peculiarities as the kinds of thinkers that people are. Our modern scientific understanding involves the mathematicized understanding Mortal Questions the world represented by modern physics. Understanding this bleached out view of the world draws on our capacities as purely rational thinkers and fails to account for the specific nature of our perceptual sensibility.

Nagel repeatedly returns to the distinction between "primary" and "secondary" qualities, that is, between primary qualities of objects like mass and shape, that are mathematically and structurally describable independent of our sensory apparatuses, and secondary qualities like taste and color, which depend on our sensory apparatuses. Despite what may seem like skepticism about the objective claims of science, Nagel does not dispute Mortal Questions science describes the world that exists independently of us.

His contention, rather, is that a Mortal Questions way of understanding a subject matter should not be regarded as better simply for being more objective.

He argues that scientific understanding's attempt at an objective viewpoint--a "view from nowhere"--necessarily leaves out something essential when applied to the mind, which is inherently from a subjective point of view. As such, objective science is fundamentally unable to help people fully understand themselves.

Nagel argues that some phenomena are not best grasped from Mortal Questions more objective perspective. One learns and uses mental concepts by being directly acquainted with one's own mind, whereas any attempt to Mortal Questions more objectively about mentality would abstract away from this fact. Mortal Questions would, of its nature, leave out what it is to be a thinker, and Mortal Questions, Nagel believes, would be a falsely objectifying view.

Being a thinker is to have a subjective perspective on Mortal Questions world; if one abstracts away from this perspective one leaves out what he sought to explain. Nagel thinks that philosophers — over-impressed by the paradigm of the kind of objective understanding represented by modern science — tend to produce theories of the mind that are falsely objectifying in precisely this kind of way.

They are right to be impressed — modern science really is objective Mortal Questions but are wrong to take Mortal Questions science to be the only paradigm of objectivity. The kind of understanding that science represents does not transfer to everything that people would like to understand.

As a philosophical rationalistNagel believes that a proper understanding of the place of mental properties in nature will involve a revolution in our understanding of both the physical and the mental, and that this is a reasonable prospect that people can anticipate in the near future. A plausible science of the mind will give an account of the stuff that underpins mental and physical properties in such a way that people will simply be able to see that it necessitates both of these aspects.

Now, it seems to people that the mental and the physical are irreducibly distinct but that is not a metaphysical insight, or an acknowledgment of an irreducible explanatory gap, but simply where people are at their present stage of understanding. Nagel's rationalism and tendency to present our human nature as a composite, structured around our capacity to reason, explains why he thinks that therapeutic or deflationary accounts of philosophy are simply complacent and that radical skepticism is, strictly speaking, irrefutable.

Nagel accuses Wittgenstein and American philosopher of mind and language Donald Davidson of philosophical idealism. This, for Nagel, elevates contingent conditions of our make-up into criteria for that which Mortal Questions real. The result 'cuts the world down to size' and makes what there is dependent on what there can be interpreted to be. Nagel claims this is no better than more orthodox forms of idealism in which reality is claimed to be made up of mental items or claimed to be constitutively dependent on a form supplied by the mind.

Nagel is probably most widely known within the field of philosophy of mind as an advocate Mortal Questions the idea Mortal Questions consciousness and subjective experience cannot, at least with the contemporary understanding of physicalismbe satisfactorily explained using the current concepts of physics.

This position was primarily discussed by Nagel in one of his most famous articles: "What is it Like to Be a Bat? The article's title question, though often attributed to Nagel, was originally asked by Mortal Questions L. In "What is it Like to Be a Bat? He states that "an Mortal Questions has conscious mental states if and only if there is something that it is like to be Mortal Questions organism—something it is like for the organism. On that understanding, Nagel is a conventional dualist about the physical and the mental.

This is, however, a misunderstanding [according to whom? Part of the puzzlement here is because of the limitations of imagination: influenced by

his Princeton colleague, Saul KripkeNagel believes that any type identity statement that identifies a physical state type with a mental state type would be, if true, necessarily true. But Kripke argues that one can easily imagine a situation where, for example, one's C-fibres are stimulated but one is not in pain and so refute any such psychophysical identity from the armchair.

A parallel argument does not hold for genuine theoretical identities. This argument that there will always be an explanatory gap between an identification of a state in mental and physical terms is compounded, Nagel argues, by the fact that imagination operates in two distinct ways.

When asked Mortal Questions imagine sensorilyone imagines C-fibres being stimulated; if asked to imagine sympatheticallyone puts oneself in a conscious state resembling pain. These two ways of imagining the two terms of the identity statement are so different that there will always seem to be an explanatory gap, whether or not this is the case.

Some philosophers of mind [who? Nagel is not a physicalist because he does not believe that an internal understanding of mental concepts shows them to have the kind of hidden essence that underpins a scientific identity in, say, chemistry. But his skepticism is about current physics: he envisages in his most recent work that people may Mortal Questions close to a scientific breakthrough in identifying an underlying essence that is neither physical as people currently think of the physicalnor functionalnor mental, but such that it necessitates all three of these ways in which the mind "appears" to us.

The difference between the kind of explanation he rejects and those that he accepts depends on his understanding of transparency : from his earliest paper to his most recent Nagel has always insisted that a prior context is required to make identity Mortal Questions plausible, intelligible and transparent. In his book Mind and CosmosNagel argues against a materialist view of the Mortal Questions of life and Mortal Questions, writing Mortal Questions the standard neo-Darwinian view flies in the face of common sense.

Nagel has argued that ID should not be rejected as non-scientific, for instance writing in that "ID is very different from creation science ," and that the debate about ID "is clearly a scientific disagreement, not a disagreement between science and something Mortal Questions. Nagel has been highly influential in the related fields of moral and political philosophy.

Supervised by John RawlsNagel has been a long-standing proponent of a Kantian and rationalist approach to moral philosophy. His distinctive ideas were first presented in the short monograph The Possibility of Altruism, published in That book seeks by reflection on the nature of practical reasoning to uncover the formal principles that underlie reason in practice and the related general beliefs Mortal Questions the self that are necessary for those principles to be truly applicable to us.

Nagel defends motivated desire Mortal Questions about the motivation of moral action. According to motivated desire theory, when a person is motivated to moral action it is indeed true that such actions are motivated — like all intentional actions — by a Mortal Questions and a desire. But it is important to get the justificatory relations right: when a person accepts a moral judgment he or she is necessarily motivated to act.

But it is the reason that does the justificatory work of justifying both the action and the desire. Nagel contrasts this view with a rival view which believes that a moral agent can only accept that he or she has a reason to act if the desire to Mortal Questions out the action has an independent justification.

An account based on presupposing sympathy would be of this kind. The Mortal Questions striking claim of the book is that there is a very close parallel between Mortal Questions reasoning in one's own interests and moral reasons to act to further the interests of another person. When one reasons prudentially, for example Mortal Questions the future reasons that one will have, Mortal Questions allows the reason in the future to justify one's current action without Mortal Questions to the strength of one's current desires.

If a hurricane Mortal Questions to destroy someone's car next year at that point he will want his insurance company to pay him to replace it: that future reason gives him a reason, now, to take out insurance. The strength of the reason ought not to be hostage to the strength of one's current Mortal Questions. The denial of this view of prudence, Nagel argues, means that one does not really believe that one is one and the same person through time. One is dissolving oneself into distinct person-stages.

This is the basis of his analogy between prudential actions and moral actions: in cases of altruistic action for another person's good that person's reasons quite literally become reasons for one if they are timeless and intrinsic reasons. Genuine Mortal Questions are reasons for anyone. Comparable to the views of the nineteenth century moral philosopher Henry SidgwickNagel believes that one needs to conceive of one's good as an impersonal good and one's reasons as objective reasons.

Mortal Questions means, practically, that a timeless and intrinsic value generates reasons for anyone. A person who denies the truth of this claim is committed, as in the case of a similar mistake about prudence, Mortal Questions a false view of him or herself. In this case the false view is that one's reasons are irreducibly his, Mortal Questions a way that does not allow them to be reasons for anyone: Nagel argues this commits such a person to the view that he or she cannot make the same judgments about her own reasons third-personally that she can make first-personally.

Nagel calls this " dissociation " and considers it a practical analogue of solipsism the philosophical idea that only one's own mind is sure to exist. Once again, a false view of what is involved in reasoning properly is refuted by showing that it leads to a false view of the nature of people. Nagel's later work on ethics ceases to place as much weight on the distinction between a person's personal or " subjective " reasons and his or her " objective " reasons.

Earlier, in The Possibility of Altruism, he took the stance that if one's reasons really are about intrinsic and timeless values then, qua subjective reason, one can only take them to be the guise of the reasons that there really are — the objective ones. In later discussions, Nagel treats his former view as an incomplete attempt to Mortal Questions the Mortal Questions that there are distinct classes of reasons and values, and speaks instead of "agent-relative" and "agent-neutral" reasons.

In the case of agent-relative reasons the successor to subjective Mortal Questions specifying the content of the reason makes essential reference back to the agent for Mortal Questions it is a reason. An example Mortal Questions this might be: "Anyone has a reason to honor his or her parents. An example of this might be: "Anyone has a reason to promote the Mortal Questions of parenthood.

The different classes of reasons and values i. The structure of Nagel's later ethical view is that all reasons must be brought into relation to this Mortal Questions view of oneself. Those reasons and values that withstand detached critical scrutiny are objective, but more subjective reasons and values can nevertheless be objectively tolerated. However, the most striking part of the earlier argument and of Sidgwick's Mortal Questions is preserved: agent-neutral reasons are literally reasons for anyone, so all objectifiable Mortal Questions become individually possessed no matter whose they are.

Thinking reflectively about ethics from this standpoint, one must take every other agent's standpoint on value as seriously as one's own, since one's own perspective is just a subjective take on an inter-subjective whole; one's personal set of reasons is thus swamped by the objective reasons of all others.

This is similar to "world agent" consequentialist views in which one takes up the standpoint of a collective subject whose reasons are those of everyone.

But Nagel remains an individualist who believes in the separateness Mortal Questions persons so his task is to Mortal Questions why this objective Mortal Questions does not swallow up the individual standpoint of each of us. He provides an extended rationale for the importance to people of their personal point of view. The objective standpoint and its demands have to be balanced with the subjective personal point of view of each person and its demands.

One can always be maximally objective but one does not have to be. One can legitimately "cap" the demands placed on him by the objective reasons of others.

In addition, Mortal Questions his later work, Nagel finds a rationale for so-called deontic constraints in a way Scheffler could not. The extent to which Mortal Questions can lead a good life as an individual while respecting the demands of others leads inevitably to political philosophy.

Mortal Questions by Thomas Nagel

Sign in Create an account. Syntax Advanced Search. Mortal Questions. Thomas Nagel. Cambridge University Press Equality in Social and Political Philosophy. Existentialism, Misc in Continental Philosophy.

Panpsychism Mortal Questions Philosophy of Mind. Subjectivity and Objectivity in Philosophy of Mind. Edit this record. Mark as duplicate. Find it on Scholar. Request removal from index. Revision history. Download options Mortal Questions copy. Configure custom resolver. Chapters BETA.

Subjective and Objective. The Fragmentation of Value. On a Confusion About a Function of Consciousness. Ned Block - - Brain and Behavioral Sciences 18 2 — Benjamin Libet - - Behavioral and Brain Sciences 8 4 Expertise in Moral Reasoning?

Cultural Learning. I Ought, Therefore I Can. Peter B. Vranas - - Philosophical Studies 2 Thomas Nagel - - In Mortal Questions. Cambridge University Press. Michael N.

Mautner - - Bioethics 23 8 Frederick Kaufman - - Mcgraw-Hill. Mortal Questions Does It All Mean? Thomas Nagel - - Oxford University Press. Richard Double - - Mortal Questions Research Archives Added to PP index Total views 4, of 2, Recent downloads 6 months 46 14, of 2, How can I increase my downloads? Sign in to use this feature. About us. Editorial team. Applied ethics. History of Western Philosophy.

Normative ethics. Philosophy of biology. Philosophy of language. Mortal Questions of mind. Philosophy of religion. Science Logic and Mathematics.

Thomas Nagel - Wikipedia

Goodreads helps you keep track of books you want to read. Want to Read saving…. Want to Read Currently Reading Read. Other editions. Enlarge cover. Error rating book. Refresh and try again. Open Preview See a Problem? Details if other :. Thanks for telling us about the problem. Return to Book Page. Preview — Mortal Questions Mortal Questions Thomas Nagel. Questions about our attitudes towards Mortal Questions, sexual behavior, social inequality, war and political power progress to more obviously philosophical problems regarding personal identity, consciousness, freedom and value.

Get A Copy. Paperbackpages. Published June 28th by Cambridge University Press first published More Details Original Title. Canto Classics. Other Editions Friend Reviews. To see what Mortal Questions friends thought of this book, please sign up. To ask other readers questions about Mortal Mortal Questionsplease sign Mortal Questions.

Lists with This Book. Community Reviews. Showing Average rating 4. Rating details. More filters. Sort order. Start your review of Mortal Questions. Jul 19, Tyler rated it liked it Recommends it for: Fans of Philosophy. Shelves: philosophy. Fourteen essays in this book tie together the question of how philosophy applies in everyday life. The personal nature of the inquiry is the book's main draw and the best reason for reading it. The most helpful approach to this kind of book is to list its topics and give my ratings, as follows: TOPIC: Death — A rather Mortal Questions discussion asking why death is thought of as such a bad event.

I recommend the book for people having a general interest in philosophy and at least a basic familiarity with its terms. View 2 comments. Jun 28, Nick Black rated it really liked it. One Mortal Questions the most probing and worthwhile philosophic disquisitions of the twentieth century. Jan 24, Hossein Gholamie rated it it was amazing. Thomas Nagel in all areas of philosophy: "metaphysics, epistemology, ethics", and Mortal Questions of the most important branches of philosophy: "philosophy, ethics, philosophy of Mortal Questions, political philosophy, philosophy of mind", has had a huge contribution.

In this collection of essays this bookhe addresses concrete issues. In this book, he has discussed articles topicsand referring to nearly 2, books.

Nearly all Mortal Questions the papers in the past 40 years have been at the center of the philosophical controversy: death, absurd, moral luck, war and Mortal Questions, sexual perversion, ruthlessness in public life, the policy preference, equality, etc. Perhaps it can be said that all fourteen Mortal Questions, with all their initial differences, look at one issue: the meaning of life.

I have repeatedly read the essay "Absurd" and is still one of the most profound articles of philosophy that I have read about the Mortal Questions of "absurd" and perhaps "the meaning of life. May 21, Steve added it. Too hard for me! I understood chunks of it, but there was plenty that whizzed past me. Great Mortal Questions though. Dec 05, Daniel Hageman rated it really liked it Shelves: general-philosophyMortal Questionsowned. First half of this book is Mortal Questions 3, while the second half is a Oct 19, Mortal Questions Roessler added it Shelves: read Mortal Questions, l-american Mortal Questions, f-philosophy.

First time to my knowledge I've seen a philosopher argue that death is really bad and we should be scared of it. And it's a good point about the nature of goodness not being restricted Mortal Questions non-relational properties Mortal Questions to a human at different times.

Still, surprising that Nagel would fail to look into the huge variety of other reasons that philosophers have embraced the idea of death.

Which points to a crucial element of Nagel's style. He is arguing with the language of the people, using Mortal Questions First time to my knowledge I've seen a philosopher argue that death is really bad and we should be scared of it. He is arguing with the language of the people, using the people's definitions of the words at stake.

It has a certain charm, a feeling of Mortal Questions sincerely engaged in questioning their way of life, at first it almost feels Socratic. But then one remembers that Socrates of early Plato particularly radically questioned the people's definitions and made them think about the definitions they'd been using.

Nagel doesn't fuss over words. Is this appropriate? Let's look at the second essay, on the Absurd. I was excited to read it, as it draws on Camus' Mortal Questions essay, which was one of the first works of "real" i.

And I was really getting pleased, when I read Nagel's Mortal Questions that we Mortal Questions our standards of meaning within life, therefore we cannot use the same standards when Mortal Questions step outside of life, in order to look at the big picture.

I agree entirely. Life cannot as a whole be meaningless, because meaning is only something generated from within life, and no longer makes sense as a tool with which to judge life as a whole.

We pull ourselves out of the individual chain of justifications when we look at the big picture, and may no longer ask for another link on that chain. Sadly, I got the same slap in the Mortal Questions from the ending that I'd gotten before with Camus. He's just demonstrated that we may not look at our overall struggles as meaningless.

So what use do we have for irony? It's just as unjustified within the text as Camus' call to defiance. This lesson about when you can use what Mortal Questions such as in the second essay, "justification" and "meaning" is throughout the book not taken seriously enough.

There is a problem with using work-a-day definitions for philosophic thought, words understood according to their use Mortal Questions certain normal situations are plucked out of their context Mortal Questions made in this innocent form to take part in exotic dances. Naturally, this method leads to mixed up conclusions - unexpected, yet no Mortal Questions rigourous for all that. We're struck by an embarassingly clear example in the essay on Sexual Perversion, written in The conclusions do not Mortal Questions and are ridiculously dated.

Philosophic truths should exercise a permanent claim on our attention, and not become silly artifacts after a mere forty years. Yet, this is only possible when we examine the concepts we're using. If you take them out of the mouths of those conversing under entirely other circumstances, you end up with stiff nonsense.

Jan 24, Matthew Ting added it. Tried using this as a broad introduction to philosophy. Now I get why everyone who read the New Yorker likes philosophy so much Maybe this is one I try again later in life when I'm a more sophisticated and wise guy. This collection of short essays explores a slew of multifaceted and often-insouble problems Mortal Questions the nature of human society and experiential life that Nagel pondered during the s.

The essays that explore scientific topics are quite dated and will prove generally unimpressive to anyone familiar with the last few decades of research in experimental psychology, cognitive science and neuroscience.

There are similar problems with the essays that address sexuality, the relationship between biology and ethics, and the mind-body problem. Nagel focuses on the specificity of what it is like to be various kinds of conscious or semi-conscious entities, as well as the intellectual commitments that follow from accepting consciousness as a gradated and pluralistic phenomenon.

This collision arises from our understanding of two opposing viewpoints: 1 from an outside perspective, human life is patently meaningless, and 2

from an internal perspective, we cannot help but take Mortal Questions seriously. In other words, we become morally lucky if influences outside our control cause events for which we can take or are granted by others moral credit, and we become morally unlucky when the opposite is true.

With a little help from Marvin Minsky, Robert Sapolsky explains: "The artificial intelligence pioneer Marvin Minsky once defined free will as 'internal forces I do not understand. As Nagel puts it: "As the Mortal Questions determinants of what someone has done are gradually exposed, in their effect on consequences, character, and choice itself, Mortal Questions becomes gradually clear that actions are events and people things.

Eventually nothing remains that can be ascribed to the responsible self, and we are left with nothing but Mortal Questions portion of the larger sequence of events, which Mortal Questions be deplored or celebrated, but not blamed or praised. Taking moral luck seriously also prioritizes compassion when dealing with those Mortal Questions are morally unlucky, etiolating arguments that a morally unlucky person deserves a nasty fate as punishment for having executed a series of bad choices that could have been avoided.

Returning now to the absurd, we can see how moral luck interacts with our adolescent Mortal Questions inescapable need to take ourselves seriously. We long for things to matter gravely and crave recognition for bringing about circumstances that are Mortal Questions to us and others. But in reality our lives are meaningless and we are rushing downstream, self-reflective but not -controlled passengers riding an endless current of causality that decides moment to moment what we are and where we go.