Arts Faculty

CAMERA SCRIPT

Sunday 9th May
Studio A.

KANT 1

Director.....Richard Callanan
Assistant.....Jane Elliott
Vision Mixer.....A. Beveridge
Floor Manager.....B. Lockyer

Designer.....Michael Richardson
Graphic designer.....Teresa Wallden

T.M.1.....Eric Furze

SCHEDULE:

10.30 - 13.00.....Rehearsal
13.00 - 14.00.....Lunch
14.00 - 15.30.....Rehearsal
15.30 - 15.45.....Tea
15.45 - 16.15.....Line-up
16.15 - 17.15.....RECORD

CONTRIBUTORS:

Godfrey Vesey, Professor of Philosophy, O.U.
Richard Rowson, Research assistant, O.U.
Professor W. Walsh, Edinburgh.

RUNNING ORDER

			pg	shot	cams
1.	OUT OF SEQUENCE Split screen Vesey and caption balloon		8	20	3, 1
2.	Opening sequence Vesey, T/J's 1 - 14 Animated caption		1 - 5	1 - 6	2
3.	Question and answer sequence Vesey andRowson. Animated caption		5 - 8	6 - 20	1,2, 3,4
4.	Recording break	Clear 1A 2 to B 3 to B	8		
5.	Question and answer seq.		8 - 9	21-23	2,3
6.	Recording break	Clear Monitor 1 to A 2 to A 3 to C Set Walsh in	9		
7.	Vesey to Cam ANIMATED CAPTION		10 - 13	24 - 26	2,3,4
8.	As Directed discussion		13		1,2,3,
9.	Closing T/J 15 6 18		13		

T/J 1 The Age of Revolutions

T/J 2 A Second Level Arts Course

1. 4 A
Caption 1
Kant and Causality.

T/J 3 Presented by Prof. Vesey

2. 2 A
MS VESEY

VESEY:

This is the second programme on Kant and Causality. The first was the radio discussion with Professor Walsh.

Let me start by reminding you where we'd got to.

Kant is trying to prove something. It concerns the distinction between a merely subjective succession of appearances, and a succession that is also objective.

We had examples to illustrate the distinction.

There was the example of the house, which you can look at in a number of ways -

T/J 4 roof of house
T/J 5 top floor
T/J 6 ground floor
T/J 7 top floor
T/J 8 roof of house

first the roof*, then the upper windows,* then the lower windows,*- or the other way round**

T/J 9 egg on table
T/J 10 egg falling
T/J 11 egg smashing

The other example was of an egg on a table* then falling*and then smashing*on the floor.

2. 2 A
MS Vesey

VESEY:

The point is that in both cases we apprehend a succession of appearances.

(T/J NEXT)

(ON 2)

Roof - upper windows - lower windows. Egg on table - egg falling - egg smashed on floor. But there's a difference - 'in the object'. In the case of the egg there's an objective succession to correspond to the subjective one. The egg being on the floor actually follows the egg being on the table. In the case of the house, however, there isn't an objective succession: the roof, upper windows, etc., don't succeed one another in the object: the succession is only in our apprehension of them.

One way of putting this would be to say that the roof, upper windows, and lower windows 'co-exist'* - that is exist at the same time. But the egg on the table and the egg on the floor don't co-exist.* The egg being on the table is followed* by the egg being on the floor.

T/J 12
Whole house

T/J 13
egg on table

T/J 14 egg smashing

3. 2 A
Vesey

Well now, supposing this distinction to be clear, what was Kant trying to prove? He was trying to prove that it is a condition of our being able to distinguish between merely subjective successions of appearances (as in the case of the house) and objective successions (as in the case of the egg falling off the table) - it is a condition of our being able to make this

distinction that objective successions should be causally determined. This was what he called 'The Principle of Succession in Time, in accordance with the Law of Causality'.

Let me put it lsightly differently.

Kant was trying to prove that only if what really happens always has a causal explanation can we work out what really happens.

The world, as an object of our of knowledge, is necessarily subject to the rule of causal law. That was what Kant was trying to prove.

Next: how did he try to prove it? How do you prove that to distinguish between exampleslike thehouse and examples like the egg, you must first accept that everything that happens is causally determined? On the face of it, it might seem that you can simply see whether or not you're dealing with objective succession. Kant has to prove that it isn't simply a matter of perception.

Well, he offered a number of proofs.

What I'm going to do in this programme was suggested by one of the, the one sometimes referred to as the 'indirect' proof. (An indirect proof, incidentally, is one which begins with the supposition that what has to be proved is not the case, andthen shows that the consequences are unacceptable.)

(On 2)

In place of two examples - the house and the egg - I'm going to have one - but one that can illustrate both what the house example illustrates and what the egg example illustrates. My one example is that of a balloon.

Let me explain how it can illustrate both things. Suppose you apprehend a succession of increasingly large balloon appearances. In other words, a balloon takes up more andmore of your field of vision. There are two possible explanations, one of which makes it like the house example; the other, like the egg example. It's like the house example if the change is due to a change in your point of view - that is, if you are approaching the balloon. It's like the egg example if there is an objective change - that is, if the balloon is actually getting larger, being blown up.

Now then, we're going to have an experiment. I'm going to show you a number of balloon-appearances on a television monitor, and I want you to try and judge whether or not the balloon is being inflated. And remember, what is at issue is whether or not a judgment can be made without somehow making use of causal knowledge.

(4 NEXT)

(On 2)

TRACK Back and pan L to inc. Rowson & Monitor.

I've asked Mr Richard Rowson, who is the Research Assistant in Philosophy at the Open University, to be the subject of the experiment which you will see on the monitor there. The results of the

4. 4 A
Wormsler caption
ANIMATE

experiment we will tabulate/ under the headings "Appearance"* a description of the image as it seems to the eye - and

ANIMATE

under "Reality"* - what is judged to be really the case. So here is the first

5. 3 A
Balloon & wallpaper
Zoom in slowly

appearance./

6. 2 A
2/S

Richard, first of all let's have a description of the appearance.

RICHARD:

Well, the image of the balloon took up more of the screen, and the background expanded.

GODFREY:

7. 4 A
Wormsler caption
ANIMATE

Right, I'll put up/ 'Balloon expands and background expand'*. Now for the reality/

8. 2 A
2/s

Do you think the balloon and background were actually getting bigger?

RICHARD:

No, of course not. You can inflate balloons, but not walls. Probably the camera was moving in on them.

(4 NEXT)

(ON 2)

GODFREY:

9. 4 A
Caption
ANIMATE

Okay./ In that case I'll put up 'Balloon not*inflated'. Now let's have the

10. 3 A
Balloon and wall. zoom out as balloon is inflated,

second appearance./

11. 1 A
Ms Rowson

GODFREY:

Well?

RICHARD:

You want the description of the appearance first?

GODFREY:

Yes.

RICHARD:

Well, the image of the balloon took up the same amount of the screen, but the background shrank.

GODFREY:

12. 4 A
Caption
ANIMATE

Right./ I'll put that up.* And you concluded?

RICHARD:

ANIMATE

That the baloon was being inflated.*

GODFREY:

13. 2 A
MS Vesey

Okay./ But before we go on, could I just ask you one thing? In the first example the image of the balloon increased in size, but you didn't think the balloon was actually increasing in size. In the second, the image of the balloon didn't

(1NEXT)

(ON 2) increase in size, yet you thought the balloon actually did increase in size.

14. 1 A — How is that?/
MS RICHARD

RICHARD:

Oh, well; in each case I had the wall to compare the balloon with - and, so far

15. 2 A — as I know walls don't expand or contract./
MS GODFREY

GODFREY:

Right. In that case, for the third example I'll give the balloon a plain

16. 3 A — background, and see how you get on./
Photo balloon
zoom in slowly

17. 2 A — GODFREY:
2/S

What about that one?

RICHARD:

Well, the balloon took up more of the screen.

GODFREY:

Yes. And do you think the balloon was being inflated or not?

RICHARD:

Well, that's just it. There was no way of telling. I need the wall, and what I

18. 4 A — know about walls, to draw a conclusion/
Caption
ANIMATE

GODFREY:

So ther's the appearance and under reality

19. 2 A — I must put a question mark./
2/s

(RECORDING BREAK NEXT)

(On 2)

Now just a moment. You said you need a wall. But anything that has a constant size will do, won't it? I mean, if I were to go over and stand by the balloon you'd have a basis for comparison, wouldn't you?

RICHARD:

I suppose so.

GODFREY:

Well, let's just try that. Watch the monitor.

RISES.

RECORDING BREAK

Clear 1A
2A to B
3A to B

20. 3 A Photo balloon
1 B Black background, Vesey enters SPLIT SCREEN
3 A ZOOMS IN
1 B ZOOMS OUT

RICHARD: (OOV)

Now I can see. The balloon's being inflated.

Oh!

21. 3 A MS RICHARD

Widen to inc. Godfrey

VESEY: (SITTING)

How about that, then?

RICHARD:

How did you do it?

(2 NEXT)

GODFREY:

We had a split screen, and while the camera on one half was zooming in, the camera on the other half was zoomingout, and then reversing the process.

RICHARD:

Zooming?

GODFREY:

22. 2 B
Group shot (2/S + monitor and cam 3)

CAM 3 zcom in and out.

Yes. Like this./ You see that camera is taking the picture of us being shown in that monitor. And by using the zoom lens, the cameraman is changing the picture size without changing his distance from us. But could we get back to the experiment what did you think was happening?/

23. 3 B
MS Richard

RICHARD:

Well, at first it looked as though the balloon was being inflated, but then I realised that I couldn't see what was happening.

GODFREY:

Right. Thank you, Richard.

/RECORDING BREAK/

CLEAR MONITOR
1 to A
2 to A
3 to C
SET WALSH IN.

24. 2 A GODFREY:

(TO RICHARD) Right. Thank you, Richard.
(TO CAMERA)
Right now. What, if anything, have we proved?
Let me begin by saying this: there are some facts about the things we look at, and about ourselves, that we know so well we take them for granted. We know, for instance, that whereas balloons can get bigger or smaller, walls cannot. About ourselves, we know that if a wall is taking up more of our field of vision it can only be because we are approaching it. That is, we know that the lenses in our eyes aren't zoom lenses.
But suppose - just suppose - that we couldn't rely on these facts. Suppose that for no reason at all our eyes started behaving differently, producing the sort of results that can, in fact, only be produced by television cameras, with zoom lenses, split screens, and the rest. Suppose, in short, that there was no regularity in the way eyes, and walls, and balloons behaved. Then what?
Then, I suggest, we could not sort out reality from appearance. Reference to

(ON 2)

causal regularities of one kind or another is our 'decision-procedure' for arriving at what is objectively the case. Explicitly - or, more often, implicitly- we take account of the way things behave, the laws of nature they obey, in order to decide what the reality of the situation is. It is only because this is so often an unconscious process that it seems to us that we simply <u>see</u> what the reality is.

What I've tried to do in the balloon experiment is to make this seem plausible to you. If it does seem plausible, then you may go on to draw the conclusion that if it weren't true that everything that happens is in accordance with a rule, we couldn't work out what happens. In other words, you may conclude that the world as we know it, in virtue of the decision-procedure involved in our knowing it, must be such that the principle of causality is true of it.

Now I can't claim to have <u>demonstrated</u> that conclusion. At the most, I've suggested a line of thought which leads in thedirection of it. If someone were to say to me: 'But I don't see why there

(4 NEXT)

(ON 2)

shouldn't be an occasional exception to the principle that everything can be brought under causal laws. Surely the occasional uncaused event wouldn't rock the boat,' I must admit that I don't know how I would answer him. I'm not sure that I would want to. I think I'd be satisfied if he admitted that there was, in general, a conceptual connexion between causality and objectivity.

But would Kant be satisfied? Well, this brings me to an admission I must make. Just now I formulated the principle of causality as follows:

'Everything that happens is in accordance with a rule'.

But this is to leave out something that seems to be important for Kant, namely an explicit reference to time. For him the principle is something more like

'Everything that happens follows on a preceding event according to a rule'.

This suggests that the key to understanding him, or to realising the truth of what he says, lies in recognising something about time, about causation being a relation between earlier and later events.

(4 NEXT)

(ON 2)

25. 4 A Caption question — A question I should like answered is/ 'What is the significance of Kant's reference to time in his statement of the principle of causality?" (PAUSE) Does it suggest a more convincing proof of the principle than the balloon experiment?

26. 3 ~~B MS Walsh~~ — With me is Professor Walsh,/ who took part in the radio programme and who is a Kant scholar. I'm going to put that question to him.

DISCUSSION

AS DIRECTED

1 A MS Vesey, MS Richard, o/s Richard

2 A MS Godfrey, 3/S

3 B MS Walsh, o/s Walsh

T/J 15 Presented by Godfrey Vesey

T/J 16 Also taking part, Professor Walsh

T/J 17 Production Richard Callanan

T/J 18 A Production for the O.U. BBC T.V.