

The Concept of Mind

A.303/4

Project No: 00525/3017
Duration: 24'30"
Production by: Mary Hoskins

Colour Film No: OUF.152
First Transmission:
4th April, 1973

Linked to correspondence text for units 1 and 2,
"Body and Mind". Open University Press 1973. Price

"The Concept of Mind" is one of the most influential books on philosophy to have been published since the war. In it Professor Gilbert Ryle attacks what he calls the 'Official Doctrine', that is, the Cartesian conception of a person being two things - a Mind and a Body. Mrs. Susan Haack, of the University of Warwick, questions Professor Ryle about some of the main themes of the book. Professor Vesey introduces and comments on the argument.

DESCARTES
CARTESIAN'S DUALISM

Title: The concept of mind

CU A303/4

Tape No. 6HT/70789

Project No.00525/3017

Producer: Mary Hoskins

O.U. film no.152 colour

Contributors: Gilbert Ryle
Susan Haack
Godfrey Vesey

Date Recorded.

1st TX.14.3.1973

Form VTR

Duration 23'25"

Class nos.128.2

Summary: The 'official' doctrine
of mind is questioned
and discussed by the
contributors.

Rww

Seq.	Time.	Footage.	Sequence List.	Sound Cue
1	2.47	43	Godfrey Vesey introduces the discussion between Haack and Ryle; he defines the 'official doctrine' of the concept of mind and describes its descent from Descartes.	..Descartes was up to
2	6.01	91	Haack, by questioning, Ryle, by replying, offer a critique of Cartesians' dualism (i.e. mind and non-mind) in their description of the problem of the concept of mind.	I'm not altogether clear..... ..he's set the question
3	6.51	103	Godfrey Vesey sums up the preceding sequence and introduces the next sequence.	It's one thing.... ..on these questions
4	14.05		Haack questions Ryle on the definition of 'behaviour'. Ryle then goes on to attempt an explanation, or rather, the beginning of an explanation of intelligent behaviour. Godfrey Vesey sums up the points made and introduces the following sequence.	at least to Descartes
5	23.04	303	Susan Haack speaks at some length on the problem of 'imaging' or 'visualizing' and the difficulty of actually defining such impropu acts (when 'imaging' is improper and not a conscious effort) in behaviourist terms. Ryle goes on to discuss behaviourism further in an attempt to explain why 'seeing in the minds eye' would not be really seeing. His explanation would arise from his notion of 'negative inert behaviour'.	I think we could... ..subject of visualizing.
	23.25	307	Credits	