Check with Hubbs

1. Can we email questions early
2. Do you think any of the activities are good
3. Do the questions look good
4. Should we print out
5. Should we ask questions we only know the answer to or also questions we don’t know the answer to

TO DO

1. Maybe add some controversial statements to questions if possible so I can facilitate debate.
2. Check:
   1. Conceptual analysis under the umbrella of conceptual engineering?
   2. Understanding how the combination of concepts in pragmatic genealogy are greater than the sum of their parts.
   3. Understand Aristotle’s 4 causes
   4. The 7 benefits of pragmatic genealogy

Ideas

1. As a class or several groups, run through analyzing the same concept through:
   1. Intension first
   2. Extension first
   3. And function first
2. Have two teams with two groups each that compete where they do conceptual engineering and conceptual reverse engineering
   1. Conceptual engineering
      1. “From the function to the conceptual practice that would perform it”
   2. Reverse engineering
      1. “Begins at the point of the conceptual practice, to the function it performs.”
   3. Each team is given the same two ideas to analyze (say truth and justice). Both teams assign their groups a concept to analyze by reverse conceptual engineering. And then the groups give their analysis (which does not explicitly spell out the idea they are analyzing) to the other group on their team and then they must use conceptual engineering to give the functions they were given to reengineer the idea. If each group, is able to piece together the concept the other group analyzed, then they get a point.
   4. Analyze what worked well for understanding ideas
   5. This technically covers material from Ch 1 pg 17
3. Create a mindmap of the features in the concepts described in this chapter

Questions Unrelated to an Activity

1. On page 31, Queloz says the approaches genealogy, pragmatism, and naturalism share a reputation for being reductive. Is there good reason for this? He also says pragmatic genealogy, which is a combination of the three aforementioned approaches, is not reductive. If there is good reason to think genealogy, pragmatism, and naturalism are reductive, how can Queloz claim the combination of them is not reductive? Why can genealogies without the pragmatism and naturalism be reductive?
2. This chapter focused primarily on the benefits to pragmatic genealogy. What are some of the drawbacks of pragmatic genealogy?
3. If at all, when would pragmatic genealogy be the preferred method of analysis? When would conceptual analysis be the preferred approach to understanding concepts?
4. Can pragmatic genealogy and conceptual analysis be performed meaningfully together? If so, what ways does pragmatic genealogy complement traditional conceptual analysis? In what ways do they limit each other when done together?
   1. Might want to get rid of the first part of the question because I think the answer is yes.
5. Can the conclusions reached through pragmatic genealogy and conceptual analysis ever conflict? If so, which conclusions are preferred? Or is this not possible?
6. Queloz says all pragmatic genealogy is a function-first approach? Are all function-first approaches genealogical? If not, what are other approaches which are function-first?
   1. Might want to get rid of the second because I believe the answer is no
   2. These other approaches could be where one knows the function already or where they focus on the function a concept should serve.
7. Why is pragmatic genealogy required for responsible conceptual engineering according to Queloz? Do you agree with this claim?
   1. It alerts us to the plethora of functions we need to consider when revising our conceptual practices?
8. How can you apply pragmatic genealogy to your own life?
9. How has your perspective changed if at all? In what ways are you skeptical of what Queloz claims?
10. Queloz brings up the trial of Oscar Wilde as being a good example of the distinction between justification and vindication. Can you think of another example which illustrates the distinction well?

Notes

* Conceptual analysis
  + Intension
    - The explicit definition of a concept.
      * The definitional content
    - Intension-first conceptual analysis is guided by Socratic Question.
    - Used to explain a concepts extension
  + Extension
    - The set of all cases a concept applies to.
    - Extension-first conceptual analysis is guided by Socratic Question.
  + Socratic Question guides it
    - Here the guiding question is a version of the Socratic ‘What is X?’ question, namely: ‘What are the conditions that are individually necessary and jointly sufficient for something to fall under the concept of X?’
    - “What is X? What are the properties or unifying principles that make it X?”
  + Sensitive to counter-examples and exceptions
    - Thinning of a concept
* Pragmatic genealogy
  + Function
    - The purpose or role a concept serves
      * Especially in relation to the needs and practices of the users of the concept
    - Pragmatic genealogy is a function-first approach
      * This approach is guided by Pragmatic Question.
        + Questions like:

"Why do we have the concept of X?”

“What does it do for us?"

* + - * Identifying a concept’s function is used to explain its existence and intension.
      * Prioritizes the point or function of concepts or terms in practice over inquiries and explanations primarily focused on their content or meaning.
    - Less limited by counter-examples and exceptions
      * Not as thin
  + Naturalism
    - Considers natural processes
  + Pragmatism
    - Looks at practical needs
  + Genealogy
    - Considers the historical origins of a concept and how it evolves through time
* Justification vs Vindication
  + Justification
    - Concerns the correct application of a concept.
    - Refers to providing reasons for a particular application of a concept or a specific expression of a value or virtue.
    - It concerns whether a concept applies in a particular case or whether certain consequences can be drawn from its application.
  + Vindication
    - Concerns the value and warrant for using the concept at all.
    - “Provides reasons for concept use.”
    - This involves providing reasons for or against cultivating a certain type of conceptual practice. It concerns whether to organize one's life along the lines articulated by the concept at all, rather than whether to apply the concept in a particular case or to draw consequences following its application.
  + The trial of Oscar Wilde illuminates the difference
    - “The difference is well illustrated by the trial of Oscar Wilde. Pressed by the cross-examiner to admit that a certain story was blasphemous, Wilde resisted. Yet he quite rightly did not dispute that the concept of blasphemy applied to the story. Instead, he found that given his needs and concerns, he had no reason to use the concept of blasphemy in the first place—‘blasphemous’, he remarked, ‘is not a word of mine’.” (Queloz 38).
* Cambridge pragmatism
  + Agent-centeredness
    - Focus on agents and their dispositions, attitudes, concepts, and words related to a philosophically puzzling topic rather than starting with the object itself.
  + A function-first approach
    - Prioritizes the point or function of concepts or terms in practice over inquiries and explanations primarily focused on their content or meaning.
  + Genealogical dimension
    - Seeks explanations of how a mode of talking, thinking, and practicing might have come about, given in terms of the functions it serves.