

Nirmith Victor D'Almeida

101160124

June 27th 2024

PHIL 2501A

Dr. Josh Redstone

Evolution of our understanding on Behaviorism

Behaviorism, as a theory, has long stood as a pivotal theory in philosophy, aimed at understanding observable behaviors. However, despite its rise in popularity, it has faced severe shortcomings whenever we are accounting for the internal mental processes of different humans and animals. In this essay, I plan to argue in favor of the inability of behaviorists to fully account for the internal mental processes of different beings along with their inability to account for similar emotions or behaviorism of other animals. Alongside these we will also be exploring the evolution of our understanding of behaviorism and examining concepts related to understanding and answering questions raised by thought experiments such as *Bettle in the box*, "What is it like to be a bat", *Cartesian Theater* and *Philosophical Zombieism* to understand the evolution in our progression of understanding Behaviorism. By examining these ideologies and experiments, I plan to argue for a more clear and simplified understanding of behavior that incorporates both observable and unobservable mental states.

We will start off by first understanding the history and rise of behaviorism and understanding of the intimate relationship between mentality and behaviorism. This concept rose at the start of the 20th century but its idea conception according to Kim starts off in 1913 by J.B. Watson whose declaration we will compare with William James in his classic "Principles of Psychology". According to Watson, Psychology is a purely objective experimental branch whose theoretical goal is the prediction and control of behavior. What this view means is we consider psychology to be more or less an experimental study of publicly observable human and animal behavior which brings into question the lack of understanding of internal mental states. This field of science dominated scientific psychology until the 60's and according to Kim made behavioral science a preferred name for it across multiple universities [textbook reference pg 61]. The author also rightly states that the rise in behaviorism popularity is no fluke. Kim states that behavior is intimately related to mentality. What the author summarizes is that we do is inseparably connected with what we think and want. Our behavior is considered a natural expression in conveying these belief and desires. This raises a few questions in our mind such as how intimate is this relationship? In simple words, having a mind is just a matter of exhibiting appropriate patterns of behavior. The idea however has lost its special privilege and position from 50s onwards when according to M. Braat et al., psychologist, linguists and computer scientists joined forces and developed empirical approaches to study of mind and cognition (add the resource stating the fall of behaviorism) however its influence according to Kim and a few other thought experiments that we will come across still lingers on. These ideas will provide us a better understanding of how interconnected these concepts are.

In order to understand the intimate relationship between mentality and behaviorism we come across the first of many thought experiments the *Cartesian theater*. According to ideas derived from Descartes, mind is a private inner stage on which mental actions take place. [Kim pg3] This stage concept needs actors who are represented by our thoughts, sensations, perceptual sensings, emotions and so on where these 'actors' play out their role and fade away. The fade away in this concept doesn't necessarily mean disappear forever rather it means till the end of the act and it prepares itself for the next scenario. Now it

brings into question how many people can view the acts? The answer is simple only oneself. We can consider this person to be the owner of the theater and has a full authoritative control of it, we can also refer him to a director or a producer. From this we can infer that nothing goes on in the theatre without their knowledge. But here we come across the concept of how would others be able to view the internal states of our mind since it is only limited to the owner of the theater. We can formulate an attempt to answer this question with the help of an example similar to one by kim pain of stubbing a toe, when we stub a toe we know we are in pain due to the feelings we experience **also termed as direct knowledge** but the person looking at us can only **infer the state we are in**. Which further raises a question wisely stated by Kim, How do you know? The answer is difficult to explain unless we are an expert in biological connections which I am not so my answer follows exactly similar to Kim's "I just do" approach since it is a knowledge associated directly to me or the person experiencing the play or act at hand.

Resources:

1. [Animal Cognition - Google Books](#)
2. [What Happened to Behaviorism – Association for Psychological Science – APS](#)
3. [The New Behaviorism | Second Edition | John Staddon | Taylor & Francis \(taylorfrancis.com\)](#)
4. [Philosophy of behaviorism \(nih.gov\)](#)
5. [Behaviorism | John B. Watson | Taylor & Francis eBooks, Reference Work \(taylorfrancis.com\)](#)
6. <https://ebookcentral-proquest-com.proxy.library.carleton.ca/lib/oculcarleton-ebooks/detail.action?pq-origsite=primo&docID=665820> (edited)
7. Bit more on the psychology side but [Behaviorism Evolves on JSTOR \(carleton.ca\)](#)
8. [Understanding Behaviorism: Behavior, Culture, and Evolution - William M. Baum - Google Books](#)
9. [1 the Rise and Fall of Behaviorism the Narrative and the Numbers - DocsLib](#) (citation: 10.1037/hop0000146)