

Joshua Reed
Being and Knowing
Spring, 2017

Study Questions 5

Thomas Nagel doesn't really think it's possible for us to understand one another's experience. Nagel uses the idea of imagining becoming a bat to make his point. The experience of existence as a bat is so radically different to our own that we couldn't really understand what it's like. Instead when we try to imagine what it's like we imagine ourselves with wings flying about eating insects.

Nagel makes the point that he cannot properly understand another's experience by adding or subtracting from his own experience. This type of imagining only tells him what it's like for him to experience being a bat, but not what it is like for a bat to be a bat.

Essentially extrapolation from our own experience cannot properly yield another's experience.

I do agree with Nagel. I definitely believe there are limits to this extrapolation. My gut reaction was that Nagel's premise didn't seem fully fleshed out. I know hunger, and lust, and vision isn't *as* far off from sonar as Nagel seems to indicate, but I realize after some thought, that these feelings would *feel* different to a bat. Actually feeling hunger would be different.