

Recent changes in the structure of consciousness?

Sleutels, J.J.M.; Stuart Hameroff

Citation

Sleutels, J. J. M. (2008). Recent changes in the structure of consciousness? *Journal Of Consciousness Studies*, 172-173. Retrieved from https://hdl.handle.net/1887/13811

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: <u>Leiden University Non-exclusive license</u>

Downloaded from: https://hdl.handle.net/1887/13811

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

In: Stuart Hameroff (Ed.), *Consciousness Research Abstracts*, 2008, pp. 172-173.

Recent changes in the structure of consciousness?

Jan Sleutels, Leiden University P.O. Box 9515, 2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands mail@dassein.com

Conference paper, Toward a Science of Consciousness, Tucson, Arizona, April 8-12, 2008. Financial support from the Leiden University Fund (LUF) is gratefully acknowledged.

Abstract

Consciousness is generally seen as an endogenous asset of the mind/brain that is responsive to pressures on an evolutionary time scale, but that is largely unaffected by cultural history. Substantial changes in recent history are ruled out apriori. A typical example of this bias is Block's dismissal of Jaynes's theory that consciousness emerged late in the second millennium BC (Block 1995, Jaynes 1976). In an earlier paper (Sleutels 2006), I argued against Block that there is reason to believe that cultures like that of the early Greeks in fact did not have so-called A-consciousness, i.e., they did not have access to discrete mental representations poised for use in reasoning and rational control of action.

Taking this argument one step further, I discuss a change in the structure of conscious experience that is likely to have occurred in Western society mere centuries ago. I start from the premise that conscious experience crucially involves a conceptual framework, an idea that has proved exceptionally fecund since its codification by Kant in 1781. In contrast, pre-modern accounts of consciousness and cognition consistently did not use the concept of a framework. From a modern point of view, the most straightforward explanation of this contrast is that pre-modern thinking was based on a different framework that lacked the conceptual resources available to us

today. Call this the standard account: earlier minds had frameworks, but not the concept of a framework.

Unlike earlier critics of conceptual frameworks such as Davidson (1984) and Rorty (1972), I take the framework view to be basically correct as an account of modern experience. Drawing on an analogy with Block's argument against Jaynes, however, I argue that the standard account of premodern experience should be rejected. A better way to understand the nature of our ancestors' conscious experience is to assume that it was in fact frameless, as has also been suggested by Heidegger (1938).

I discuss three arguments for my claim. First I show that the standard account's explanatory value is highly doubtful. I then argue that historical changes in folk psychology are prima facie evidence of changes in mental structure, and I consider examples of such changes. Finally, with reference to the extended mind approach, I argue that modern frame-based experience is best seen as an internalization of new communications technologies developed in the late Middle Ages and early modern period as a result of the rise of manuscript industry and the invention of the printing press (cf. Olson 1994).

References

Block, N., (1995). On a confusion about a function of consciousness. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 18, pp. 227-247.

Davidson, D., (1984). On the very idea of a conceptual scheme. In: *Inquiries into truth and interpretation*. Clarendon Press, Oxford, pp. 183-198.

Heidegger, M. (1938). *Die Zeit des Weltbildes*. Translated as: The age of the world picture. In: *The Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays*. Transl. by William Lovitt (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1977), pp. 115-154.

Jaynes, J. (1976). *The Origin of Consciousness in the Breakdown of the Bicameral Mind* (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin).

Kant, I. (1781). Kritik der reinen Vernunft.

Olson, D. (1994). *The World on Paper. The Conceptual and Cognitive Implications of Writing and Reading* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Rorty, R. (1972). The world well lost. *Journal of Philosophy* 69, pp. 649-665. Sleutels, J. (2006). Greek zombies. *Philosophical Psychology* 19, pp. 177-197.