Cultivating the Soul, Session 3a
By James Moreland

[crowd murmuring]

Moreland:
Come together this evening.

Last time I tried to describe to you the different views about the human person and I talked about physicalism, property dualism, and substance dualism. And I suggested that there is a there are things called substances and they have properties or characteristics and events happen to them. OK so what does the physicalist think that you and I are? We are our brains.

What about what if something is what if a quote unquote mental state is going on inside of me. Suppose I'm thinking or having a sensation or I have a belief or I'm engaged in an act of will or something like that. What is that quote unquote mental state? What is that? Yes it's just right it's some kind of it's some kind of brain state. That's all it is. You understand it's either a C-fiber firing or when you're thinking your thought is just the state of your brain when you're having when you're seeing - when you're having an awareness of blue - that sensation that's going on inside of you. OK? the book is blue outside of you right. It's not inside you but the sensation of Blue is in you right. If there were nobody in the room would there be a blue book probably would there be any sensations of the blue book if nobody was in the room? No no. So according
to the physicalist that sensation is just something happening in your brain because something hit your retina. You follow me on that.

And the physicalist says I could describe everything about that sensation if I could tell you everything there is to know about it using just the language of neural physiology and physics and chemistry and that's it. That's what it is. You understand that the property dualist says what he wants to try to tell me what the property dualist says? Anybody want to give it a shot [pause]

What does the property dualist say I am? I'm my brain. So they agree that I'm a physical object. Some of my properties are physical. I'm 5ft 8", my brain does have when I'm when I'm thinking or sensing something - there are certain physical properties in my brain at that time that seem fair. But there are also mental properties going on in my brain that are different from the physical properties. In fact one might cause the other one. It may be because a certain nerve nervous system stimulation happens that I feel pain. But they're not the same thing. Right on that view the substance dualist says no your body is one thing and you're. Your brain is is one substance or and you're another one and your brain has the physical properties and you have the mental properties. That make sense to you at this point?

OK now there's a lot hanging on this and I've belabored this with you. I'm going to wrap it up tonight I assure you. We won't go on any further and I won't torture you any any any longer here.
But I want to wrap this up by now laying out in a very simple way a case for why your mental life is not physical and why you're not physical. OK. So first of all I want to argue for property dualism. Now you remember the old Law of Identity. If A is identical to B there the same something. So whatever is true of A is true of B and vice versa. Because they're just one thing out there we're talking about that's different than cause effect. Remember that? if one thing CAUSES another thing they're different.

OK. Now what I want to do in the next few minutes is is show you a number of things that are true of your mental properties that aren't true of any of you of any of your brain's properties. So that if I'm right about that then your thoughts and your sensations and your beliefs - which are all features of you - are not physical OK. That's the first thing I'm going to do and I'm going to list two three four considerations about that and what I'm going to try to do is to show there's something true of your thoughts or beliefs or sensations that aren't that are not true of anything physical, so they can't be the same thing. OK.

Now once I've tried that then the next thing I'll do and I'll tip you off to when I've done this is I'm then going to try to show that not only is your conscious life mental but you are a mental substance. OK. And then I'm going to give a bunch of reasons for that. And what if I'm right about this. This opens up the possibility of life after death. It doesn't prove it, but it sure opens up the possibility of it. It also has this very odd result. If you are not a physical object, you're a soul, then you then a lot of things that you know you don't know by your senses because aren't you
aware right now of what you're thinking and feeling and sensing and all that but you can't see your sense your thoughts and feelings or any of that sort of thing but you still know them but you can't see touched a similar Harum. So there's at least one thing you can know that is not doesn't have to use your senses and it's you and you can sort of kind of get to other people's souls by watching their bodies and listening to their mouths move and stuff.

OK. And then just maybe you might be able to get to God by looking at the order in the world. And think maybe there's a big soul out there that made the world because it sure looks like what we make when we do things intelligently. You might be able to do something like that see. There's a lot of stuff that can be pulled out of this hat. All right. To begin with let's - I'm going gonna trace some of the arguments that I list here in the chapter that I write for the text, chapter 2 but I'll just I'll just list some of them.

Let's take a thought. Suppose that you have a thought that that dinner was good today or you have a thought that your thought is I wonder if there will be cheese at the break [audience laughter]. Now ladies and gentlemen I hope you're not thinking that right now but I'm just let's assume you were thinking OK. [inaudible audience comment and laughter] see me after class. All right.
All right let's suppose you're having a thought that dinner was good. Now the question that I'd like to ask is how heavy is that or how much does it weigh compare the thought that lunch is good with the thought that there will be cheese at the break. Which of those thoughts weighs more than the other one. Which one of them is longer than the other. What is it. What is the thoughts shape. What is its geometrical shape. Is it square. Is it kind of spread out through an area sort of like a field of some kind. You know what I mean? Would we want to say that my thought that lunch was good, sort of I don't know spread out kind of like mayonnaise, kind of on the left half of my head sort of or you are you are you sort of tracking with me on this.

What's the chemical composition of that thought? What what chemical elements is the thought that lunch is good made of. Well there seems to be something that even wrong with those questions because I think most people would say thoughts just aren't that that kind of a thing. They don't have you know like I said the other time philosophers may have heavy thoughts but they don't need neck braces right. And that because they are heavy in that sense are they. But do you recognize that while you're having that thought there is something going on in your brain and it will make sense to ask where is that brain pattern located.

As a matter of fact that brain pattern can actually be localized on a scanner if you're looking at the person's brain you can detect electrical activity in a certain part of the brain you understand what I'm saying. And you could say something like it is sort of. It is sort of cylindrical and it's in the right hemisphere right now. This electrical activity and it has such and such electrical firings
in it and it maybe it's it's incited certain chemicals to occur in the brain there. You might even be able to talk about the mass of the particles that are kind of form that but but you understand it doesn't seem to talk about the thought in that term in those terms. If you're following me on that.

Now here's another side of it. Suppose that you look at this object and close your eyes you will experience what is called a blue after image. There will be a period of time when you will continue to have a blue sensation. A lot of people I'm actually able to do this a lot of people have enough imagination where they can picture a pink elephant in their mind if they close their eyes or they can dream in very vivid colors. I don't know if any of you've ever done that - but you have events going on inside of your mind in a dream that are sensations of color is there.

Don't look at me like that please. This is not a seance [audience laughter] OK. It's OK. Is this making sense to you. I mean is that seem like a plausible thing to suggest now do you recognize that if I'm having a blue I'm aware of a pink elephant in a dream or I'm having a hallucination of a pink elephant or I'm having a blue after image. There is something that is going on inside of me that is a sensation of blue. I am aware of it. How do I know it's there? Because I'm aware of it. I don't know how else to tell you. Now remember I'm not saying there's a pink elephant in my mind. I'm saying there is a there's a sensation of a pink elephant. You okay on that?
Ladies and gentlemen while that's happening there is nothing that is an awareness of pink in my brain anywhere. There is no awareness of pink anywhere in my brain - anywhere! A scientist while I'm doing that could scan my entire brain with an electron microscope or any instrument he wants and he will see no nothing shaped like an elephant. He'll see nothing that's pink or nothing that is an appearance of pink or an awareness of blue in any sense of the word.

John Stossel which I technically like I think frankly I think most of the media are terribly secular and unfair and left wing. They just do not represent the issues that matter to us in anything that even approximates journalistic objectivity. But John Stossel comes about as close as most people that I've seen. Think he does a pretty good job. They had a show on all about a year ago I don't remember the date might have been during the fall. I lose track of time which was literally laughable. Stossel - but you see what what made it so sad was because people would buy it just because a scientist said it - he was talking about oh I forget it was a show on the brain and he was talking to a neuro physiologist at the University of Michigan and they had the top of a person's brain a scan of it on a computer screen and and there was a certain patch where there was a certain shading of Red activity going on and the rest of the brain was blue. You understand that.

And the the one hemisphere was red and Stossel said what are we, what are we looking at here? And the scientist says that's love. You're looking at love there is Stossel said well how can you tell I mean if it was love couldn't you tell by looking at it? Not a bad - Not a bad question right.
Well he said We know that that's that's love. Now not that. Now look ladies gentlemen I will assure you that love is not a red blotch in anybody's hemisphere even even if Newsweek magazine does say that love is a certain chemical. I don't even know what that means. That's the I don't even know what that's supposed to mean much less could it possibly be true. To me that's just the height of lunacy. What the scientist should have said is this. We have talked to people many many times and we have found that when they're thinking loving thoughts their brains do a certain thing that we've now been able to identify.

Well look here that patient must be having a loving thought because look what his brain is doing. You understand that that's a causal relation now. Right. That's not an identity claim. Can I use that language with you now. That's not saying that the love is identical to the brain; the causal relation will do fine to say that the brain is causing love or probably in this case the Loving thought is causing the brain to do something that's probably more accurate. And I have no problem at all with the scientists looking at the brain and learning what people are thinking that's wonderful.

But that doesn't prove that love is the brain. In fact it's hard to even know what it would mean to say that love is colored red or it's got a certain electrical pattern. All right. That's the first argument. There just appear to be certain things true of my thoughts that are true of not true of
my brain and vice versa. And it's hard to see how anybody could mistake these as being the same thing. That's argument number one. OK.

Argument number two this is sometimes called the deaf scientist story. The deaf scientist story. Suppose that we lived in the year ten thousand A.D. and there was a scientist who's who is an expert on what goes on in the brain when we hear things. In fact now scientists have learned everything there was to know about the chemistry and physics and the neurophysiology of hearing. So something falls wavelengths go through the atmosphere. This, they hit the eardrums. They cause certain little hairs and there to vibrate those in turn produce electrical sparks that go down a certain pathway and they end up producing a very specific electrical configuration in the brain. You understand that?

Now this scientists let's assume knows everything there is to know about that. In fact there's nothing left out. She knows the entire physical description of that entire process. OK let's assume that. I submit to you though that if this scientist had been born deaf and all of a sudden if she for some reason her hearing was restored there would be some brand new facts some completely new facts that would be totally new to her that she would not know and those facts would be facts about what it is like to hear. It would be facts about the mental sensations of hearing different things. Now if I'm, if you're following the argument here remember the the argument assumes that she already knows all the physical facts.
You see that. She knows all this all the facts about the physical goings on. You understand that.
Now would you admit she learned some new facts. Does this seem like it might be that she
learned some new things. Now if she learned some new things - she gains your hearing and learn
something new. But if she already knows everything physical then what she learns that's new
can't be physical because if what she learned was a new something new physics a new physical
fact about the brain, she would already know that because she already knows everything about
the brain physically. That's our that's our story. You understand. But this is something new she
learns and it's not something that can be expressed.

What it's like to hear or to smell or see cannot be expressed in scientific language.

Let me give you another example then I'll see if you have a question. This is one of the great
proofs to me that animals have souls. One philosopher wrote an article and you understand that
we we write bizarre things and this article was called what. What is it like to be a bat - not a
baseball bat ladies and gentlemen. But one of these. OK. And he argued. He said - his name is
Thomas Nagel - and he said Look suppose we had a computer here. And suppose that it was a
computerized bat and in fact suppose that we put bat skin over it. But we knew it was
computerized. Now suppose we knew everything there was to know about the workings inside
that computerized bat. We knew all of the chips and every circuit and every capacitor and all the
when you put input into everything that would do inside and what it would cause the thing how it
would move if you did something to its sensors so that we knew all there was to know about that computer.

Nagel argues that there would be nothing left to know. We would know the entire system if we knew all the physical facts about that computer. Everything about its internal machine and and what it would do if you did things to it there would be there would be nothing left out to learn. But he says Take it take a real bad. Suppose now that we knew everything there was to know about the same stuff about the bat we knew everything about its brain and central nervous system we'd learned everything about its internal organs. We knew all of the bat's behavior we knew when it would turn left and when it would die and that sort of thing there would still be something that we would not have one clue about. And it's what it is like to be a bat.

Now do you see what's the difference between the real bat and the computerized bat that can engage in bad behavior? Do you understand the difference is the real bat has - I'm going to use a word here I hope I won't throw you off - the real bad has an insides. What do I mean insides don't we know all the insides of the computerized bat.

Yeah so we don't mean he has a bunch of parts in his carcass what we mean is there is consciousness there. He has a conscious personal pride that mental like bats aren't persons but he does have a subjective personal experiential life and you know you can't learn anything about
that by just learning about the bat's brain. You follow me. You know it's entirely possible that bats can't see color for example. Now you can tell when a bat can discriminate things like that but you can't tell what the experiences they use to discriminate it.

I don't know if you're catching this. So there is something about the bat and my dog and a cow. People laugh at cow souls. What I'm saying is cows are conscious. They have a court. They have sensations. They probably have certain rudimentary emotions. I'll talk later about animal souls this evening but certainly everybody would agree that animals can experience pain and they have a conscious life and you can't describe that by talking about its brain or anything of that sort.

By the way here's what's interesting about this. Would you agree that - let's distinguish the first person point of view. The first person from the third person [writing on chalkboard] I have first I have first person knowledge of myself. But you have third person knowledge of me. I'm an object to you. OK I'm a subject to me. OK. Now here here's what's interesting. Take any material object you want. And please please stay with me here. Take any physical object you want a chair if you want a computer. A robe a computerized robot bat if you want to I don't care any material object do you recognize that anything I can know about that physical object its size its weight how it works is available to you too you can learn anything about that physical object by doing the same things I do. If I measure it you can measure it. If I tinker with it and watch how it moves you can do the same thing you understand that. Do you know though that there is but
that's not true of my mental life because I have a way of knowing about my mental life that's not available to you and that's simply by introspection.

Now you understand you might know more about my brain than I do if you're a scientist but you can't know more about my thought life than I do. Let me come at this just I'm saying this and a lot of different ways. Could a scientist study my brain and learn pretty much what he wants to learn about my brain by investigating it? OK same thing would be true of the computer or a or a river or a stone or a chemical element makes sense to you.

Have you ever wondered why scientists have to wake patients up and ask them if they're dreaming or what's going on if they're gonna - you know that watch these rapid eye movements and they can tell people are dreaming when their eyes move in their sleep. How do they know that they ever thought how they have they do they know it by just looking at their eyes moving. Do they know it by doing more detailed looking at the eye moving maybe by looking at the eye moving under a microscope. Would that would that help. Well maybe what they need to do is look at the is put the person's brain on the operating and open it up while the person's eyes are moving and look at the brain activity is that going to help.

Now what do they have to do to tell whether a person is dreaming when their eyes are moving? They've got to wake them up at some point and to say what was going on then and the person
said I was dreaming about this. Then they come up with a correlation. They say OK. Dream type one. Maybe it was a happy dream is correlated with brain state one and they do it later and they still kill and find different kinds of dreams. These are kind of sad dreams they're correlated with brain state too right.

So the next. Or let's say eye movement 1 and eye movement 2. So the next time they see somebody is I'm moving in this way they'll say well he's probably having this kind of dream that's OK right. That's I don't mind that but the point is they didn't. How did they get this. Because they only have access to this side of the correlation. They can't get at this one. How come they can't get at it if it's your brain because they can get it your brain you understand what I'm saying to you.

They have total access to your brain why if they have total access to studying your brain don't they have to ask you what's going on inside of you when your brain is doing such and such? Why do they have to do that? Because they can't see in your soul that's why they don't have any access inside your mind you gotta tell them - why? Because you have first person awareness of your mind then he doesn't he's outside the box looking in your inside the box all right.
Well I got one more. I'll wrap this part of the class up. See if you have a question. I hope you're getting something out of this. I mean you may wonder why I'm beating a dead horse on this I guess the main reason you're not the dead horse. The issue is the dead horse [audience laughter].

You know you could become a dead horse after I beat this dead horse!

But the reason I'm doing this is because everybody does brain talk all the time. Nobody talks about soul anymore. And I think that's absolutely tragic. And you know what. And people have the assumption that that's because science has taught us to see the world that way and we've got to see the world away. And I'm saying that's absolutely false absolutely false.

All right.

Your mental states [writing on chalkboard]. These are your thoughts and your sensations and that sort of thing. OK your mental states have intentionality. I'll tell you what that means in a minute. Nothing physical [writing] as intentionality. Therefore mental states aren't physical [writing]...Now what I'm saying is there is something mental states have I'm told you what it is yet but there is something that your thoughts your sensations your beliefs your desires have that nothing physical has. And if that's true then your thoughts and beliefs and sensations have
something true of them that's not true of anything in your brain so they aren't physical. You see the argument

Now. What is intentionality? You know what's embarrassing about this. It is so obvious it's almost silly to tell it to you. In fact I'm going to use a word here that will be hard for you to at first perhaps see what's going on because it's so obvious intentionality means of-ness or about-ness [writing]. Your thoughts or thoughts OF something you have a thought ABOUT the California Angels your hopes our hopes ABOUT a brighter day your sensation is a sensation OF the desk your beliefs our beliefs OF or a belief ABOUT such and such.

You have a desire ABOUT, you have a fear OF dogs you understand all of your mental states are of something.

There are a lot of things.

OK they're of things you know you think that when you said the word dog is that that is about a dog right. The word dog is the word dog really isn't about a dog. We use the word dog because our thought of the dog is about a dog and we use the word to stand for our thought. The word
dog isn't about anything but your thought of the dog is about a dog. And we use the word to stand for our thoughts. You understand that?

Now you know Of-ness is not anything in physics chemistry. You can look at you go the library and get any physics and chemistry book or a brain you can get any book on the brain and you're not going to see anything about of there. No state of your brain as of anything right. One state of the brain might cause another state of the brain. Something happens in one part of your brain and might cause something. Another part of your brain. But none. There's no part of your brain that is about something or of something. Another way to put this is thoughts have meaning but physical things don't have meanings. Thoughts have meanings content that are about things but your brain doesn't have any meanings that are about anything.

And so they're not the same. I want to, I'd like to ask you to take just five three minutes and this review what I've said. Just review these arguments and then we'll come back and I'll see if you have a question about it.
I was asked a question that I'm gonna postpone. But it was am I assuming that animals are conscious of themselves I'm going to say yes and no I think they're conscious of themselves I don't think they're conscious of themselves as selves that is to say I think an animal when it's stuck with a pin can be aware of the hurt so it can be conscious of its self but it can't be it is not conscious of itself as being a self and that's different if you follow me. So I believe animals have self awareness but not awareness of themselves as selves because they do not have the concept of what it is to be a self. So that would be my quick answer.

OK. Is there a question or a problem. And please don't feel like your question this can be intimidating because this is the first time you've heard it and don't let this intimidate you I'm here to serve and help you and you may disagree with me and that's fine but please. Yes ma'am. All right.

Speaker 2:
I work in a hospital and I take care of people in commas.

Moreland:
Yes.

Speaker 2:
with different and even [inaudible] levels of consciousness.
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Moreland:

Right.

Speaker 2:

So we knew we were asking them who's the president of the United States etc. Are we talking to their soul? Are we evaluating the non-physical?

Moreland:

OK that yes. I would say that we are our soul. So if you're talking to them you're talking to their soul. We are our souls in my view I have I'll try to show that

Speaker 2:

but this is this is scientific data, we're charting it.

Moreland:

Oh yeah! What. But what are you charting. What is it that you're charting? Tell us. I mean

Speaker 2:

it would be oriented. Oriented times three

Moreland:

okay. Can you describe that for us?
Speaker 2:
Person, place, time

Moreland:
Okay do they have an orientation right. Well what you're basically doing I think is you're asking is their soul functioning normally right now. Here's what I would be getting at. And you're using certain physical indicators to show that and there's nothing wrong with that. See what I want to what I want to show you is that there's nothing scientifically that you have to abandon here.
What you have to abandon is the claim that science tells us all there is to say. That's what you have to abandon because that's clearly false. But you do not have to abandon reasonable scientific claims. That's not a problem. Yes?

Speaker 3:
A question, is all of science knowledge physical?

Moreland:
I would agree with that I would agree unless eventually unless you were able to come up with a table that correlated it. But then that would require some time in the past that you had to do it. So

Speaker 4:
So souls have malfunction?

Moreland:
Oh yeah! What do you think sin is? [audience laughter] Let's stop and think clearly now. As we'll see later brain dysfunctioning can cause mental dysfunctioning and mental dysfunctioning can cause your brain chemistry to be distorted. It goes both ways. This is OK I'll give you a practical application. This is why caring for your body is critical for the life of your soul. And this is why you will probably be more or less prone to get sick if you have a cheerful soul inside because a cheerful soul can actually impact your brain chemistry and your let your nervous system and your immune system and so on. It goes both ways because I'm not a disembodied soul right now. I am a body-soul entity. I've got to care for both of them right now. All right.

Any anybody else. I sense that we're getting I sense you're getting this and I'm really, I love that [scattered laughter in audience] and some of you aren't getting it as much that's OK. Yes?

Speaker 5:
Does your soul need rest while it's hear on earth?

Moreland:
Yes it does. When you sleep your soul -

Speaker 5:
How about brains?

Moreland:
I don't - I mean I'm open, I don't you know here's where a scientist would have to tell me. I would need evidence for whether we're conscious when we're sleeping or if we're unconscious but I'm open to either. I don't know. Uh, believing that I have a soul can accommodate either view

Speaker 6:
Well if we're not unconscious we're not conscious -

Moreland:
Yeah. So certainly it appears that you can be unconscious

Speaker 6:
and be resting and getting a full night's sleep if you're having a million dreams.

Moreland:
Yeah. Yeah.

Speaker 6:
And wake up feeling well-rested

Moreland:
Yeah. That goes both ways or unrested as the case may be sure. Absolutely. Now. Yes sir. One more.
Speaker 7:
If I may be so bold,

Moreland:
Yeah please do.

Speaker 7:
I agree with everything you're saying here about the mind and everything just, the different [inaudible].

Moreland:
Yes.

Speaker 7:
But the bottom line. Have we proven that soul exists separately?

Moreland:
No. I. All right

Speaker 7:
just for a measure of faith
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Moreland:

well I'm not sure a measure of faith is required. But let let let me let me let me tease a couple of things out if I if I could this might be - I find this a great question. I appreciate you asking it. If my arguments are good and I'd like to see them refuted there I think they're obvious arguments to anybody who's doesn't have an axe to grind then what I've shown is that your conscious life is not a state of your brain. I haven't said anything about you yet. For all I know you could still be your brain but your brain could have conscious episodes in addition to brain episodes. So I haven't demonstrated yet by argument that you are a mental thing. I've just shown the for - It would be consistent with what I've argued so far that you're your brain but that your brain has sensations and thoughts and dreams in it. So that of course if that's the case when your brain dies you cease to exist.

You or your you haven't you're troubled about that.

Speaker 8:

I'm just - does the third person first person thing address that a little bit? If your mind -

Moreland:

Well maybe. Well we'll come to that. We're going to come to that. Hold that thought. Yes it does. It does. I think it does. Cup two other things that I might share. So the first thing is no I haven't done anything at all to suggest that we are souls. And even if I can prove we are solved that
doesn't prove that they can survive the death of the body because in my view animals are not just brains with conscious events in them. They are souls with conscious events in them.

But the animal soul die ceases to exist when the animal body is dysfunctional. I do not think the animal soul continues to exist so uh, I could be wrong about it. So it even though I have a soul. Life after death could still be false but at least it opens up the possibility of it and makes it more plausible. I would like to say I would like to urge that that and you know just think about this. Maybe I'm maybe I'm wrong on this and you know no harm done if I'm wrong. I have been wrong before my wife has assured me of this [audience laughter] I'll get to in a minute. but I would like to urge you to maybe modify your understanding of what faith means and I have a very I promise you a very simple easy book to read coming out this summer. Trust me [audience laughter]. And I talk of I go through what biblical faith is but the idea that many people have today is that faith is kind of something you used to make up for paltry evidence and that the more evidence you have the less need the risk for faith.

I actually gave it evangelistic talk in Schenectady New York to a bunch of non Christians and Christians and I opened it up for questions so I gave arguments for God's existence. One believer - bless her heart I wish she hadn't raised this because I wanted the unbelievers to raise the questions. But she says Well Doctor more than a few prove God exists. What room is there for faith? And I said Well I don't know. I said on that view of faith maybe we ought to prove that
every conceivable piece of evidence could come in against the Bible so we'd have a room for a lot of faith on that view.

Now look you understand that faith is not something that - here is the target reason takes you this far, and then Faith bridges the gap. Faith is trusting what you have reason to believe is true in the scriptures. Faith is trusting what you have reason to believe is true. Now sometimes we have reason to believe something because the Bible says it. But I would hope that we would also have reasons for believing the Bible's true from history and that kind of thing. Now one other thing and then I'll come to you ma'am and then I will. I'll want to jump back in.

Listen I don't know how else to say this but [pause] I'm an authority on this subject and you can ask me any question and I'm not worried about it. So you don't have to hedge your punches and say I hope you don't mind me asking this. I've been down this road pretty deeply before and I think where we and I don't say that to boast. What I say to you is to say I think we're often used to being confronted with teachers and this is not a - this is not a fault of anybody's but but who are good generalists because you have to be to be a pastor but they're not experts on anything. And there may be three or four questions deep but they know something about a lot of things and that's a good that's a good thing to be. That is a life well lived. There is nothing wrong with that but we need in the church a few people that are 10 or 15 miles deep in a few subjects and I and I think I'm in hitting that ballpark on this. So you can relax and there are plenty of us around and you just need to rest assured that the Christian community has a robust number of intellectuals
that can handle just about any question you want to ask them so you can just ask your questions. I say that because we are fearful I think that if we ask questions maybe really nobody knows the answer. And I'll tell you that's false. There may be a few questions that we don't know but somebody has the answer to some - most of them. In fact probably Augustine solved 80 percent of them in the three hundreds [audience laughter]. If you ever read him you'll you'll know why I say that. OK now you had something ma'am and then.

Speaker 9:
It's not a question I'm trying to address something that you talked about - how do you know that the thought is something different than the brain?

Moreland:
Yes.

Speaker 9:
Like for example if the surgeon is performing a brain surgery

Moreland:
Yes

Speaker 9:
and exchange and swap the brains from A to B.
Moreland: Cultivating the Soul, Session 3a

Moreland:

Yes

Speaker 9:

When the person wake up, A will not have the mind of B, and vice versa.

Moreland:

Well first of all when they do this and it will come. My prediction is that the person who wakes up will be the person with the body not the brain. So if I take brain from A, and brain from B and put this one over here in this person's body I think the person that will wake up will be the person in the body not the brain. That's my prediction. Let's assume I'm wrong. Let's assume I'm wrong. All that shows me is that the soul is deeply connected to the brain and it follows the brain but not it that it's the same thing. And I'll prove that to you shortly. I really will. I'll prove that to you.

Okay. Let's talk about why. Let's talk about why we are not our brains and why we are not our mental states. Now let's just loosen up here. We're all tired and we want to try to lay hold of this. What I'm doing now is I've given you arguments for why your thoughts and sensations are not states of your brain. Now I'm going to try to show that you are the thing that has your thoughts and you're not your brain or your thoughts. OK. You are neither your brain and body and you're not your mental life. You're the thing that has your mental life and that has a body. That's what I want to show now. OK. Here's a very simple argument for it:
Disembodied [writing] life after death is possible.

Have you heard of some of these near-death experiences? You've heard of those. Even if you think that those stories are every single one of them false which I don't. But suppose you thought every single one of those stories is false. Would you agree that at least they're possibly true. They might be true even if you think they're false. If you're willing to grant that they might be true. That's enough to prove you're not your brain or your body. OK. Why? Because what we're - we're not envisioning a brain up on the top of the lab room looking down at the body are we.

Let's just follow with me disembodied life after death is possible. If you're your brain disembodied life after death that's not possible. Why. Can a brain exist without without being the brain? Are you tracking with me here. OK. If you're your brain, could your brain exist without being material? Could your brain exist without there being anything physical at all. No. Because it's your brain your brain could you exist. Is it possible for you to exist with no nothing physical existing is that possible? Is it possible for your brain to - could God create a world where you're in that world and there's nothing material. I think you could. Could God create a world with your brain in that world and there's nothing material in that world not even God could do that. So you can't be your brain because disembodied existence if you're your brain is impossible. You see that if you are your brain then disembodied life after death is not only false. It couldn't be true
because to claim that there is there could be life after death. That's disembodied given that I think your brain would be for me to say your brain could exist without being material.

I don't know what that means. You see that? I'm seeing a lot I'm seeing more blank stares now [audience laughing].

Look I'm not assuming life after death is true. I'm just assuming it might be true it could be - it's possibly true but that's enough to prove that you aren't your brain because there's one thing I know about you if you're your brain and that is that it is completely impossible for you to survive the destruction of your brain that's impossible if you're you're brain. I mean you see that? If you're your brain and your body, not only do you not survive its destruction it's impossible for you to because you're just your brain and body but if it's possible for you to survive the destruction of your brain the body even if you don't but if it's just possible you can't be your brain and body.

Now you see the possibility of disembodied existence doesn't prove the disembodied existence is true. You can't prove disembodied existence is true just from the fact it's possible but you can show you're not your brain if it's possible and that's what I'm doing here. Because disembodied existence is completely impossible if you're just your body. What would it mean to say a body could exist disembodied. I don't know. What does that mean now that you understand that what
that me if a person says that you're just your brain they're committed to the thesis that that life after death is not only false but it couldn't possibly be true. That's a pretty strong statement. That is very strong. I'd like to see some proof for that and I'm claiming that it's at least possibly true.

Yup

Speaker 10:

What if you argue in a way that disembodiment, uh -.

Moreland:

Disembodiment is not possible because you are your brain a body?

Speaker 10:

Yeah

Moreland:

Well then I would say. Then I would say to somebody okay now you're forced to weigh two different views. First is is the assertion your brain give me evidence for that. The second is the is the fact that it is seems evident to me that I might be able to survive my death. You don't see anybody talking about these these near-death experiences as being impossible. A lot of people might say they're not true right. But I don't I've not heard anybody say that it's totally impossible that they be true. In other words I've not heard anybody say they couldn't be true before we investigate it.
Speaker 10:

But then you could say it's possible that it's not true.

Moreland:

Well but that doesn't matter because you see all you need to show that I'm not my body is that it's possibly true. That's all you need right. All I need to show that I'm not my wife is that it's possibly the case that I live in a different house from her even though I don't and won't. But if it's possible for me to live in a different house somewhere if I can't be the same thing as my wife OK. Let's keep let me keep going here.

Could you survive a loss of your mental life and memory? Suppose that you lost. Suppose that you changed your thoughts and feelings and beliefs and desires and they they were replaced with new thoughts and feelings and beliefs and desires. Or suppose that you had a set of a certain mental life and you lost all your memory of that could you still be the same person? I think so.

If that's true then you can't just be your mental life because if you're just your mental life if it changes and it's totally different then you are totally different. Now if you're willing to grant to me that you you could completely undergo a change of your mental life and still be you then you have got to be something different than your mental life. Right. Does it make sense to you? If you could survive a complete loss of your mental life and gain a new mental life then and still be the same person then you can't be your mental life because it's totally different now but you're
still the same person. I would describe it by saying you're the same person with a new mental life and you were the same person with the old mental life. Yes.

Speaker 11:
So someone who believes in reincarnation, they would support that you are not our brain and they would think that there would be a complete loss of [inaudible]

Moreland:
Yes

Speaker 11:
And they're still that same person?

Moreland:
No. No. That's. That's the big difference. Because at reincarnation you're not essentially a person. And that's the difference. Because you're you're what's called just a bare little mental dot. And you can come back a dog. Or a gorilla. And so it's not essential to you that you'll be a human person in my view if you're a soul it is essential to you that you'll be a human person. It's impossible for you to be other than a human person. You're not just this little dot that it doesn't matter what you are. Now there are some things about you that aren't essential to you; having a body and having the specific thoughts you have. But it is essential to you that you be a human person. Yes in the back.
Speaker 12:

[inaudible]...if one concedes that life after death is possible -

Moreland:

Yes

Speaker 12:

Then they're also conceding that in fact we are more than a brain or else they couldn't say that.

Moreland:

Right.

Speaker 12:

Why couldn't they merely be saying that life after death is possibly true, and it's possibly true therefore that we are more than a brain?.

Moreland:

I'm sorry say it again. OK.

Speaker 12:

I'm not saying -
No. OK.

Speaker 12:
They don't have to go far to say that -

Moreland:

Shhh, all right. Because [pause] the identity relationship is necessary. This is this gets bad. Something's identity with itself is necessary to it. It's not what's called contingent. It could be might not. Might be might not be. Me being five eight is not necessary to me. It's conceivable that I could exist and not be 5 8 but me being me. There's no world where I could exist and not be me. If it's possible. If it's not even possible for me to exist and not be identical to me. You understand that at this point does that make - dol you understand that or not.

So you see if A is identical to B it is impossible for A to be somewhere without B being somewhere. You follow me. So if A is me and B is my brain and they're identical then it's not possible for me to be somewhere without my brain because they're the same thing.

If I can show that it's possible for me to exist without this they can't be identical they can't be identical. That's the key here. This is a powerful argument. Yes.

Speaker 13:
In terms of the body,

Moreland:
Yes ma'am.

Speaker 13:
If you remove an arm or a leg you could

Moreland:
Still be the same. OK

Speaker 13:
So if part of the brain [inaudible] with alzheimer's or -

Moreland:
Yeah. You're still the same but you've lost some functioning. It's still the same human being.

Speaker 13:
But it's, I'm thinking about the body as a whole as the soul, the body - it all flows through it, and so forth as being a whole and we still function if we lose a portion of that, but if we lose a portion of our brain we become different.

Moreland:
OK by become - OK. There you gave the game away right there because you see if A - if some object A - begins with being F, say a leaf is green and it goes to becoming G. So that we would say it's different. You've got to have A existing at the beginning of the process and at the end to put it differently. Change assumes sameness. You cannot have change. You can't have change without having something being the same. Right.

Speaker 13:
It seems that the brain is the thing that's changing more than anything else.

Moreland:
I'm not denying that I'm open to that idea but all that shows is that my brain is a very special thing that that is intimately related to my functioning. I will give you a break now I want it. I want to jump to something else I wanted. Let me do something else with you and then we'll come back here and before we take a break we have. I have to make an announcement. Let me. This is an important issue. The ancient Greeks talked about this ship that was owned by a warrior named Theseus and there was a mythological story but the story went like this and see what you think about this.

Theseus went out to sea and at the end of the year he came back and the carpenters were waiting on the shore and they took a plank off of the boat set it on the shore and replaced it with a new plank and he and his priest went out for another year and came back the next year.
The Carpenters took the second plank off the boat and set it on the shore and put another plank and on this went until eventually over the years a pile of lumber appeared on the shore and the ship of that the priests are now riding on is made out of totally completely new parts. The Carpenters weary of being land-lovers reconstructed the original parts of the ship of Theseus with only those parts and all the parts in exactly the same structure in precisely the same structure. Now if we assume for the sake of argument that one of these ships is the original ship of Theseus which one is it is it the one the carpenters have. Or is it the one that Theseus has?

Now. I think the obvious answer to me is that the Carpenters own the original ship of Theseus. And I'll tell you. Okay let me tell you what let me make it a little bit more obvious and see if this helps. Suppose instead of replacing it with wooden planks they replaced it with slivers of frozen green jello so that now at the end of the time Theseus is now driving a ship of frozen green jello and the carpenters are now occupying a ship made out of the same stuff as the original ship. That might help to some degree. Now suppose you buy this if you don't that's fine. Let me give you one of the thing while I think this is okay. Go ahead.

Speaker 13:
One other question

Moreland:
All right.
Speaker 13:
At what point did it not become the first original ship?

Moreland:
When the first plank was removed. If you're talking about the whole ship, now here. OK I'll go ahead and do this [audience laughter]. Suppose that suppose that you're thinking about the ship. And there's one plank removed. This one right here right [writing/drawing on chalkboard]. And now you're saying is that this is that now is that the original ship. This ones removed and replaced with another one. You with me on this now. OK.

[inaudible audience question]

No you take one to set it over here and you put a completely different piece of wood up there now.

Speaker 13:
So you're saying is that ship-

Moreland:
Now we're asking is this now the same identical Ship of Theseus. The answer is no. And if you think Well come on surely it is what you're thinking about it is really a different ship. This is what you're now thinking about; the ninety nine percent ship without that piece of wood. Now that's the original ninety nine percent ship because it hasn't lost any parts.

Now you see could this could God have made this very music stand to be made out of cheese? I believe no because to me it is essential to a material object that it be made of the exact parts it's made of; different parts, different physical object. I don't know what sense it would be to say that this very desk here could have been made out of cheese. It would have been a different desk in my view.

Now I assume you buy that you understand what this means is that you constantly lose body parts and gain new ones. You lose body parts and gain new parts. You also lose some of your mental life and gain new mental abilities. You understand that? If all you are is a collection of physical body parts and mental and a mental life you are not literally the same individual from one moment to the next. I want to suggest though that you have an awareness that you are the same. I think you have an introspective awareness that from one moment to the next you are the same human person.
I'm not suggesting that you don't gain new thoughts but you would, you'd probably be inclined to say I have new abilities that I used to have or maybe I've lost some but it's still I who now have these abilities but used to have those. Now you see if you don't think that you're the same from one moment to the next because you are losing parts but you're literally not the same. This is not meant to be a joke and please don't take it as a joke - then this has incredible implications for punishing people for things that happened a year ago or a week ago because it's not strictly speaking the same individual any longer and it has implications for fearing the future because one ought not fear the future on this read because it won't literally be you that will go to the dentist two weeks it will be something that shares but you will cease to exist.

Do you understand that if you if that's the way you are you become a series of little momentary I's that exist and cease to exist. You become a string of events and series of I's. Is that communicating to you. That's what the Buddha taught. That's why the Buddha didn't believe much. He said that Buddha held to a doctrine called Anata which is no self. He didn't believe we had selves or souls. He thought we were fleeting little 'I' events that lasted an infinitesimally width and time. And it was here and gone and a new one existed.

You are literally for the Buddha a completely new self every instant of time that exists and you become a string of selves. I know I'm sorry. This is one of the reasons I think Buddhism is false because I know I'm not a series. I may be a happening ladies and gentlemen but I am not happening in that sense. I am an enduring self that remains the same even though I lose my
mental states and gain new ones. And even though I lose body parts and gain new ones. If that's true then I have got to be something that's different from my body and from my mental life.

And I suggest that what that is is a is a conscious mental self which which is called a soul. Well we're going to take a ten minute break. We have an announcement and then we'll take a break.

[End of recording.]