

## Essay Unit 12

John StGeorge

**Question 6: “If there are no such things as qualia, that means that human beings do not really experience feelings or sensations, they only talk and act as if they do.”**

May I paraphrase? “If there are no such things existing with the linguistic identification of qualia, then human beings do not know what they are talking about on the subject of feelings or sensations”. This concept seems to place in question the existence of feelings or sensations if qualia are not accepted as an inviolable identity.

Let the consideration be the case where a cat is mistakenly identified as a dog, would that mistaken identity annihilate the nature and features of the dog? Perhaps not, and it may be the case, that this analogy does not obtain, how my thoughts meander along this line in correspondence to the question concerning qualia and the need to accept that particular nomenclature guarantee the existence of feelings or sensations? Is the existence of these basic human feelings reduced by way of nomenclature?

I have consulted Wikipedia and the Oxford Dictionary for a definition of qualia and it appears that the concept itself is controversial. Unit 12 supplies a very comprehensive analysis of the fundamental workings of qualia in the practical sense, and so I am able to offer some thoughts on this informative material.

Firstly, I ponder of what use we can make in regard to the machinations of our world, by acceptance of the existence of qualia. We may assert a multiplicity of outcomes by virtue of an intrinsic subjectivity and nominate the outcomes as qualia. If qualia is viewed as inviolable then we have a burgeoning agenda of intrinsic subjectivities.

A further comparison with these outcomes to the reality and judgment principles adds a strong element of doubt to the existence of qualia as an inviolable concept. Paragraphs 252, 253, 254/12 to my mind travel very close to the processes of private thoughts and solipsism which, for me, throws further doubt on the possibility of qualia. But not of the word, qualia, itself, but the processes purports to facilitate.

It may be that some if not all, of the processes it describes exist, however the emphasis seems to be on what these processes are called. If there were no such thing as intoxication, would that mean, that people would not know what they were talking about when they described a drunk they had met that day? Feelings or sensations seem to be a given in the makeup of human beings, the nomenclature may have its roots from several various

sources and even by common usage.

The intrinsic subjectivity would also qualify as a 'given' in what that given produces seems to be the kernel of the debate surrounding the existence of qualia. Seemingly a controversial subject in the professional philosophic context and so for me, a layman's appraisal of the existence of qualia.

However, I have no such prevarications regarding the possessions of feelings or sensations no matter under which linguistic title they exist. Perhaps qualia could be a variation of the soul of epiphenomenalism. Does that 'something' need any other name than that 'something'?