Knowing What It’s Like

DAVID LEWIS

THE most formidable challenge to any sort of materialism and functionalism comes from the friend of phenomenal qualia. He says we leave out the phenomenal aspect of mental life: we forget that pain is a feeling, that there is something it is like to hold one’s hand in a flame, that we are aware of something when we suffer pain, that we can recognize that something when it comes again. So far, our proper reply is the one sketched in Section VIII ["Mad Pain and Martian Pain"]: we deny none of that! We say to the friend of qualia that, beneath his tendentious jargon, he is just talking about pain and various aspects of its functional role. We have already said what we take pain to be; and we do not doubt that part of its causal role is to give rise to judgments that one is in pain, and part is to enable one to recognize pain (the same realizer of the same role) when it comes again.

So far, so good. But if he persists, the friend of qualia can succeed in escaping our unwelcome agreement; and when he does, we must reverse our strategy. Suppose he makes his case as follows.1

You have not tasted Vegemite (a celebrated yeast-based condiment). So you do not know what it is like to taste Vegemite. And you never will, unless you taste Vegemite. (Or unless the same experience, or counterfeit traces of it, are somehow produced in you by artificial means.) No amount of the information whereof materialists and functionalists speak will help you at all. But if you taste Vegemite, then you will know what it is like. So you will have gained a sort of information that the materialists and functionalists overlook entirely. Call this phenomenal information. By qualia I mean the special subject matter of this phenomenal information.

Now we must turn eliminative. We dare not grant that there is a sort of information we overlook; or, in other words, that there are possibilities exactly alike in the respects we know of, yet different in some other way. That would be defeat. Neither can we credibly claim that lessons in physics, physiology, . . . could teach the inexperienced what it is like to taste Vegemite. Our proper answer, I think, is that knowing what it’s like is not the possession of information at all. It isn’t the elimination of any hitherto open possibilities. Rather, knowing what it’s like is the possession of abilities: abilities to imagine, abilities to predict one’s behavior by means of imaginative experiments. (Someone who knows what it’s like to taste Vegemite can easily and reliably predict whether he would eat a second helping of Vegemite ice cream.) Lessons cannot impart these abilities—who would have thought they could? There is a state of knowing what it’s like, sure enough. And Vegemite has a special power to produce that state. But phenomenal information and its special subject matter do not exist.2

Imagine a smart data bank. It can be told things, it can store the information it is given, it can reason with it, it can answer questions on the basis of its stored information. Now imagine a pattern-recognition device that works as follows: When exposed to a pattern it makes a sort of template, which it then applies to patterns presented to it in future. Now imagine one device with both faculties, rather like a clock radio. There is no reason to think that any such device must have a third faculty: a faculty of making templates for patterns it has never been exposed to, using its stored information about these patterns. If it has a full description about a pattern but no template for it, it lacks an ability but it doesn’t lack information. (Rather, it lacks information in usable form.) When it is shown the pattern it makes a template and gains abilities, but it gains no information. We might be rather like that.

NOTES


2. This defense against the knowledge argument is presented in detail in Laurence Nemirow, Functionalism and the Subjective Quality of Experience (Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1979), chapter 2; and more briefly in his review of Thomas Nagel's Mortal Questions, Philosophical Review 89 (1980): 473–77.
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STUDY QUESTIONS

1. What is the difference between phenomenal information and qualia?
2. What is the distinction that Lewis is drawing between gaining new information and gaining a new ability?
3. Do you think that Lewis's response to the knowledge argument is convincing? Why or why not?