

Review of: "Hard problems in the philosophy of mind"

Teresa Álvarez Mateos¹

¹ Universidad Complutense de Madrid

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This text is maybe too long for an article, but could be the draft of a future book. I think it needs a clearer structure, with an introduction which limits the scope of the research. I also find that maybe the title leads to confusion. The author does not problematize hard problems of the philosophy of mind but 1. criticizes physicalism, 2. defends substantial dualism of mind/body, 3. infers some consequences of this dualism regarding ethics and religion. I think at least one of these topics should appear in the title and/or introduction/abstract, so that the reader could know what this text is about. I find very remarkable that although the author is not a "professional philosopher" he does have deep philosophical insights concerning the mind/body problem. Nevertheless, sometimes the philosophical argumentation is missing, and instead the author assumes dogmatic presuppositions as undisputable truths (God exists, God is the creator, and so on). I think this rethoric should be left aside in philosophical argumentation. I also find interesting that the critique of physicalism (or physical reductionism) moves the author back towards classical dualism (in Descartes way: two differentiated substances, *res cogitans* and *res extensa*). If someone wants to write a book about Hard problems in the philosophy of mind, he/she should take into account other ontologies and philosophical models beyond physicalism and cartesian dualism (monism, pluralism, emergentism etc.). That is why I think the author should limit the scope of the text to a critique of physicalism (including the issues of supervenience, the indeterminacy of representations of reality in physical terms, the physical inexplicability of mental phenomena, physicalist causal theories of mental content, informational theories, etc.) leaving aside questions of ethics, intersubjectivity, theology and religion. I think the text could achieve more rigour in this way.