

## Paper Assignment

Below are some topics for your short paper. A paper is different from an answer to an exam question. You set the problem and specific thesis of your paper and address it. The question you address may depart from the ones posed below as long as the paper ends up with a good thesis. If you have a question as to whether the argument you choose to defend might drift too far from the questions posed below, ask me. Your paper should have a thesis that you articulate and defend throughout the paper. Don't assume your reader will figure out what you are doing and how the things you say fit together—make it clear. And remember that a title is your first opportunity to direct your reader's attention to what you are doing in the paper.

The overall evaluation of your paper will reflect both how well you do what you set out to do and how ambitious your project is. But be aware of the page limit—this is to be a short paper, 3-5 pages double-spaced (900 to 1500 words). Do not get so ambitious that you need 10-20 pages to do what you set out to do. Typically, you will be better off narrowing your focus and developing the discussion in detail rather than pursuing a very broad issue superficially.

Write your paper for an intelligent audience, but do not assume that they have been in this class or read what you have read. That is, you need to explain the relevant material to your audience, not just make an allusion and assume they will understand. You may ask others to read your paper and give feedback, but the writing is to be your own.

If possible, please submit your paper electronically to the following email address ([papers@mechanism.ucsd.edu](mailto:papers@mechanism.ucsd.edu)) in MS Word or .rtf format. Please be sure that you do not have any computer viruses before submitting (I hope you don't have any other kind either). Otherwise, you may submit hardcopy to my mailbox. It is due by Noon on Friday, 2 March (note, this is not a class day).

1. Evaluate the competing claims of Crick and Koch and Prinz regarding the neural correlate of visual consciousness. Identify what you take to be the *strongest* argument for each of their views, consider how each would respond to the other, and explain why you think one or the other has the more compelling position.
2. Mandik proposes to apply his account of the subjectivity of experience to the case of thermoreception, which Akins uses in her critique of representational accounts of sensory processing. Present what you take to be the strongest argument for each of their views and consider how each would respond to the other. Identify who you think makes the more compelling case, and explain why.
3. Grush develops his account of representations (which he distinguishes from presentations) in terms of motor control. Does this entail that sensory processing does not involve representations? If so, is this a limitation of his view? If not, under what conditions would information processed in sensory systems count as representations for Grush?
4. Akins uses the example of thermoreception to press her case that sensory systems are narcissistic. Is this a special feature of thermoreception, or are other sensory modalities narcissistic? Focus on one, such as visual perception. What hinges, for understanding representations in that system, on whether it is narcissistic?