

Chapter 1 : Models of communication - Wikipedia

Current Research Top. John Holbo is perennially working on a book on philosophy and literary theory that he hopes will someday see the light of publication; also, he has a paper on ethics and the imagination that really should be published someday.

The universe is recursive. This paper proposes a method of unifying quantum mechanics and gravity based on quantum computation. In this theory, fundamental processes are described in terms of pairwise interactions between quantum degrees of freedom. The geometry of space-time is a construct, derived from the underlying quantum information processing. The computation gives rise to a superposition of four-dimensional spacetimes, each of which obeys the Einstein-Regge equations. Carroll on this approach to quantum gravity and cosmology. He especially goes a superb job at tying information theory into the intricacies of the second law. Overall, I find his section on quantum demonology and quantum exorcism quite entertaining. Despite on the surface appearing rather fantastic, harnessing dynamic demons for the purpose of quantum computing might " after all " be inline with reality. However, my impression is that the approach starts with a discretization of spacetime, and that approach faces some fundamental problems right from the start; see this post by Jacques Distler for some idea why: So, he ends up considering the set of all possible formally describable theories. It is not clear to me that you then really need quantum algorithms. Why not postulate an ensemble of classical algorithms? What he says is too vague to be called Science. I will argue the following: I believe there are different senses of complexity being employed, though I may be very misled. What I mean is that in terms of descriptive complexity the initial and final universes are equivalent and the current state is much more complex it takes a lot to describe our current state "however, the algorithmic complexity should increase monotonically with the entropy of the system " so, while we currently have regularities in, say molecular structures " dna, whatever " the end universe will be completely random and so have very high algorithmic complexity. The halting problem whether or not a computer running a program will ever stop is unsolvable in general in the sense that no algorithm can decide this in the general case. This means that algorithms can do undecidable things. As entropy increases the opportunity for new interactions to occur also increases until some critical point when we start experiencing a decline in available interactions. Looking at simple entropic realization and thermodynamics, how is it that one could not be enamored with how we would interpret information loss, and the resulting universe in question, as a complexity entropically?? Of course, we need a way in which to do this as well as measurably? Taking reductionism down to quantum perceptions. But there is one frequently-confusing issue that perhaps I can clear up. Think of it this way: Well, if you insist that we specify the exact microstate, the position and momentum of every single molecule, it would require a huge amount of information. From that point of view, the state is zero entropy and very complex. But low-entropy states may or may not be. If the molecules were organized into some complex structure, it would be both low-entropy and low-simplicity. Experts are welcome to chime in. In fact, there are only a handful of problems for which a quantum computer provides an exponential speedup. In addition, there are a few important problems that gain a polynomial speedup. The fact that factoring is one of the former, and that it is the basis of all modern cryptography has caught the attention of government agencies that carry large suitcases full of money. Every grant proposal now tries to make a connection to quantum computing, because that is where the money is. Some people are very cynical about this, but it has ensured a healthy level of funding for all branches of physics that concentrate on manipulating quantum systems. A lot of interesting results have come out of this some nothing to do with quantum computing , and today we can do things that were wild dreams five years ago. I am convinced as is David Deutsch that we will have a working prototype of a quantum computer within a decade. Finally, we are slowly gaining a better understanding of what is quantum about quantum information theory. Quantum information needs its own James Clerk Maxwell to extract the essence of it all and condense it into a coherent theory.

Personally, I believe that this theory will have something to say about quantum gravity, possibly via the holographic principle. I agree with you about the serendipitous nature of one of the few exponential speedups belonging to an algorithm that can attack public-key encryption techniques. I would also say that quantum communications are more useful than quantum computers in the short term. The minimum size of a cell in phase space is typically chosen as \hbar^{3N} , but this is ultimately an arbitrary choice. Who knows what goes on at extremely small scales. For all we know, there is an enormous amount of complexity that is averaged out. Think of the aliens at the end of *Men in Black*. The question is thus whether we really have an increase in complexity followed by a decrease. Kolmogorov complexity fails to describe that too. Some tries to define appropriate complexity measures. One such is found in [http:](http://) The definition is in Fig 2, not Box 1. Elliot The interface between physics and information theory is a very interesting area. He is a very smart guy with an interesting view of the emergence of complexity. Also at one point a compatriot of Lee Smolin. I think foundations of QT was a very good starting point for learning quantum information, because you study quantum theory in a very formal way nowadays we have specialised courses and research groups. So I have no problem when the foundations people try to eat from this trough. They have a small appetite anyway. There are other areas in physics that take the mickey much more when it comes to grant applications. Too bad the sup tag did not work in my earlier comment it did in the preview. In fact, complexity is so embedded, even and necessarily in the inorganic universe, this reality must be systematically addressed if modern physics is to be credible. In a universe of finite mass, eternal time the one infinite dimension of a hyperspherical universe and higher dimensionality are the two keys to understanding complexity. Although the universe is finite and spatially closed, it has had forever to develop complexityâ€¦. Good luck to them and it makes sense, often enough. It is appropriate that plectics refers to entanglement or the lack thereof, since entanglement is a key feature of the way complexity arises out of simplicity, making our subject worth studying. I think language is algorithmic, in the same sense that physics, math and other sciences are. It has a symbol code base, and can be assembled in sequences such as everyone has done in this post to convey incredibly complex concepts with relatively few symbol choices. The intent is that scientific concepts can be captured and encapsulated with the combinations of letter shapes chosen to represent them. It accomplishes two things. It introduces a common language of communication between researchers of varied disciplines, and it provides a coded structure of familiarity to manipulate in search of new discovery. We sent our measures down to this level? Entanglement Interpretation of Black Hole Entropy in String Theory Measurement would be very important, as well, secondary particle emissions from cosmic partice collisions? These realities of existence combined with the permanence of existence produce a sytem of stored, embedded information which phylogenically evolves over eternity- single process time being the one infinite dimension of existence. The resultâ€¦an imperfect universe, very good and very impressive, but always falling short of perfection in some wayâ€¦very much the universe we live inâ€¦! To be sure, if the universe is finite in mass, random quantum fluctuations MUST HAVE an absolute eternity, with no beginning or end to produce information and developing complexity of the kind we observe. Eternity is beyond our comprehension. Speculation about a beginning, or ending is very much antithetical to the concept.

Chapter 2 : Pragmatarianism: November

The Para-Costives Mark Kaplan 35 Against My Better Judgment Adam Kotsko 36 On Theory and its Empire, 2: the Politics of Capitalization Kenneth Rufo 37 Conceptualization and its Vague Contents John Holbo IV. 38 Nussbaum v.

A ride like that would be worth the intellectual humiliation of having written an ignorant post, foolishly denouncing the greatest breakthrough in freakonomics in living memory. If that is indeed what I have done. And if there is such a brilliant argument, and Douthat just forgot to mention it, while noodling around with vague cultural complaints, then I think Douthat should take his lumps along with the rest of us. How many descendants does Homer, have, and to whom do we pay the royalties? Should Tennyson, not to mention Joyce, be prosecuted posthumously for plagiarism? By the genteel standards of the NYT Book Review, Douthat delivered an extremely negative and almost explicitly derisive assessment of the book. But if you are too genteel to write reviews that are harsher than this, I think you should be too genteel to review books this bad. The rights were not mentioned as being ceded in the Treaty of London which established the independent Kingdom of Greece in , and may therefore be assumed to have remained with the Porte. For similar reasons acquisition by internationally recognised conquest, followed by an absence of cession , the royalties for the Bible and the Epic of Gilgamesh should be sent to the same address. If someone writes a very bad public-intellectual argument say, for the Atlantic, or LRB, or NYROB , and then expands it into a public-intellectual book, the rest of us are faced with a number of choices: Too late to try that on David Brooks, alas. But is the Lessig view on copyright the default view that the average newspaper columnist must defer to on pain of being foolish? Near as I can tell it amounts to Some people think that copyright extension is a bad thing. Also, Lawrence Lessig is a communist. If you steal a copy, the original owner might buy a replacement. And this is what Douthat seems to be complaining about in his piece “ e. Douthat makes it abundantly clear that this is a book of the bad kind “ the paragraph: Also the bit about: Lessig is not a tenth the writer that Helprin is, but he has other gifts “ the ability to argue in a calm and ordered fashion; the capacity to at least pretend to give the other side its due; and the ability to avoid fevered prose and name-calling while making a controversial case. I should perhaps do a more moderate follow-up. The reason why the final paragraph made me go ballistic is that I think the most important thing about this issue is that there is a truly remarkable degree of consensus among those who take the issue seriously “ be they socialists or Hayekians, lawyers, economists, geeks, philosophers, whatever “ that infinite indefinite extension is a bad idea. It really only makes sense a way of generating unproductive rent-seeking. And yet this is the system we have. Stupid stuff happens in politics. Not everyone agrees with Lessig, by any means. And everyone who studies the issue knows that some of the most serious arguments against copyright extension are market arguments. But the average reader of the NY Times actually does not know this. Did they reach their hyperlink quota over at the Times or what? Intellectual products by their nature are copied and shared freely Eh? If not, why do they think one form of rent-seeking is worse than another? I look forward to the argument as to why. Not necessarily term limits. Antitrust laws, I think, would be an example of restricting unproductive rent-seeking. Or do you know already, and are winding up to make a specific skeptical argument against them? If the latter, perhaps you could just make the argument. How small is this Universe? Indeed, if things were arranged otherwise, they would be even more confusing than they already are. So you could shorten your complaint to: I think this was covered fairly thoroughly in the previous copyright thread. Widespread copying is not theft because you can still use the original. But if the way you wanted to use the original is to be able to sell it, then it might as well have been stolen for all the difference it makes to you. My beef is with the de facto elimination of copyright and IP, not with shortening the copyright period. Would *Pride and Prejudice* and *Zombies* be counted as a reprint of *Pride and Prejudice* since it does, after all, contain most of the text of the of the original or a parody? The idea that content owners can perpetually make greater and greater demands of the public and expect this to just be accepted is pretty bizarre. In the sense that he has written at least one very

good novel? This is a genuine question. And I got a good way into the book thinking it was terrific. The idea is that the way to maximize utility is to balance incentives to create gotta have those with realization of the good provided by lots of people being able to enjoy things that, in fact, lots of people can enjoy, non-rivalrously. As usual, Douthat would be missing the point: As my forthcoming novel, War and Peace and Zombies will no doubt prove. Austen had no children, but she certainly had heirsâ€”her brothers and their descendants. To me, at least, it reads like a throwaway at the end so as not to be seen as unmercifully trashing the book. Sort of like thanking a completely incoherent guest on a talk-show by saying how their views were interesting and gave the host something to think about. The lengthening of copyright laws is what gets middle-aged people excited, because they see the creative loss of materials they might find interesting. The ability see the next Twilight movie before it hits the theatres is what concerns the young. The two are completely independent of each other, although the destruction of copyright and IP is making the lengthening of copyright laws essentially meaningless. Thanks for the clarification. Are there any heirs still alive? Said boat, ironically enough, being captained by Mickey Mouse. Actually I think readers often enjoy very hostile reviews. An editor actually asked me once to put more positive points in a review. I declined, and it was not printed. The delightfully named Norton Knatchbull is one with a Wikipedia entry. Perhaps, tabloid culture and all that, but I have my doubts. But for the majority of readers who are simply reading the book section for interesting essays and the occasional book recommendation, failing to maintain minimum standards of civility where civility is defined by the reader may make the reader uncomfortable and suspicious of the review. One can be perfectly civil while savaging a bad book â€” but this threatens to be a thread derail, so I will stop there. Think taxes aimed for redistribution. You could make the argument that IP is like a house you rent out. But the reality is that by the end of a reasonable copyright period, the remaining value is pretty small, so not a lot of value is confiscated. The main reason I favour artist lifetime copyright has more to do with how many artists feel about their personal creations than financial gain. Sure, I just wonder why people are footling around trying to prevent extensions on or actually trying to do away with copyright when they could obviously do so much more social good agitating for reform of private property law with very similar arguments â€” if doing social good is really their aim, of course. Imagine applying the same standard to Shakespeare. In the sense of working for the money, not necessarily any derogatory sense. Some works of art made in this century will probably continue to have an influence in future centuries, although we may not be able to predict right now which ones. Not necessarily of Shakespearean magnitude, but perhaps on the order of Dickens or Austen. The author would receive, in exchange, at most the actuarial value, i. Although IMO, let him invest the fruits of his labors in the present like every other worker; should the people who built the Empire State Building have their descendants entitled to a share of the rent? That preserves the social purpose of copyright: If you want to promote nonmarketable works, you need something more NEA-like. This may be important if technology renders more work nonmarketable. What about the case of an author who writes an obscure novel that no one takes any notice of and subsequently lives a miserable penurious life, and then 30 years later someone makes a movie of that novel and the reissued edition starts selling like hot cakes. Do you think it fair that the author should get nothing? One of the more trenchant cartoons of the Internet era features a stick-figure man typing furiously at his keyboard. From somewhere beyond the panel floats the irritated voice of his wife. The person at the computer may or may not be male 2. The end of perpetual copyright brought about the canon of English literature, by ensuring access to multiple editions of Milton, Shakespeare et al; having multiple generations of copyright rent-seekers is socially deleterious. The argumentum ad Matthew Copyright is an early modern invention, and unlike tangible property, has been subject to argument about its purpose and extent for the years since the Statute of Anne. I pretty much assume each reader assumes the main character has his or her race, for all that it matters i. That story would be just as sad if Congress, in its wisdom, granted Lived N. Penury a 1, year copyright on his works, which he then sold for pennies to some publisher, which then 30 years later made tons of money. You can come up with hypothetical tragic examples no matter which way you slice things. The story would be even sadder if Mr. All in all, arguments about the pure dessert of Mr. Dessert

is too sticky a concept, especially if we are talking about perpetual copyrights. If the opera Elektra makes me want to read the Oresteia, who deserves to benefit from that? Richard Strauss and descendants? A 19th century translator? The 19th century German translator who inspired Strauss?

Chapter 3 : Looking for a Fight is There a Republican War on Science 06 Holbo - [PDF Document]

Conceptualization and its Vague Contents Posted by John Holbo on 04/06/06 at AM A passage from John Searle, "Literary Theory and Its Discontents", in good ol' Theory's Empire (pp.).

The distinctions between fat and thin, rich and poor, democracy and authoritarianism, for example, do not have sharp boundaries. More important for our present discussion, the distinction between literal and metaphorical, serious and nonserious, fiction and nonfiction, and yes, even true and false, admit of degrees and all apply more or less. It is, in short, generally accepted that many, perhaps most, concepts do not have sharp boundaries, and since we have begun to develop theories to explain why they cannot. Indeed, in addition to examinations of the problem of vagueness, there have been quite extensive discussions of family resemblance, open texture, underdetermination, and indeterminacy. There has even developed a booming industry of fuzzy logic whose aim is to give a precise logic of vagueness. When I pointed out that Derrida seemed to be unaware of these well-known facts, and that he seemed to be making the mistaken assumption that unless a distinction can be made rigorous and precise, with no marginal cases, it is not a distinction at all, he responded as follows: And, I must confess, also the most incomprehensible to me. What philosopher ever since there were philosophers, what logician ever since there were logicians, what theoretician ever renounced this axiom: If Searle declares explicitly, seriously, literally that this axiom must be renounced, that he renounces it and I will wait for him to do it, a phrase in a newspaper is not enough, then, short of practicing deconstruction with some consistency and submitting the very rules and regulations of his project to an explicit reworking, his entire philosophical discourse on speech act will collapse even more rapidly. Which is surely fair enough. Searle quotes another bit from Limited Inc. It is clear from this discussion that Derrida has a conception of "concepts" according to which they have a crystalline purity that would exclude all marginal cases. It is also clear that on his view intentional states also have this feature, and they even have what he calls "ideal self-presence". Derrida obviously does not rest with such a crystalline conception of concepts. The whole point is to deconstruct such stuff. But this slippage is easily repaired: Let me illustrate this thought with a passage from J. The essay was written in Already a clear distinction can be drawn, among critics influenced by these new developments, between what might be called For the most part these critics share the Socratic penchant, what Nietzsche defined as "the unshakable faith that thought, using the thread of logic, can penetrate the deepest abysses of being. Opposed to these are the critics who might be called "uncanny. These critics are not tragic of Dionysian in the sense that their work is wildly orgiastic or irrational. No critic could be more rigorously sane and rational, Apollonian in his procedure, for example, than Paul de Man. Sooner or later there is the encounter with an "aporia" or impasse Dramatically, this set-up is promising enough. But, philosophically, it is sheer artificiality and staginess. To put it another way, there is a hazardous ambiguity in the notion that it is precisely the most rational position that reveals itself as irrational. Because it is hardly surprising that the most rationalistic position will be irrational, i. Because philosophical rationalism - the doctrine that reason itself can give you all the answers - is an extreme and problematic view. Simply put, it is not generally a good idea to assume that, to deconstruct a position, you need only deconstruct the strongest formulation of that position. Nuanced, qualified positions - i. And so we end up with a sort of socratic counter-drama in which complacent uncanniness, lulled by the promise of impossibility of rational order, has its unshakeable faith in the shakeability of all canny faiths shaken by the rather uncanny inversion of Derridean uncanniness into a sort of elementary Wittgensteinian canniness, eerily immune to Derridean attack. He just took a swipe. So my question for you is this: And there is really nothing wrong with this?

Chapter 4 : gmackin | Introduction to Ethics

*Edited by John Holbo 37 Conceptualization and its Vague Contents John Holbo IV. 38 Nussbaum v. Butler, Round 1
John McGowan 39 Nussbaum v. Butler, Round 2.*

Those of you who have decided to do this portion of the assignment must read the rest of this document very carefully. You are responsible for addressing all of the aspects of this assignment. Please select ONE of the following prompts. Papers are to be pages long, with one-inch margins, double-spaced, in 12 point font, and in Times or Garamond fonts. Papers are due Monday, December 9 at the beginning of class. Since these topics are asking you to address issues at stake in modern politics and society, you may need to do some basic research on the subjects. However, you absolutely must cite any information or research that you do. Any summaries, paraphrases, or direct quotes must be cited in your text, and at the end of the essay, you must provide a complete works cited page. The moral-political controversy you choose is up to you, but I highly suggest you talk with me about it first. Topics could include though are not limited to: Euthanasia, infanticide, abortion, environmental destruction, the idea of aiding the poor, or develop your own. When discussing these topics, you must explain how some of the theorists we have discussed in class do or do not help us to resolve or understand these issues. Compose your essay to address the following points explicitly: Provide a brief description of the controversy. Explain the positions of the various sides in the debate. It is also a good idea to explain why these two sides might find it difficult to resolve the differences. Pick at least two theories that we have examined in class to investigate what they might have to say about this controversy. In some cases for instance, Kant or Mill , the theorists might offer principles that would help to resolve the controversy; in others Nietzsche, for example , the theorist might not offer a principle that resolves the theory but instead might investigate its origins, why we see it as controversial, and what effects this way of seeing things might have. At any rate, after you have selected the two theorists, you need to present and compare their analyses. In this process, you should first present the strengths of the respective positions: What are the primary virtues of each analysis of the controversy? After having developed the virtues of the two approaches, then present their potential weaknesses: Are there aspects of the analyses that are flawed? What is the source of this weakness? Finally—and this is the most important part of this essay—try to determine which approach to the controversy is preferable and why. In this section, you may want to address some but not necessarily all of the following questions: Do the two accounts share weaknesses of the same sort for instance, it might be that, say, Kant and Mill suffer from a problem that Nietzsche helps us to see more clearly? If so, what type s of revision might help? Or should we instead adopt an entirely different approach? This is a broad question, so once again let me try to direct you. Because Nietzsche is providing a broad diagnosis of pretty much all aspects of modern politics, culture, economics, and society, he might have something to say about just about anything. So the phenomenon you pick is pretty much wide open. My suggestion in picking out a topic to discuss, however, is that you start with the Nietzschean concept you want to explore and then think about a possible example of that concept. In other words, it is probably a good idea to begin by thinking about, say, the notion of resentment, or his claim at the end of Essay 3 that morality is dying, and then try to explore this idea through a discussion of the cultural phenomenon you are interested in. Though you do not need to compose the essay in this specific order, you should address the following points explicitly: Identify the cultural phenomenon you are discussing. Explain in sufficient detail what is happening in this phenomenon and why it is interesting. Are there other ways of looking at the phenomenon that might be preferable? Finally—and this is the most important aspect of this paper—determine whether a Nietzschean analysis is ultimately a good way to understand the phenomenon you are examining. In other words, after having explored the strengths and weaknesses of his analysis, come to a conclusion. Here you might focus on some but not necessarily all of the following questions: Why or why not? What parts do you agree with or disagree with? Are there ways of adding to or modifying his position to improve it? Do you agree with his method of analysis but perhaps not

necessarily his conclusions? Instead, he engages in a genealogical and critical approach to moral phenomena. Please address the following issues explicitly: Give a brief description of the way Nietzsche approaches moral phenomena and how his approach differs from Kant or Mill. Here it might be useful but is not required for you to provide an example of how Nietzsche and Kant or Mill might approach a moral problem. Make sure you identify the source of these problems. When assessing these virtues you might but are not required to consider addressing the following: Are there aspects of moral phenomena that he helps us to understand more clearly? Might some of his observations help to lead to a better moral system, or does his approach to morality point to an entirely different or new system of evaluation?

Chapter 5 : The Valve - A Literary Organ | Conceptualization and its Vague Contents

/ Jodi Dean --Prosthetic thoughts / Mark Kaplan --Breaking news / Mark Kaplan --The para-costives / Mark Kaplan --Against my better judgment / Adam Kotsko --On theory and its empire, 2 / Kenneth Rufo --Conceptualization and its vague contents / John Holbo --Nussbaum v.

Their goal was to make sure that the telephone cables and radio waves were working at the maximum efficiency. Therefore, they developed the Shannon-Weaver model which had an intention to expand a mathematical theory of communication. Their initial model consisted of four primary parts: The sender was the part of a telephone a person speaks into, the channel was the telephone itself, and the receiver was the part of the phone through which one can hear the person on the other end of the line. Shannon and Weaver also recognized that there may often be static or background sounds that interfere with the process of the other partner in a telephone conversation; they referred to this as noise. Certain types of background sounds can also indicate the absence of a signal. To illustrate the process of the communication the first step is the information source where the information is stored. Next, in order to send the information, the message is encoded into signals, so it can travel to its destination. After the message is encoded, it goes through the channel which the signals are adapted for the transmission. In addition, the channel carried the noise course which is any interference that might happen to lead to the signal receive a different information from the source. After the channel, the message arrives in the receiver step where the message reconstruct decode from the signal. Finally, the message arrives at the destination. According to this common communication-related conception, communication is viewed as a means of sending and receiving information. The strengths of this model are its simplicity, generality, and quantifiability. The mathematicians Claude Shannon and Warren Weaver structured this model on the basis of the following elements: An information source , which produces a message. A transmitter , which encodes the message into signals A channel , for which signals are adapted for transmission A receiver , which reconstructs the encoded message from a sequence of received signals and decodes it. An information destination, where the message arrives. Shannon and Weaver argued that this concept entails three levels of problems for communication: Daniel Chandler criticizes the transmission model in the following terms: It makes no allowance for differing purposes. It makes no allowance for differing interpretations. It makes no allowance for unequal power relationships. The factors include communication skills, awareness level, social system, cultural system, and attitude. This is the part where determine the communication skills, attitude, knowledge, social system, and culture of the people involved in the communication. After the message is developed which is elements in a set of symbols. The encoder process is where the motor skills take place by speaking or writing. In this process, the receiver interpreter the message with her or him sensory skills. Finally, the communication receiver gets the whole message understood. Wilbur Schramm also indicated that we should also examine the impact that a message has both desired and undesired on the target of the message. These acts may take many forms, in one of the various manners of communication. The form depends on the abilities of the group communicating. Together, communication content and form make messages that are sent towards a destination. The target can be oneself, another person or being, another entity such as a corporation or group of beings. Communication can be seen as processes of information transmission governed by three levels of semiotic rules: Therefore, communication is social interaction where at least two interacting agents share a common set of signs and a common set of semiotic rules. This commonly held rule in some sense ignores autocommunication , including intrapersonal communication via diaries or self-talk, both secondary phenomena that followed the primary acquisition of communicative competences within social interactions. Barnlund[edit] In light of these weaknesses, Barnlund proposed a transactional model of communication. In a slightly more complex form, a sender and a receiver are linked reciprocally. This second attitude of communication, referred to as the constitutive model or constructionist view, focuses on how an individual communicates as the determining factor of the way the

message will be interpreted. Communication is viewed as a conduit; a passage in which information travels from one individual to another and this information becomes separate from the communication itself. A particular instance of communication is called a speech act. In the presence of "noise" on the transmission channel air, in this case, reception and decoding of content may be faulty, and thus the speech act may not achieve the desired effect. One problem with this encode-transmit-receive-decode model is that the processes of encoding and decoding imply that the sender and receiver each possess something that functions as a [code-book], and that these two code books are, at the very least, similar if not identical. Although something like code books is implied by the model, they are nowhere represented in the model, which creates many conceptual difficulties. Theories of co-regulation describe communication as a creative and dynamic continuous process, rather than a discrete exchange of information. Canadian media scholar Harold Innis had the theory that people use different types of media to communicate and which one they choose to use will offer different possibilities for the shape and durability of society. Lanham and as far back as Erving Goffman have highlighted. Constructionists believe that the process of communication is in itself the only messages that exist. The packaging can not be separated from the social and historical context from which it arose, therefore the substance to look at in communication theory is style for Richard Lanham and the performance of self for Erving Goffman. Lanham chose to view communication as the rival to the over encompassing use of CBS model which pursued to further the transmission model. CBS model argues that clarity, brevity, and sincerity are the only purpose to prose discourse, therefore communication. This is saying that rhetoric and style are fundamentally important; they are not errors to what we actually intend to transmit. The process which we construct and deconstruct meaning deserves analysis. Erving Goffman sees the performance of self as the most important frame to understand communication. The truth in both cases is the articulation of the message and the package as one. The construction of the message from social and historical context is the seed as is the pre-existing message is for the transmission model. Therefore, any look into communication theory should include the possibilities drafted by such great scholars as Richard A. Lanham and Goffman that style and performance is the whole process. Noise; interference with effective transmission and reception of a message. For example; physical noise or external noise which are environmental distractions such as poorly heated rooms, startling sounds, appearances of things, music playing some where else, and someone talking really loudly near you. Message; the verbal and nonverbal components of language that is sent to the receiver by the sender which conveys an idea. Humans act toward people or things on the basis of the meanings they assign to those people or things. As human beings, we have the ability to name things. Symbols, including names, are arbitrary signs. Linear[edit] This is a one-way model to communicate with others. It consists of the sender encoding a message and channeling it to the receiver in the presence of noise. In this model there is no feedback or response which may allow for a continuous exchange of information F. In the linear communication model, the message travels one direction from the start point to the endpoint. In other words, once the sender sends the message to the receiver the communication process ends. Many communications online use the linear communication model. For example, when you send an email, post a blog, or share something on social media. However, the linear model does not explain many other forms of communication including face-to-face conversation. The sender channels a message to the receiver and the receiver then becomes the sender and channels a message to the original sender. This model has added feedback, indicating that communication is not a one way but a two way process. It also has "field of experience" which includes our cultural background, ethnicity geographic location, extent of travel, and general personal experiences accumulated over the course of your lifetime. Draw backs " there is feedback but it is not simultaneous. For example, " instant messaging. The sender sends an IM to the receiver, then the original sender has to wait for the IM from the original receiver to react. Communication theory framework[edit] Main article: Theory of communication Communication theory can be seen from one of the following viewpoints: Social Constructionist Symbolic Interactionist: This view considers communication to be the product of the interactants sharing and creating meaning. The Constructionist View can also be defined as, how you say

something determines what the message is. The Constructionist View assumes that "truth" and "ideas" are constructed or invented through the social process of communication. The other view of communication, the Transmission Model, sees communication as robotic and computer-like. The Transmission Model sees communication as a way of sending or receiving messages and the perfection of that. But, the Constructionist View sees communications as, "â€¦in human life, info does not behave as simply as bits in an electronic stream. In human life, information flow is far more like an electric current running from one landmine to another" Lanham, 7. The Constructionist View is a more realistic view of communication[opinion] because it involves the interacting of human beings and the free sharing of thoughts and ideas. Daniel Chandler looks to prove that the Transmission Model is a lesser way of communicating by saying "The transmission model is not merely a gross over-simplification but a dangerously misleading representation of the nature of human communication" Chandler, 2. We do not simply send facts and data to one another, but we take facts and data and they acquire meaning through the process of communication, or through interaction with others. This view considers communication as a source of power and oppression of individuals and social groups. Theories can also be studied and organized according to the ontological, epistemological, and axiological framework imposed by the theorist. Ontology[edit] Ontology essentially poses the question of what, exactly, the theorist is examining. One must consider the very nature of reality. The answer usually falls in one of three realms depending on whether the theorist sees the phenomena through the lens of a realist, nominalist, or social constructionist. Realist perspective views the world objectively, believing that there is a world outside of our own experience and cognitions. Social constructionists straddle the fence between objective and subjective reality, claiming that reality is what we create together.

Chapter 6 : Vagueness (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)

Framing Theory's Empire carries on the conversation with sophistication and flair. "Denis Dutton, editor, Philosophy & Literature It's rare for authors to have their work be the object of a lengthy, detailed, serious and lively dialogue shortly after its publication.

Inquiry Resistance If you cut one head off of a two headed man, have you decapitated him? What is the maximum height of a short man? When does a fertilized egg develop into a person? These questions are impossible to answer because they involve absolute borderline cases. In the vast majority of cases, the unknowability of a borderline statement is only relative to a given means of settling the issue Sorensen , chapter 1. The formula is to divide his weight in kilograms by the square of his height in meters. If the value exceeds 30, this test counts him as obese. The calculation will itself leave some borderline cases. The mother could then use a weight-for-height chart. These charts are not entirely decisive because they do not reflect the ratio of fat to muscle, whether the child has large bones, and so on. When we reach this stage, we start to suspect that our uncertainty is due to the concept of obesity rather than to our limited means of testing for obesity. A proposition is vague when there are possible states of things concerning which it is intrinsically uncertain whether, had they been contemplated by the speaker, he would have regarded them as excluded or allowed by the proposition. Peirce , In the case of relative borderline cases, the question is clear but our means for answering it are incomplete. In the case of absolute borderline cases, there is incompleteness in the question itself. When a term is applied to one of its absolute borderline cases the result is a statement that resists all attempts to settle whether it is true or false. No amount of conceptual analysis or empirical inquiry can settle whether removing one head from a two headed man counts as decapitating him. But that would amount to changing the topic to an issue that merely sounds the same as decapitation. Vagueness is standardly defined as the possession of borderline cases. No amount of conceptual analysis or empirical investigation can settle whether a 1. Borderline cases are inquiry resistant. Where does the tail of a snake begin? When posed as a rhetorical question, the speaker is hinting that there is no definite answer. A false attribution of indeterminacy will lead to the premature abandonment of inquiry. The risk of futile inquiry into questions that cannot be answered must be balanced against the risk of abandoning questions that are actually answerable. Inquiry resistance typically recurses. For in addition to the unclarity of the borderline case, there is normally unclarity as to where the unclarity begins. Twilight governs times that are borderline between day and night. First, Gottlob Frege could no longer coherently characterize vague predicates as incoherent. If the line is not drawn between the true and the false, then it will be between the true and the intermediate state. Introducing further intermediates just delays the inevitable. This motivates second thoughts about second order vagueness. Instead of continuing to treat higher order vagueness as an insight, several philosophers repudiate higher order vagueness as an illusion Wright They deny that there is an open-ended iteration of borderline status. They find it telling that speakers do not go around talking about borderline borderline cases and borderline borderline borderline cases and so forth Raffman , The iterations are confusing but perfectly meaningful. Defenders of higher order vagueness have also tried to clinch the case with particular specimens such as borderline hermaphrodites reasoning that these individuals are borderline borderline males Sorensen Although relativization disambiguates, it does not eliminate borderline cases. There are shorter pygmies who are borderline tall for a pygmy and taller Masai who are borderline tall for a Masai. Words are only vague indirectly, by virtue of having a sense that is vague. In contrast, an ambiguous word bears its ambiguity directly" simply in virtue of having multiple meanings. This contrast between vagueness and ambiguity is obscured by the fact that most words are both vague and ambiguous. The contrast is further complicated by the fact that most words are also general. If a word is ambiguous, the speaker can resolve the ambiguity without departing from literal usage. If a word is vague, the speaker cannot resolve the borderline case. He would be understood as taking a special liberty with the term to suit a special purpose. Acknowledging departure from

ordinary usage would relieve him of the obligation to defend the sharp cut-off. The aptness of his generalization is not judged by its literal truth-value because it is obviously untrue. Likewise, we do not judge precisifications of borderline cases by their truth-values because they are obviously not ascertainable as true or false. We instead judge precisifications by their simplicity, conservativeness, and fruitfulness. A precisification that draws the line across the borderline cases conserves more paradigm usage than one that draws the line across clear cases. But conservatism is just one desideratum among many. Sometimes the best balance is achieved at the cost of turning former positive cases into negative cases. Once we shift from literal to figurative usage, we gain fictive control over our entire vocabulary— not just vague words. We instead interpret the travel agent as speaking figuratively, as meaning that France is shaped like a hexagon. Given that speakers lack any literal discretion over vague terms, we ought not to chide them for indecisiveness. Where there is no decision to be made, there is no scope for vice. Speakers would have literal discretion if statements applying a predicate to its borderline cases were just permissible variations in linguistic usage. For instance, Crispin Wright and Stewart Shapiro say a competent speaker can faultlessly classify the borderline case as a positive instance while another competent speaker can faultlessly classify the case as a negative instance. For the sake of comparison, consider discretion between alternative spellings. Who can turn a can into a cane? Who can turn a pan into a pane? Who can turn a cub into a cube? Who can turn a tub into a tube? Indeed, like other professors, he scolds students if they fail to stick with the same spelling throughout the composition. Choose but stick to your choice! He would continue to assert it. He can conjoin the original assertion with information about the alternative: Discoveries of notational variants do not warrant changes in former beliefs. News of borderline status has an evidential character. Loss of clarity brings loss of warrant. If you do not lower your confidence, you are open to the charge of dogmatism. That is why debates can be dissolved by showing that the dispute is over a borderline case. The debaters should be agnostic if they are dealing with a borderline case. They do not have a license to form beliefs beyond their evidence. News of an alternative sense is like news of an alternative spelling; there is no evidential impact except for meta-linguistic beliefs about the nature of words. Assertions are not robust with respect to news of hidden generality. News of hidden generality has evidential impact. When it comes to robustness, vagueness resembles generality more than vagueness resembles ambiguity. A term can also be vague without being general. Borderline cases of analytically empty predicates illustrate this possibility. Generality is obviously useful. Often, lessons about a particular F can be projected to other Fs in virtue of their common F-ness. When the girl says that she wants a toy rather than clothes, she narrows the range of acceptable gifts without going through the trouble of specifying a particular gift. The girl also balances values: There is an inverse relationship between the contentfulness of a proposition and its probability: By gauging generality, we can make sensible trade-offs between truth and detail. This precipitates many equivocal explanations of vagueness. For instance, many commentators say that vagueness exists because broad categories ease the task of classification. If I can describe your sweater as red, then I do not need to ascertain whether it is scarlet. This freedom to use wide intervals obviously helps us to learn, teach, communicate, and remember. The problem is to explain the existence of borderline cases. Are they present because vagueness serves a function? Or are borderline cases side-effects of ordinary conversation—like echoes? Every natural language is both vague and ambiguous. However, both features seem eliminable. Indeed, both are eliminated in miniature languages such as checkers notation, computer programming languages, and mathematical descriptions. Moreover, it seems that both vagueness and ambiguity ought to be minimized. And they deserve their bad reputations. Think of all the automotive misery that has been prefaced by Driver:

Chapter 7 : Framing Theory's empire in SearchWorks catalog

Stanford Libraries' official online search tool for books, media, journals, databases, government documents and more.

Consequentialism , Libertarianism Why Not Utilitarianism? A lot of very smart non-philosophers are attracted to some form of utilitarianism. In contrast to these fellow travelers, most philosophers do not believe that utilitarianism is an adequate moral theory. In this post, I want to set out a few reasons why. The first, somewhat pedantic, point is that utilitarianism and consequentialism are not the same. Consequentialism is best understood as a family of moral theories, united in the agreement that consequences alone determine the rightness or wrongness of actions or rules, or practices, or motives – see here for discussion of the complications. Utilitarianism is a particular type of consequentialism that specifies the kind of consequence that matters – not wealth, not human achievement, but utility. It follows that utilitarianism is necessarily a more controversial theory than consequentialism. The second point, and the more important one, is that believing that consequences matter for moral assessment is not enough to make you a consequentialist. Any plausible moral theory is going to hold that consequences matter at some level. What distinguishes consequentialism from other moral theories is its claim that consequences are the only thing that matter. This is a much stronger and much less plausible claim. Think you have some reason to keep your promises simply because you made them and not because of the good that you expect to produce by keeping them? So why do most philosophers reject utilitarianism? Here a few quite non-exhaustive reasons. But what does this mean? Most of you are probably familiar with the worry that utilitarianism sanctions injustice – the slavery of the few, for example, so long as it benefits the many. Worries about the separateness of persons are related to this, but more fundamental. The reason utilitarianism allows us or mandates us! In focusing exclusively on aggregate happiness, it fails to show proper respect to individuals. As Nozick put it: He does not get some overbalancing good from his sacrifice Nozick, *ASU* , p. These responses may or may not ultimately work. But they miss the deeper problem. The deeper problem is that even if utilitarianism gets the right answer about how we should treat one another, it gets that answer for the wrong reason. It says, in fact, that utility is the only thing that is intrinsically valuable. And how plausible is it? Does utility mean pleasure? Happiness in some broader, eudaimonistic sense? And why should we believe that utility has intrinsic value in the exclusive and universal way that utilitarianism suggests? If a child molester derives pleasure from fondling young kids, why on earth should we think that that pleasure has any moral value at all? Your own happiness counts for no more and no less than the happiness of any other person. But again, why should we believe this? It is an almost entirely unargued-for assumption. And it is one that we should reject. Notice that none of these objections is avoided by moving from act-utilitarianism to rule-utilitarianism or rule-consequentialism. They are deeper moral problems stemming from the underlying structure of consequentialist or utilitarian theories in general. It does nothing to address the underlying theoretical defects. And there are, as Kevin Vallier has suggested in several posts on this blog, good reasons to think that it is not. The problems we have discussed here are simply problems with utilitarianism as an adequate moral theory.

Chapter 8 : Table of contents for Framing Theory's empire

by John Holbo on June 23, Matthew Yglesias goes way too easy on Ross Douthat's book review of Mark Helprin's Digital Barbarism: A Writer's Manifesto [amazon]. Let's start with the book itself.

British english[edit] As an American, I have used my style of english punctuation on the inside of the quotation marks, not outside, etc. Since the Manifesto is British, the article should be in British-English. I vaguely recall coming across references to Geras a few years ago, as a " post-Marxist " which might be preferable, if cumbersome. That article itself though, needs more work on it. Since it is a fairly controversial charge to claim that a Labour MP intervened on behalf of a Republican presidential candidate in such an outspoken way, I am going to delete this unless someone provides a source, or unless I find one. One of these, Gisela Stuart MP, declared during the American presidential election that a victory by challenger John Kerry victory would prompt "victory celebrations among those who want to destroy liberal democracies. I formatted using the ref tags. Gisela Stuart did not draft the manifesto and did not attend any of the meetings of the group before its publication. She is listed on a flyer publicising an event on the fringe of the British Labour Party conference because she is a Labour Minister of Parliament and because she signed the manifesto. This is because the war is widely assumed by the mainstream media to have been "disastrous". I look forward to reading one of my drunken tirades against Saddam Hussein transcribed by an anti-EM witness sitting further along the same public bar and cited here as proof of the immoderate attitudes of the manifesto authors. The addition should be deleted. For example, the bulk of the manifesto was written by Norman Geras, a well-known and self-described Marxist. I am strongly opposed to Marxism, as are many who might otherwise sign the document, but I cannot object to this controversial ideology being associated with the EM. Many have argued that there is a well-trodden intellectual path from Marxism to neo-conservatism. The question is one of relevance. Are the people holding those views anything to do with the creation of the document? Perhaps we can add some quotes from tinfoil hat-wearers? Neutral point of view?: Pass needs more citations anyway 5.

Chapter 9 : Talk:Euston Manifesto - Wikipedia

Much better to go back and reread one of John Holbo's "for Holbo is smart, honest, and witty" eviscerations of Helprin and Douthat: John Holbo: Douthat On Digital Barbarism: "Matthew Yglesias goes way too easy on Ross Douthat's book review of Mark Helprin's Digital Barbarism: A Writer's Manifesto.

Masks 1 The main readings in this book are three philosophical dialogues. Maybe a cross between a play and a problem set? All of Western philosophy is footnotes to Plato. Rather, they narrate encounters between another philosopher, Socrates, and various further figures, who tend to lend their names to the dialogues. In Euthyphro, Socrates debates holiness with a priest named Euthyphro. In Meno, he argues with Meno about the nature of virtue. Socrates debates three different characters with different views about that. Not only is Plato himself nowhere to be seen. The conclusions of these debates he stage-manages tend to be inconclusive. The problem set has no answer key. So it would seem. He was a real, historical figure. For doing the sorts of things he is described as doing in these dialogues. Unlike Plato, whose complete works make a thick book, Socrates never wrote a word. To his fellow Athenians, to anyone he met. Unlike Plato, who founded a famous Academy, Socrates never taught, in any formal sense. Still, he had followers " admirers, imitators, spectators. Plato was one of these. Plausibly, then, the purpose of these philosophical dialogues is to preserve, for posterity, a portrait of a man Plato admired. Since what was so distinctive about Socrates was, apparently, the way he asked questions and interacted with others, the portrait is a dramatic one, as opposed to being a book of wise sayings or a body of doctrine or theory. Not that these dialogues can be anything like transcriptions! Plato could have been with Socrates around the time of his trial. So it is not impossible that he might have witnessed an encounter with a man named Euthyphro. But dramatic events in Republic are set much earlier, when Plato was just a child. If Republic is fiction it seems reasonable to suspect Euthyphro is, too. Still, it could be that Plato is trying to write realistic fiction. Plato fictionalizes unrecoverable detail in the service of overall historical, biographical, intellectual fidelity. On this view Plato, the author, is a bit like one of those Russian dolls. We crack the Plato case to get to an authentic, Socratic core. Maybe we need to keep cracking. Maybe what looks like Socrates is really Plato, wearing a Socrates mask. Plato puts ideas into the mouth of his martyred teacher. For any number of reasons. Plato might not want to risk that himself. Speaking through a mask affords deniability. Or perhaps using Socrates as a mouthpiece is an attempt to borrow authority, or is a sincere gesture of filial piety. Obviously it can be hard for students to know at what point, exactly, they come into their own. Where does teacher stop and student begin? Here is an interesting fact. Several followers of Socrates did so in the generation following his death. Mostly these early works are lost, except for scraps and half-forgotten author names: Aeschines, Antisthenes, Phaedo, Eucleides. But some of these writers were, apparently, prolific. Plato had the foresight to start a school in which his writings were preserved and passed down. He towers over these others " no doubt in part due to the fact that he was a tremendous writer and thinker. But even if his reputation as a uniquely great thinker is deserved, the loss of these other writings gives us a skewed perspective on the Athenian intellectual scene. Please do not distribute without permission. We have intact dialogues by only one other author, Xenophon. His Socrates is, in many ways, a different character. Suppose " just suppose! Obviously this would be an unscholarly attitude. But the fact that our approach would be grossly irresponsible, under ideal conditions, reminds us how far from ideal our condition is. We want to know who Socrates really was. As readers we tend to think of Plato as contemporary with these characters who inhabit his works. But Thrasymachus was dead before Plato put pen to papyrus to write his first dialogue, never mind his mature masterpiece, Republic. The picture has holes in it, but the mind insists on seeing definite faces. Try to keep that in mind. On the mask view we are basically talking to Plato himself. For a variety of reasons " some common sense, some having to do with features of texts and independently known facts " neither of these extremes is quite believable. Kahn, Plato and the Socratic Dialogue: Masks 5 The truth probably lies somewhere in between. What do scholars think? They

disagree and debate. What did you expect? An intermediate, fairly standard position is that it is possible to establish a rough chronology, an approximate order in which the dialogues must have been composed. A path of intellectual development for Plato corresponds to this chronology – several, in fact. There is more consensus about chronology than interpretation. Many an interesting argument begins in the space between. But, broadly, no one will look at you as if you are crazy if you say this: We think we can mostly tell which are which. In early dialogues we may find something closer to an accurate portrait of the historical Socrates. Middle Plato is coming into his own as a thinker, so in middle dialogues we may meet a hybrid Socrates. Late Plato may have left his teacher behind. It fits with this view that, in one late dialogue, *Laws*, Socrates does not appear at all. In a few others Socrates is a minor character. Some scholars seriously doubt it. But everyone familiar with these debates will be familiar with this view. It provides the basis for many discussions. The standard view is plausible and seems to explain a lot. It provides a coherent picture. But think about how, if you interpret a given dialogue on the assumption that it is early, you have to be extra careful not to double-count your interpretation as independent evidence that the dialogue really is early, or that the early-middle-late scheme is right. Coherence is not truth. Think of the standard view as a nice, negotiable starting-point. The third, *Republic*, is middle. But *Book 1* may have been written earlier. Call it, like *Meno*, early-middle. In the meantime, the next two chapters will pursue the crucial who are we dealing with? What did they say? What did they mean by saying it? What did they think? For an authoritative expression of doubt about the standard view, see the Introduction to John M. Complete Works Hackett, *The Gadfly of Athens 1* In this chapter I present a view of what the real, historical Socrates may have been like – a view the reader now knows to take with a grain of salt. But first, let me introduce the excerpt itself. What he asked were ethical questions. How should I live? Not broad, metaphysical questions about the nature of the universe. *Apology* gives us a description of this negative procedure and purports to provide, as well, a justification for such a practice. The dialogue purports to contain speeches Socrates delivered at the trial at which he was convicted and sentenced to death.