McMahan’s Embodied Mind Account and the Identity Problem

I. Introduction

A psychological criterion, which presumes the essence and identity of our existence to be preserved by consciousness function due to brain function, has been upheld.[[1]](#footnote-1)[[2]](#footnote-2)[[3]](#footnote-3) Higher consciousness function and psychological action play a great role in our daily lives, and thus, we have an inclination to consider that human identity is preserved by the memory and personhood, which we have built up thus far. Furthermore, we are also inclined to presume personal identity to be inherent in the brain, which possesses higher consciousness function, considering the fission case in which a person is divided into the brain and body parts individually. That is, I think, the other reason a psychological criterion has been supported. Although we do not legally adopt a higher brain criterion which is created under the basis of a psychological criterion, it is not difficult to understand the reason for this criterion to be a continuous topic of brain death controversies and for quite a few physicians and philosophers to uphold,[[4]](#footnote-4)[[5]](#footnote-5)[[6]](#footnote-6) taking into consideration these reasons by which a psychological criterion has been defended.

One of the positions which endorse a psychological criterion claims that we must preserve psychological continuity and personhood in order to exist as the same being.[[7]](#footnote-7) Although there are various views about how to define psychological continuity and personhood, I presume them to be a relatively higher cognitive function, which include a thought, self-awareness, rationality, and emotion because many physicians and philosophers share a certain agreement about the definition in that way. In the psychological criterion, which regards having psychological continuity and personhood as the qualification to be a person, if a certain problem occurs in cerebrum function of a person and s/he loses a thought, self-awareness, rationality, and emotion, s/he is considered to cease to exist. However, this view which assumes possessing psychological continuity and personhood to be the qualification to be a person is problematic because there is no agreement about what the essential element, by which we could become a being with higher psychological continuity and personhood, would be, and we cannot form a definite criterion, at which point we could be regarded as a person.[[8]](#footnote-8) Even if there were a certain criterion, according to which we could be thought to be a person with higher cognitive function, it would still be problematic to presume a patient with consciousness function will cease to exist due to the fact that s/he did not fulfil that criterion.[[9]](#footnote-9)

McMahan creates his own psychological account about the essence and identity of human existence, critically considering the psychological criterion which requires psychological continuity and personhood to be a person. According to McMahan, the qualification according to which we could exist is not possessing higher cognitive function but preserving conscious function due to brain function. In McMahan’s view, a patient who loses higher cognitive function (e.g., an Alzheimer’s patient) does not cease to exist because s/he can preserve consciousness function. When a patient’s brain function which creates consciousness function irreversibly ceases, s/he is presumed to cease to exist. McMahan’s view, by which a person is assumed to cease to exist due to the irreversible cessation of cerebrum function, is formed as the more philosophically sophisticated theory than other psychological accounts, which uphold the higher brain criterion, due to the fact that it is grounded by the rigorous analysis of the identity and death problem. In this article, I examine if McMahan’s theory is logically consistent, focusing on his view about human identity and critically analyzing it.

II. McMahan’s Embodied Mind Account of Identity

According to McMahan, the essence of human existence is thought to be represented as embodied mind. Embodied mind is consciousness function, which is created by brain function. The essential factor, which retains the identity of human existence, is regarded as the preservation of consciousness function by means of brain function. McMahan’s view on human identity is called ‘Embodied Mind Account of Identity.’[[10]](#footnote-10) According to McMahan’s embodied mind account, preserving consciousness function is not to possess the continuous higher cognitive function (e.g., continuous psychological function and personhood) but to retain the capacity that creates consciousness function.[[11]](#footnote-11) A person is presumed to live as the same entity even if s/he loses psychological function and personhood, unless his/her brain’s capacity which would create conscious function irreversibly ceases. Furthermore, McMahan argues that the preservation of a brain’s material and minimum functional part is the factor by which human identity is retained.[[12]](#footnote-12) McMahan’s embodied mind account is distinguished from the other psychological accounts because his account requires the preservation of a brain’s material part which would create consciousness, not retaining mere consciousness function. We would be regarded as the identical entity even with a quasi-psychological state and quasi-memory and that would be problematic, taking into consideration the preservation of mere consciousness function. In order to prevent the problem, McMahan claims that preserving a certain material part of the brain is the essential factor which would retain human identity.

According to McMahan, quasi-psychological state and quasi-memory are consciousness and memory which a certain person (A) is convinced to possess as his/her own, possessing them in some manner, although they were actually the other person (B)’s. Suppose (A) loses the memory of a certain experience s/he had due to the problem of brain function. Then, a surgeon removes the disordered tissue from (A)’s brain and transplant a replica of the tissue (B), which is functionally the same as what (A) had prior to the dysfunction. After the surgery, (A) is convinced that s/he possesses the same memory which s/he had previously, but it is a quasi-memory, which the replica of the tissue (B) creates, and thus, it is not identical to what A originally possessed with his/her own tissue. According to McMahan, we could possess consciousness and memory with the replica of our brain tissue, which is not qualitatively different, but we are essentially distinct from a being who possesses a quasi-consciousness and quasi-memory with the replica, not with the original tissue. McMahan argues that we cannot be egoistically concerned with the being possessing the replica, as we are with ourselves, and our identity is not preserved by that being.[[13]](#footnote-13) McMahan claims that we might be concerned with the being who possesses a quasi-consciousness and quasi-memory, as we are with someone who is very close to us, but we will not be concerned with it in a way that we wish to desperately save our own lives.[[14]](#footnote-14) Our identity is retained only by the maintenance of consciousness function, which is created by the preservation of a material part of our brain in an appropriate causal relation, not having a quasi-consciousness with the replica of brain function.[[15]](#footnote-15)

According to McMahan’s embodied mind account, the essence of human existence is regarded as a person with brain function, and thus, the life of a human organism which is preserved by bodily integration is considered not to be important. McMahan claims that a person and a human organism are essentially different entities due to the different persistent condition of their existence, and the deaths of a person and a human organism are defined in different ways respectively. The irreversible cessation of consciousness function with brain function determines the death of a person, while the irreversible cessation of bodily integration causes that of a human organism.[[16]](#footnote-16) Although we are inclined to believe that the concept of death is biological and works only for a human organism, McMahan argues that claim is groundless and states that there will be no difficulty in stating a person dies when s/he ceases to exist with the irreversible cessation of consciousness function.[[17]](#footnote-17) In McMahan’s view, a person is presumed to die due to the irreversible cessation of cerebrum function due to the fact that cerebrum function is widely recognized as a part of the brain which would produce consciousness function.

III. The Existence of a Fetus and Non-Identity

According to McMahan, a person does not exist until a certain entity possesses consciousness function. An entity transforms from ‘something’ to ‘someone’, that is, an entity changes from a human organism into a person with consciousness function due to brain function. McMahan claims that aborting an early fetus, which has no consciousness function, is not killing but simply preventing something from coming into existence as a person, and states it is relatively similar to contraception.[[18]](#footnote-18) McMahan recognizes that a critique of his view about an embryo exists claiming that we should respect the life of an early embryo due to the fact that it possesses a potential to be a person, having no consciousness function yet, although the right to abortion is allowed in social policy.[[19]](#footnote-19) McMahan refutes this notion by claiming that there is no ground that an earlier embryo has the potential to become a person, preserving identity, and thus, he claims there is no ethical problem in abortion. According to McMahan’s embodied mind account, an early embryo has only potential capacity to produce an entity which is non-identical to itself.[[20]](#footnote-20) In McMahan’s view, non-identity of an entity is regarded similarly as; a lump of bronze becomes a statue when it is formed in a certain way, but a lump of bronze and a statue are not identical entities, and the entity, bronze, becomes another kind of entity, a statue, and two different kinds of entities coexist, while they consist of the same material.[[21]](#footnote-21) Similarly, when an early embryo, an organism, comes to possess consciousness function with brain function in the process of growth, it will cause another kind of entity, a person, who is essentially non-identical to itself, existing as different entities in an organism.

I argue McMahan’ s view that an early embryo would become a person who is essentially different from and is non-identical to itself, a human organism, with the possession of consciousness function due to brain function, is not appropriate. I wonder if an early embryo, which is alive with life-processing such as integration, could become a new entity which is essentially different from itself. Following McMahan’s view that an early embryo, an organism, would become a person who is essentially different from itself with consciousness function, and that we are essentially a person, we will have to conclude that we are essentially distinct from an organism, and it will be very problematic due to the contradiction to our intuition and biological fact.[[22]](#footnote-22)

Contrary to McMahan, I maintain it is appropriate to consider that an early embryo, which is alive with life processing such as integration, will become a late embryo, a newborn, and a child with personhood, changing through a phase and growing as the same entity, an organism. We should not consider that a human organism and a person would coexist with a non-identical relation but should presume we are essentially an organism and survive as an organism with identity, whether or not possessing consciousness function. Consciousness function is one of the functions that we, an organism, are endowed with; and, it is wrong to assume that a human organism would become a new entity, a person, who is essentially different from itself as McMahan claims. We grow with the acquisition of consciousness function, internally changing through a phase, but we exist as the same entity, an organism, even if we do not have the function or irreversibly lose it. Whether a being possesses consciousness function is not an essential factor which would determine what kind of entity it is.

Furthermore, McMahan’s view that aborting an early embryo simply prevents something from coming into existence as someone, which is regarded as relatively similar to contraception, is not proper. McMahan presumes that contraception and abortion are relatively similar due to the fact that an early embryo has a potential with which it will become a person who is non-identical to itself as a sperm and an egg, reproductive cells, does so.[[23]](#footnote-23) It, however, is difficult to find McMahan’s view is appropriate because contraception and abortion are very different due to the fact that contraception prevents sperm and eggs from becoming an organism through fertilization, while abortion deprives an embryo, an already existing organism, of its own life. Moreover, there is no specific entity in the case of contraception, which is prevented from coming into existence, because there are millions of ways in which millions of sperm and eggs are fertilized.[[24]](#footnote-24) On the other hand, an embryo, a sole entity as an organism, is injured through the act of abortion. I argue that we should not regard abortion, in which the subject that is injured is clear, and contraception, in which the one is not, as relatively similar.

On the contrary, I assume that McMahan will claim abortion and contraception are not very different because someone is prevented from coming into existence as a person and there is no subject who is injured due to the fact that no person exists in both of abortion and contraception. I expect such a counterexample from McMahan because he presumes that an embryo, a human organism, would be essentially distinguished from a person with brain function due to the fact that they would be different entities. If McMahan argues in that manner, I would point out that McMahan’s presumption that an early embryo, which is alive with life processing such as integration, would become a new entity as a person with consciousness function itself is problematic. Consciousness function is merely one of the functions which an organism can possess, and thus, whether that function exists does not determine what kind of entity a certain being would be. Without a doubt, consciousness function plays a great role in our lives, but we continue to be alive essentially as an organism, regardless of having that function. It is difficult to find appropriate McMahan’s view that when an organism obtains consciousness function, a new entity, a person, would appear and coexist with the organism. McMahan argues that abortion and contraception are relatively similar in that an organism would be prevented from becoming a new entity as a person and there would be no subject which would be injured in both cases, and thus, if contraception is allowed, abortion should also be. I, however, claim McMahan’s argument would not work due to the problem of its presumption. Contrary to McMahan’s view, contraception prevents reproductive cells from coming into existence as an organism, while abortion deprives an organism, which is identical to our existence, of its life. Contraception and abortion are very different acts, and thus, they should not be regarded as relatively similar. The abortion problem should be discussed and dealt with more deliberately than the issue regarding contraception.

IV. The Existence of a Persistent Vegetative State and an Interest to Live

As mentioned, McMahan claims that it is no difficulty in regarding us as dead when we cease to exist due to the irreversible cessation of consciousness function. A patient is diagnosed as a persistent vegetative state (PVS) if there is no indication that his/her consciousness function (e.g., the ability to recognize an external environment and oneself) is recovering one year after a brain injury.[[25]](#footnote-25) According to McMahan’s embodied mind account, a PVS patient who irreversibly loses consciousness function ceases to exist as a person who is as him/herself, losing identity, and is regarded as dead. McMahan mentions that we do not have to preserve the life of a human organism such as a PVS patient, which irreversibly loses consciousness function. McMahan argues a mere organism, which irreversibly loses consciousness function, has no interest in living and thus, he does not regard the preservation of its life important. According to McMahan’s embodied mind account, only the life of a person, which is presumed to possess an interest to live, is crucial and must be preserved.[[26]](#footnote-26) Since it is difficult to find that a being which merely lives as an organism would possess internal value due to consciousness function, which is peculiar to human life, the life of an organism such as a PVS patient, which loses an interest in living due to the irreversible cessation of consciousness function, is regarded as unsacred.

Contrary to McMahan’s view, I argue that a PVS patient still possesses an interest in living. Considering if a certain entity has an interest to live, whether or not it has consciousness experience is not a necessary condition. According to Tom Regan’s view of the interest principle, that an entity (A) has an interest of (x) is represented in two ways: (1) A has an interest in x (= x is in A’s interest) and (2) A takes an interest in x (= A is interested in x). Regan argues what matters in the interest principle is that x is in A’s interest, and thus, A has an interest in x, as (1)’s usage of the principle mentions, not that A is consciously interested in x, as (2)’s usage suggests.[[27]](#footnote-27)[[28]](#footnote-28) Contrary to Regan, it is not clear whether the interest principle that x is in A’s interest is more crucial than the one that A is interested in x at all times, and there is a view that an interest in living should be consciously represented.[[29]](#footnote-29) I, however, presume a PVS patient to possess an interest to live due to the fact that life is in his/her interest while s/he is alive as an organism with integration, which includes metabolic action, the intake of nutrition, circulatory/respiratory function, and so on, although s/he is unable to be consciously interested in life. If an interest to live completely disappeared from a PVS patient, s/he would lose integration and the capacity to live as an organism.

I maintain that a patient loses an interest to live when his/her life processing, by which an organism can survive, is irreversibly lost due to the complete cessation of integrative function. There are two views about at which point we can determine the complete cessation of integrative function. One is the view of a whole brain criterion, in which integrative function is assumed to completely cease due to the irreversible cessation of whole brain function (i.e., the cessation of not only cerebrum function but also whole brain function including brain stem function).[[30]](#footnote-30) The other is the view of a circulatory and respiratory criterion, in which integrative function is presumed to completely cease due to the irreversible cessation of bodily circulatory/respiratory function, not that of brain function, because a brain dead patient who irreversibly loses whole brain function can possess integrative function with a ventilator.[[31]](#footnote-31) There still is a debate about whether a patient dies as an organism as a whole either with the irreversible cessation of whole brain function or with that of bodily circulatory/respiratory function, and that is a problem which will not easily be solved.[[32]](#footnote-32) Nevertheless, it is clear that a patient does not die as an organism as a whole only due to the irreversible cessation of cerebrum function and, thus, we cannot prove him/her to completely lose an interest to live. McMahan’s view that a PVS patient loses an interest to live is not appropriate. A patient is consciously interested in life and pursues further good with consciousness function due to brain function, but it will be proper to presume that s/he does not lose an interest to live while living as an organism with integrative function, even if s/he irreversibly loses consciousness function.

In contrast to my critique of McMahan’s embodied mind account with Regan’s interest principle, McMahan would claim that a PVS patient who is alive as an organism could possess an interest in living, but it would not be necessary to regard the life of the patient who cannot possess consciousness function as important. According to McMahan, only a being with consciousness function could become a person, and what essentially matters for our lives is regarded as the idea that a person is interested in living. Thus, it is easily anticipated McMahan would claim that it would be difficult to think of the life of a patient who irreversibly loses consciousness function as important. Contrary to McMahan’s claim, I argue that consciousness function is one of the functions which we, who are essentially an organism, can possess and thus, we cannot become a new entity, a person, with that function, as mentioned previously. Furthermore, I maintain McMahan’s embodied mind account has a problem in its assumption again because the fact that we are interested in life is presumed not to be a necessary condition to preserve our lives. I claim McMahan’s argument that we must regard the life of a person, who would be considered to appear differently than that of an organism due to consciousness function of brain function, as important is not well-grounded due to the fact that his assumption itself is problematic.

V. Two Entities, a Person and a Human Organism, and the Identity Problem

I argue that the assumption in McMahan’s argument, in which a person with consciousness function due to the development of brain function would appear essentially different from an early embryo, is problematic. I clarify McMahan’s embodied mind account is not consistent in explaining the identity of our existence, analyzing this assumption problem with the relation of a conceptual problem regarding human identity and considering counterarguments from McMahan thoroughly. According to McMahan, a human organism is assumed not to disappear due to the appearance of a person, but they are presumed to coexist. However, if a person and a human organism coexisted, they would be regarded as sharing a living body including the brain. If so, the problem that a person and a human organism would have the same consciousness and thought due to the possession of the same brain seems to arise. This conceptual problem, in which at least more than two entities that are numerically different but possess the same consciousness and thought would appear and we could not determine which entity’s consciousness and thought would be essential, is called the ‘too many thinkers problem.’[[33]](#footnote-33)

McMahan argues that a person and a human organism do not merely coexist as a numerically different entity in a living body, but they exist in spatially different places, in order to prevent the too many thinkers problem.[[34]](#footnote-34) McMahan states that a person exists in a region of the brain and it is a part of a human organism, which is the whole living body. According to McMahan, a person and a human organism would coexist, but only a person who would reside in a region of the brain could possess consciousness and thought non-derivatively and would be essential to our existence. McMahan regards a human organism as the being which would have consciousness and thought only derivatively and does not expect that the too many thinkers problem would occur in his account due to the fact a person and a human organism would not possess the same consciousness and thought, even though they would exist numerically differently.

Contrary to McMahan’s argument, David Hershenov argues that his view that a person would be a part of a human organism and these two different entities would exist in spatially difference places could not prevent the too many thinkers problem.[[35]](#footnote-35) Hershenov’s view is grounded by the fact that we could exist as an organism with consciousness and thought, even if we were reduced to the size of the brain.[[36]](#footnote-36) According to Hershenov, considering us to exist after reducing to the size of the brain, if we regard a person and a human organism as different entities as McMahan claims, they would exist in the brain which is spatially the same place. If so, Hershenov criticizes McMahan’s account because it would fall under the too many thinkers problem due to the fact that there would be no distinction between consciousness and thought, which a human organism would possess derivatively, and those, which a person would have non-derivatively, and two entities which exist in the same place would possess the same consciousness and thought.

Contrary to Hershenov’s critique, I assume McMahan would argue that his account would prevent the too many thinkers problem because a person existing in a region of cerebrum function and a human organism residing in the whole brain which includes the cerebrum, brain stem, hypothalamus, and so on, would be located in spatially different places, and thus, the two would not possess the same consciousness and thought. According to McMahan, we are presumed to be essentially a person who could exist due to cerebrum function that is a part of the brain. McMahan would maintain that the essence of our existence would reside in a person who could possess consciousness function, which would be non-derivatively created by cerebrum function, and a human organism which would be the whole brain including the cerebrum could have consciousness function only derivatively, and thus, too many thinkers problem would not occur. If McMahan would claim so, that would be a proper counterargument which could prevent Hershenov’s criticism.

Hershenov further analyzes McMahan’s embodied mind account by considering the case that we could be reduced from the size of the whole brain to that of the cerebrum and be alive in a thought experiment, predicting such a counterargument from McMahan. Being reduced to the size of the cerebrum, since a biological being (i.e., we are reduced into the size of the cerebrum in this case, and thus, it is proper to call ‘a biological being’ rather than an organism) and a conscious being, namely a person, would coexist in the same place of the cerebrum, Hershenov argues that based on our existence under McMahan’s embodied mind account, the too many thinkers problem would occur due to the fact that a biological being and a person would be presumed to coexist in the same place. I, however, claim that a biological part, the whole cerebrum, and a conscious part, the minimum cerebrum, would be considered as existing in different places in the cerebrum according to McMahan’s account. That is, McMahan, I presume, would bring forward a counterargument that a conscious being (i.e., a person), who would be essential to our existence, would exist in the minimum part of the cerebrum which is presumed to create consciousness function non-derivatively, and a biological being resides in the whole cerebrum which includes that part, and thus, two different entities would not be in the same place and too many thinkers problems would not occur.

Hershenov also understands such a counterexample from McMahan, and he additionally argues that the embodied mind account would not prevent the too many thinkers problem due to the fact that a biological being and a person would coexist in the same place again when we would be reduced to the minimum part of the cerebrum, further advancing the thought experiment. Contrary to Hershenov’s view, I claim that only a person is presumed to exist in the minimum conscious part of the brain which would create consciousness function non-derivatively, and thus, a biological being is not assumed to appear in the same place, understanding McMahan’s embodied mind account in a proper way. The too many thinkers problem is not presumed to occur in McMahan’s account because he regards only a person as existing in the minimal part of the cerebrum which could purely create consciousness function.[[37]](#footnote-37) After all, I argue that we must present a ground that there is no such place where only consciousness function would be created and only a person would exist, which does not include the existence of a biological being, in order to prove that McMahan’s account would not be able to prevent the too many thinkers problem. Therefore, I will clarify the problem of McMahan’s account with the ground, by which there could not be such a place where only a person would appear without being coexistent with a biological being in principle below.

McMahan’s embodied mind account presumes a certain region in the cerebrum would produce consciousness function non-derivatively, but it does not make clear which part of the cerebrum would play a role in creating it non-derivatively. Thus, my view is no more than a guess, but it seems he assumes neurons in a certain region of the cerebrum would produce consciousness function non-derivatively. The problem, however, is the situation that brain circulation is preserved is required for the activity of neurons, even understanding certain neurons in the cerebrum would create consciousness function non-derivatively. If so, preserving brain circulatory due to the fact that certain neurons in the cerebrum work in cooperation with other neurons and brainstem function is necessary in order for them to work to produce consciousness function. Thus, I argue that the problem, in which we cannot specify the place where only a person would exist, will appear due to the fact that these certain neurons are not regarded to solely play a role in creating consciousness function non-derivatively.

Contrary to my critique, McMahan would argue that certain neurons in the cerebrum would be essential to us because they would play a great role in producing consciousness function and would be a person, despite the fact that preserving brain circulation is required for the function. Contrary to such a counterexample, I would maintain that each neuron in the cerebrum not only plays a role in creating consciousness function by sending electronic-chemical signals but also plays a part in producing biological function, which includes the intake of nutrients, the exclusion of waste materials, metabolism, and so on.[[38]](#footnote-38) Therefore, I argue that we must conclude a person and a biological being will coexist in the same region due to the fact that certain neurons in the cerebrum possess not only consciousness function but also biological function, even if we regard the neurons as those that would greatly play a role in producing consciousness function non-derivatively and would be a person which would be essential to us.

In the end, I maintain that McMahan’s embodied mind account, in which there would be two entities, a person and a human organism, and we would essentially be a person, will not be able to prevent the too many thinkers problem. McMahan’s account which has this problem will not be the theory that is consistent in explaining the identity of our existence because it is not clear about whether consciousness and thought of either a person or a human organism (or a biological being) is essential to us. I argue it is appropriate to consider that we are essentially an organism and grow as an identical organism with consciousness function due to the development of brain function, internally changing through a phase, not changing from a human organism to a new entity, a person, as McMahan states. I claim that we will not be able to establish a theory that can explain the identity of our existence not inconsistently, unless considering it in that way.

In this article, I examined the human identity problem on McMahan’s embodied mind account, focusing on the issues regarding the existence of an embryo, that of a PVS patient, and the relation between two entities, a person and a human organism, respectively. An early embryo, which has no brain function yet, grows as the same entity with the acquisition of consciousness function due to brain function, not becoming a new entity, a person. Furthermore, I claim that a PVS patient who is regarded as irreversibly losing brain function does not deprive of an interest to live and is alive with human identity, maintaining integration as an organism. Lastly, I argue McMahan’s embodied mind account, in which two entities, a person and a human organism, would coexist in a living body, could not defend itself from the too many thinkers problem, and thus, it could not be a theory which would be consistent in explaining human identity.

According to McMahan’ embodied mind account, a person, who is regarded as residing in the part of the brain that would produce consciousness function non-derivatively, and a human organism, which is presumed to consist of the region other than that part in a living body, are different entities. The essence and identity of our existence are regarded as being preserved by a person, a conscious being. This account will lead to the view that we are not essentially an organism, and it will be very problematic. Possessing consciousness function due to brain function is not a definitive factor that determines what kind of entity a certain being will be. We are essentially an organism, and our lives begin as an early embryo with no brain function and continue with identity, irreversibly losing consciousness function due to brain function. I argue that consciousness function is one of the functions we, as organisms, are endowed with, and we would not become a new entity which would be different from the existence thus far with the acquisition of that function, contrary to McMahan’s view.
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