

Letters

Multiple Personality

Ian Hacking disparages what he takes to be my account of Multiple Personality Disorder in his review of Stephen Braude's book on the subject (*LRB*, 11 June), but from what he says about it, I suspect that he has been misled by the book under review into confusing two different theories of mine: the Multiple Drafts Model of normal consciousness, which I developed with Marcel Kinsbourne, and the account of Multiple Personality Disorder that I developed with Nicholas Humphrey (Humphrey and Dennett, 'Speaking for Our Selves', *Raritan* 9, No 1, Summer 1989). The latter is given a brief summary in my book, *Consciousness Explained* – too brief, I am now inclined to think, in the light of this understandable confusion. I claim that the Multiple Drafts Model can provide the basis for all varieties of human consciousness, normal and pathological, and hence it must be capable of explaining the phenomena underlying Multiple Personality Disorder: but the peculiarities of MPD require a theory over and above the Multiple Drafts Model, and I think Humphrey and I have given such an account. It has nothing to do with 'cognitive modules': as an unflagging critic of Fodor's concept of modules, I must protest Braude's misnomer and Hacking's adoption of it. The Humphrey-Dennett model of MPD has been praised by many of the professionals in psychotherapy whose opinion counts highest with me (and, I expect, with Hacking), precisely for its balanced attention to just the sort of details Hacking chides me for overlooking: 'the square pegs of cognitive modules simply don't fit into the round holes of multiple experience' – I couldn't agree more. I wish Hacking, whose historical perspective on MPD is nonpareil, had contrasted Braude's account with the Humphrey-Dennett account, and not with Braude's unsympathetic version of my account.

Daniel C. Dennett

Center for Cognitive Studies,
Tufts University