UG PH S6-03(DSC)

FOUR YEAR BACHELOR'S DEGREE COURSE
(CBCS in Accordance with NEP 2020)

SEMESTER - VI

FUNDAMENTAL CONCEPTS OF PHILOSOPHY
PHILOSOPHY

Surya Kumar Bhuyan School of Social Sciences
KRISHNA KANTA HANDIQUI STATE OPEN UNIVERSITY

Subject Experts

1. **Prof.(Rtd.) Sauravpran Goswami,** Dept. of Philosophy,Gauhati University
2. **Dr.(Rtd.) Sabitri Devi,** Associate Professor, Dept.of Philosophy, Cotton University
3. **Dr. Naba Prasad Nath,** Associate Professor, Dept. of Philosophy, Nowgong University

Course Coordinator: Dr. Bhaskar Bhattacharyya, K.K.H.S.O.U

SLM Preparation Team

Units	Contributors
1.	Prof. (Rtd.) Sibnath Sarma, Gauhati University & Dr. Bhaskar Bhattacharya
2.	Dr. Pallavi Sharma, NEF College & Dr. Tejasha Kalita
3.	Dr. Shakuntala Bora, Gauhati University
4 &5	Dr. Paran Borthaqur, Haflong Govt. College & Dr. Bhaskar Bhattacharya
6, 9, 14 &15	Dr. Bhaskar Bhattacharyya, KKHSOU
7.	Dr. Rajlakshmi Kalita & Dr. Tejasha Kalita
8.	Dr.(Rtd.) Anjana Neog, Pragjyotish College
10.	Dr. Ramala Sarma, Cotton University
11 &13	Prof. (Rtd.) Sauravpran Goswami, Gauhati University
12.	Smt. (Rtd.) Meenakshi Sarma Pathak, Handiqui Girls' College Dr. Bhaskar Bhattacharya

Editorial Team

Content Editor: Dr. Bhaskar Bhattacharyya & Dr. Tejasha Kalita
Language Editor: Dr. Bhaskar Bhattacharyya & Dr. Tejasha Kalita
Format Editor: Dr. Bhaskar Bhattacharyya

1st Edition : March, 2026 **ISBN :**

© Krishna Kanta Handiqui State Open University
No part of this publication which is material protected by this copyright notice may be produced or transmitted or utilized or stored in any form or by any means now known or hereinafter invented, electronic, digital or mechanical, including photocopying, scanning, recording or by any information storage or retrieval system, without prior written permission from the KKHSOU.
Printed and published by Registrar on behalf of the Krishna Kanta Handiqui State Open University.

The University acknowledges with thanks the financial support provided by the **Distance Education Council, New Delhi**, for the preparation of this study material**.**

Housefed Complex, Dispur, Guwahati-781006; Web: www. Kkhsou

CONTENTS

UNIT 1: Nature, Scope and Utility of Philosophy **7 - 22**

Definition of Philosophy, Nature of Philosophy, Philosophy and Science, Philosophy And Common Sense, Scope of Philosophy, Utility of Philosophical Study

UNIT 2: Nature and Kinds of Knowledge: 'Knowledge by Acquaintance' And 'Knowledge By Description' **23 - 31**

Knowledge by Acquaintance, Knowledge by Description, Relation between "knowledge by acquaintance" and "knowledge by description"

UNIT 3: Theories of Knowledge: Rationalism and Empiricism **32 - 46**

Origin and Sources of Knowledge, Theories of Knowledge, Rationalism, Standpoints of Different Philosophers, Empiricism, Standpoints of Different Philosophers, Criticism, Standpoints of Different Philosophers

UNIT 4: Kant's Critical theory **47 - 64**

What is Criticism? Kant's Preliminary Clarifications on The Kinds of Knowledge and Judgments, Kinds of knowledge, A priori knowledge, A posteriori knowledge Kinds of judgments, Analytic judgment, Synthetic judgment, Synthetic a priori, Synthetic a posteriori, Possibility of synthetic a priori judgment, Copernican Revolution

UNIT 5: Scepticism: Hume **65 - 79**

What is Skepticism? Different Kinds of Skepticism, Pyrrhonian Skepticism Cartesian Skepticism, Humean Skepticism

UNIT 6: Theories of Truth **80 - 89**

Truth in Philosophy, Correspondence theory of truth, Coherence theory of truth, Pragmatic theory of truth

UNIT 7: Realism: Naive and Scientific **90 - 98**

Classification of Realism, Naive Realism, Scientific Realism, Difference between Naive and Scientific Realism, Conclusion

UNIT 8: Idealism: Subjective and Objective **99 - 109**

Definitions of Idealism, Kinds of Idealism, Definition of Subjective idealism, Supporters of Subjective Idealism, Viewpoints on Subjective Idealism, Definition of Objective Idealism, Supporters of Objective idealism Viewpoints on objective idealism

UNIT 9: Mind-Body relation: Descartes and Spinoza **110 - 131**

Descartes view on Mind- Body relation, Interactionism, Spinoza's View on Mind-Body relation, Parallelism, Leibnitz's view on Mind-Body relation, Pre-established Harmony, Russell's view on Leibnitz's concept of Mind and Body relation Strawson's view on mind and Body relation

UNIT 10: Universals: Realism and Nominalism **132 - 153**

Universal: Its nature and theories, Realism, Plato's realism, Aristotle's realism, Nominalism: What this theory says, Hobbes' view, Hume's view

UNIT 11: Outlines of Logical Positivism **154 - 164**

Supporters of Logical Positivism, Verification theory of meaning, Elimination of Metaphysics, Critical Appreciation

UNIT 12: Existentialism **165 - 180**

Advocates of existentialism, Salient features of existentialism, Atheism and theism in existentialism, Existence precedes essence, Critical evaluation

UNIT 13: The Concept of Person **181 - 196**

What is the Concept of Person? Strawson on No-ownership theory, Strawson on Cartesianism, Strawson's distinction between P- and M - Predicates, Strawson's view on P-predicates, Bernard William's view on Strawson's concept of p-predicates

UNIT 14: Theories of Punishment **197 - 210**

Theories of Punishment, Deterrent theory, Reformative theory, Retributive theory, Capital Punishment

UNIT 15: Individual and Punishment **211 - 227**

Social Contact theory of Society, Criticism of the Social Contact theory, Organic theory of Society, Criticism of the organic theory, Theory of Group of Mind, Modern Debate on Individual and Society

COURSE INTRODUCTION

This course introduces us to the fundamental concepts of philosophy. It basically focuses on metaphysical and epistemological concepts of philosophy. While going through this course, learners will be able to know the general or basic concepts of philosophy.

This course is sum total of fifteen units. The first unit is 'Nature, Scope and Utility of Philosophy'. The concepts included in this unit are- Definition of Philosophy, Nature of Philosophy, Philosophy and Science, Philosophy and Common Sense, Scope of Philosophy, and Utility of Philosophical Study.

The second unit is 'Nature and Kinds of Knowledge: 'Knowledge by Acquaintance' and 'Knowledge by Description'. The issues to be discussed in this unit are Knowledge by Acquaintance, Knowledge by Description, Relation between "knowledge by acquaintance" and "knowledge by description".

The third unit is 'Theories of Knowledge'. After going through this unit, you will be able to know the concepts which are- Origin and Sources of Knowledge, Theories of Knowledge, Rationalism, Standpoints of Different Philosophers, Empiricism, Standpoints of Different Philosophers, Criticism, and Standpoints of Different Philosophers

The fourth unit is 'Criticism' (Kant). The concepts to be discussed in this unit are- What is Criticism? Kant's Preliminary Clarifications on The Kinds of Knowledge and Judgments, Kinds of knowledge, A priori knowledge, A posteriori knowledge, Kinds of judgments, Analytic judgment, Synthetic judgment, Synthetic a priori, Synthetic a posteriori, Possibility of synthetic a priori judgment, and Copernican Revolution.

The fifth unit is 'Scepticism'. The concepts included in this unit are - What is Skepticism? Different Kinds of Skepticism, Pyrrhonian Skepticism, Cartesian Skepticism, Humean Skepticism

The sixth unit is 'Theories of Truth'. The concepts included in this unit are- Truth in Philosophy, Correspondence theory of truth, Coherence theory of truth, and Pragmatic theory of truth.

The seventh unit is 'Realism: Naive and Scientific'. The concepts are Classification of Realism, Naive Realism, Scientific Realism, Difference between, Naive and Scientific Realism, and Conclusion

The eight unit is 'Idealism: Subjective and Objective'. The concepts in this unit are Definitions of Idealism, Kinds of Idealism, Definition of Subjective idealism, Supporters of Subjective Idealism, Viewpoints on Subjective Idealism, Definition of Objective Idealism, Supporters of Objective idealism, and Viewpoints on objective idealism.

The ninth unit is 'Mind-Body relation: Descartes and Spinoza'. The concepts included in this unit are Descartes' view on Mind- Body relation, Interactionism, Spinoza's View on Mind- Body relation, Parallelism, Leibnitz's view on Mind-Body relation, Pre-established Harmony, Russell's view on Leibnitz's concept of Mind and Body relation, and Strawson's view on mind and Body relation.

The tenth unit is 'Universals: Realism and Nominalism'. The concepts included in this unit are- Concept of Universal and Its nature, Realism, Plato's realism, Aristotle's realism, and Hobbes' and Hume's view on religion.

The eleventh unit is 'Outlines of Logical Positivism'. This unit deals with the sections such as Supporters of Logical Positivism, Verification theory of meaning, Elimination of Metaphysics, and Critical Appreciation.

The twelve unit is 'Existentialism'. The concepts included in this unit are existentialism and its supporters, Salient features of existentialism, Atheism and theism in existentialism, Existence precedes essence, and Critical evaluation.

The thirteenth unit is 'The Concept of Person'. The topic included in this unit are- What is the Concept of Person? Strawson on No-ownership theory, Strawson on Cartesianism, Strawson's distinction between P- and M -Predicates, Strawson's view on P-predicates, and Bernard William's view on Strawson's concept of p-predicates.

The fourteenth unit is 'Notion of Punishment'. The concepts included in this unit are Theories of Punishment- Deterrent theory, Reformative theory, Retributive theory, and Capital Punishment.

The fifteenth unit is 'Individual and Punishment'. The concepts included in this unit are- Social Contact theory of Society, Criticism of the Social Contact theory, Organic theory of Society, Criticism of the organic theory, Theory of Group of Mind, and finally Modern Debate on Individual and Society.

While going through this course you will come across some boxes which are put on the left side or right side of the text. These boxes will give us the meanings of some words and concepts within the text. Apart from this, there will be broad and short questions included under Activity and Check your Progress in every unit. Activities will increase our thinking capacity because questions put in Activity are not directly derived from the text. But answers to the short questions are put in the section Answers to Check Your Progress. Besides, there are some text related questions which are put in Model Questions. These questions will help you in selecting and mastering probable topics for the examination so that you can prepare for examination with confidence.

UNIT 1: NATURE, SCOPE AND UTILITY OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIT STRUCTURE

1.1 Learning Objectives

1.2 Introduction

1.3 Definition of Philosophy

1.4 Nature of philosophy

1.5 Philosophy and Science

1.6 Philosophy and Common Sense

1.7 Scope of Philosophy

1.8 Utility of Philosophical Study

1.9 Let us Sum up

1.10 Further Readings

1.11 Answers to Check Your Progress

1.12 Model Questions

1.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to:

- Define philosophy;
- Explain its nature;
- Distinguish philosophy from Common Sense and Science;
- Describe its Scope;
- Discuss the uses of Philosophy; and
- Show its relation to life.

1.2 INTRODUCTION

You must have heard the names of Plato, Buddha, Nagarjuna, Samkara, Russell, Radhakrishnan, Aurobindo etc. These are philosophers. They think differently from what common people think. They think even differently from what the scientists think.

You must have heard a lot of things said about philosophers. That they are absent minded, that they are careless about their dress and food, etc. All that is not true. There are myths and rumours floating in society. You should not believe

in these things. There are absent minded persons in society, that is true. They may be highly educated or they may not be educated at all. There is no link between absent mindedness and philosophy. Accidentally some philosophers may be absent minded. Similarly, some scientists, mathematicians, poets, businessmen also may be absent-minded. Therefore, there is no link between absentmindedness and philosophy. Many may think that study of philosophy makes person ascetic, otherworldly, dejected and pessimistic. There are all rumours spread by ignorant persons. Free yourself from such unfounded stories.

Philosophers are normal human beings like you and me. They only think differently. Another little misgiving you have to avoid is that philosophers are saints. Actually philosophers are intellectuals and not saints. They do not practice holiness or absolute goodness. Philosophy is essentially a theoretical discipline. There is no bar in applying it in life. In fact that constitutes its applied aspect. But fundamentally it is theoretical. Practice is a part of life only.

(Freeing yourself from all prejudices, biasness and preconceived ideas about philosophy, read this unit carefully and you will be what an interesting subject philosophy is.)

1.3 DEFINITION OF PHILOSOPHY

'Man is a rational animal' is an example of a good definition. Man is an animal and he is different from other animals because of rationality. Definition of anything should have this characteristic of singling out the thing defined from among other things. But so far no such definition of philosophy is available. You do not have a universally acceptable definition of philosophy. You only have some conceptions, ideas, descriptions of the nature of philosophy-but not a logically created definition of it.

But that does not mean that there are no distinguishing marks of philosophy. Philosophy is an intellectual enterprise. It is analytical and investigative in nature. It is explanatory. It is different from Science, Poetry, Politics etc.

You will understand what philosophy is as you progress through this course. To begin with, you contemplate on some concepts of philosophy as (1) A systematic interpretation of experiences, (2) A critique of language, (3) Outlook on the world and our life in it, (4) Understanding the human situation, (5) Inquiry into perennial values in the world, (6) Foundation of the scientific inquiry of the world, etc.

Do not get swayed by these cryptic expressions. In the sections that follow, the nature and Scope of Philosophy explained to you.

1.4 NATURE OF PHILOSOPHY

Here we shall continue with what we have started in sec.1.2.

Every word has one or more meanings. What is the literal meaning of philosophy so that we understand what it stood for in the beginning.

The word 'philosophy' is derived from two Greek (Greek is the language of Greece, the land of Socrates, Plato, Aristotle….) words philos and sophia. Philos stands for love and Sophia for wisdom. It stood for serious cultivation of the intellect and understanding. It was a searching inquiry into the deeper values of life. But simply stating that philosophy is love of wisdom does not carry any sense any more. For in the past, philosophy was the only sustained search for knowledge. But these days you have a lot of other branches of study. For instance, science when you say 'philosophy is a love of wisdom' –does it mean that there is no love of wisdom in science? You may try to bypass this difficulty by differentiating between knowledge and wisdom. That knowledge is empirical and wisdom is valuational. That knowledge is theoretical and wisdom is practical. And while science strives for knowledge, philosophy strives for wisdom. But such a line of argument many philosophers do not like. For them, love of wisdom is too old, too vague and too wide a concept. Being imprecise, it cannot be accepted as a concept of philosophy.

Then there is another difficulty which we have to encounter: the random and reckless use of the term philosophy. It seems as if philosophy has no fixed meaning at all. For anybody and everybody attaches to any and every concept. There is philosophy of life, philosophy of business, philosophy of science, philosophy of history and philosophy of what not. While being so used - this term stands for the basic nature, aim, purpose of the thing qualified. Or it may stand for the rationale - the logic of its being: why a thing is such and such and not otherwise. 'The philosophy of your joining Krishna Kanta Handique State Open University may be that you want more knowledge, better job, higher achievement and satisfaction in life. Now, though this seems to be fairly sensible, but it does not give the essential quality of the discipline or subject philosophy that is taught in the universities.

Philosophy is the general name of some activities which are unique in themselves. You can call it an umbrella concept under which some functions occur.

For instance, you know well how science is not a specific concept. It is also an umbrella concept under which activities of physics, chemistry, biology, botany, psychology etc. take place. Exactly in the same way, under the brand name or umbrella of philosophy, you have some activities called epistemology, metaphysics, ethics, aesthetics, theology etc. (In section 1.6 these names will be explained) There are some activities which together go by the label philosophy.)

But what kind of a work philosophy in general is? What does a person while philosophizing do? Many philosophers may quarrel about this essential nature of philosophy. We will give you the broadest outlines of a philosophical activity from dominant philosophical trends.

1. A strong appealing trend is that philosophy is a systematic interpretation of experiences. (Do you remember this definition given section 1.2?) Human life is a series of experiences, thoughts, memories, hopes and aspirations. If you carefully think, you cannot have anything in your mind which was not at one point or another the experience of you or somebody else. There cannot be absolutely imaginary ideas. Normally, imaginary ideas have foundation in some experiences. You may talk of immortality. It is the opposite of mortality that is our regular experience, i.e., seeing someone dying. The idea of God is a cluster of ideas derived from various experiences - of power, of intelligence, of kindness of forgiveness etc. The idea of a golden mountain is derived from the experiences of gold and mountain joined together. The idea of a fairy is derived by joining together the experience of beauty, girl, wings, magical power etc. The idea of a square circle is derived from combining the experiences of a square and a circle. The idea of a barren woman's son is derived from the experiences of a barren woman and a son. So, if even impossible ideas are derived from experiences, there need not be any difficulty in assuming the fact of all ideas coming from experience.

   Now, there are certain experiences that are very important and useful - but their nature is not quite clear. For instance, we talk of knowledge, truth, beauty, goodness, happiness, holiness, propriety, duty, freedom, change, law, punishment, virtue, sin, suffering etc. These are universal experiences. And somebody has to explain their nature and worth, origin and growth, impact on human life etc. Take an example: A boy is standing on the pavement. An old

woman comes and wants to cross the road but is unable to do that. The boy takes her by the arm, slowly leads her across the road safely to the other side. You see the whole thing. Do not you say, "what a kind and good boy!" Everybody everywhere would feel like you. On the contrary, if the boy would have pushed the woman and she had fallen down on the pavement - you would surely think," How bad! What a cruel boy!" well, all would feel like that. But how many persons have the time, competence and desire to go deeply into the problem "what is goodness?" "What is badness?" etc. Similarly, these are universal experiences of truth, beauty, happiness etc. All these experiences deserve thorough explanation.

Philosophy is that branch of study which systematically investigates not only the well-known experiences, but all experiences leading to concepts, ideas, communication, meaning and such issues. Here philosophy is a speculative discipline.

2. From the above, we reach a state where linguistic clarification and conceptual analysis appears as the central point in philosophy. It is often accepted as linguistic analysis or "A critique of Language." (Wittgenstein) Here philosophy is restricted to conceptual study centering round language. It is taken as a second order study-not going to things or realities but remaining confined to clarification of concepts. In such a concept of philosophy, analysis is taken as a tool of clarification of concepts. These concepts are useful only as constituents of propositions or statements. The statements are those expressions which are either true or false, which in turn must be grounded on the real world. Thus verification, clarity, brevity, precision, meaningfulness etc. become central issues in philosophy. Not 'thing', but 'language' is the raw material of philosophical enquiry. Here philosophy is linguistic analysis.

(3) Again, there are other philosophers who confine themselves to intelligible experience alone - and nothing else. They talk of ignoring the world from where the experience is supposedly derived. The real world outside experience can be doubted, but the phenomena that our mind constructs out of the experience cannot be doubted. Therefore, study these phenomena carefully and intimately. Such philosophers concern themselves with essences of things ignoring their existences. And they consider it as the correct method of philosophy. Here philosophy is phenomenology.

(4) Yet others are there who revolt against such methods and standpoints. For them, existence precedes essence-at least in the case of human beings. Hence, study of human existence in all its limitation and grandeur, pains and anguishes, freedom and responsibilities - become the nature of philosophy. Here philosophy is existentialism.

(5) Following one or the other way of philosophizing, you can reach certain conclusions. Philosophy is actually both the process and the outcome. You may espouse a high and noble life for human beings. You may deal with justice, goodness, democracy and such other individual and social principles. You may also profess certain policies that might warn you from being very sure about anything but yourself. You may be an idealist or a realist, a spiritualist or a materialist. You may be a skeptic and a solipsist too (Do not be puzzled by these terms. You will know about these as you continue to stands philosophy.) You may allow moral prescription as possible or you may totally denounce these as emotive utterances, not permitted by logic. That does not mean that you will be very selfish and bad; that only means that you cannot construct a rational philosophy supportive of good life. But there are others who completely believe that philosophy actually stands for justifying a good life!

Philosophy is a very vast area of work where lots of questions are asked systematic and logical answers to these are sought. It is the expression of the deep inquisitiveness of human mind, ever restless and full of curiosity till a satisfactory answer is obtained. There are other manners and methods (for instance, Science) of satisfying curiosity, but philosophy is the earliest and oldest of them all. It has the merit of being co-extensive with human culture and civilization. Philosophy began when the first human being asked a deep question and it will continue to be as long as such questions are asked.

ACTIVITY

- What is philosophy? Give your definition.

.....

- Write names of three Indian philosophers and books written by each of them.

.....

.....

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q 1: What are the two Greek words from which Philosophy has been derived?

……..

……..

Q 2: Fill up the blanks

a) Man is a …….animal.

b) Philosophy……..enterprise.

Q 3: Distinguish between:

a) Knowledge and Wisdom

b) Philosopher and saint

1.5 PHILOSOPHY AND SCIENCE

(1) Both philosophy and science are intellectual enterprises, but they differ in their essential nature and methodology. Science is an objective study of the world supposedly existing independently of any thinking mind. Hence by nature it is realistic. But philosophy does not have any compulsion to the realistic-though there are realists among philosophers. There are idealists too-who declare that the world outside the thinking mind depends on human experience.

(2) For those who consider philosophy as a second order discipline (confined to conceptual analysis), science is a first order discipline. It is concerned with the real, natural, world of things and events. Those who believe in this kind of difference between philosophy and science, think that philosophy deals with facts (i.e. things in relation) and science deals with things proper.

(3) The method of science is observation, experiment, calculation, prediction, verification etc. The only method in philosophy is logical and systematic analysis and debate. It is a discourse based on rational description and study of events and facts. Logical consistency is its central point. Logic is active in science too, but any statement made in science has to be objective tested before its accepted as true. The subject matter of philosophy is often such as objective verification is impossible. The range of philosophy is wider that that of science. It is also concerned with the realms of the possible. Science is more concrete in this respect.

(4) Very often philosophy is synthetic and prescriptive. It concerns itself with the value of life. It guides us in making choices. Hence value-study is confined to philosophy alone. Scientific studies are value-neutral. That is why often ethical changes are brought against some scientific researches. This is the expression of the philosophical mind of the society.

(5) Scientific studies tend to break things and go to the minimal constituents of them. In this respect, it is an analytical study-whereas, because it dies not break anything, also does not prescribe breaking anything of substantive or synthetic study.

(6) Science is not concerned with the moral or aesthetic aspect of events. Philosophy very often raises moral and aesthetic aspect of events. Philosophy very often raises moral and aesthetic questions.

From the above, you should not think that philosophy and science are very different and antagonistic to each other. That is not the case. In the beginning, all serious thoughts were philosophy. Science was 'natural philosophy'. Slowly, over the years, science has evolved as a distinct field of study separate from philosophy.

The epithet 'natural' is still useful in understanding the distinction between science and philosophy. Science purports to enquire into things as they are. I(it) have already told you that there is a growing tendency these days to call science a first order discipline merely concerned with concepts. You must not be carried away by this type of differentiation –though there is some truth in it. On the contrary, you should carefully try to understand the situation.

If we strictly contrast science and philosophy as belonging to two words, then the outcome may be amusing. Science as the first order discipline is the study of things as they are. Is philosophy, as a second order discipline, a 'study of things as they are not'? Such an implication is absurd. To bypass this, we have to say that science studies things as they 'appear'. But the scientists will have objection to this. Anyway, the truth of the 'appearance' of things will be only lower than the truth of things 'as they must be in fact.' If we say that science studies this aspect only and not the 'appearances', then, interestingly, philosophy also that! Then virtually there is no difference between philosophy and science. Hence, it is wrong to designate only science as the first order discipline.

And yet there is a difference between philosophy and science. That is one of 'method of study' and not of subject matter. The subject matter is the world itself. Science studies it in one way, philosophy in another.

1.6 PHILOSOPHY AND COMMON SENSE

You must be beginning to understand what is philosophy in contrast with science. It is often easier to understand in contrast than in knowing the similarities, though not always. Let us contrast philosophy with common sense. Just as philosophy is different from science, common sense, it is different from common sense also. Let us take an example. The Sun sets in the West and arises in the East. It is a common experience and belief. Once the Sun sets in the West, common sense is sure that it will rise in the East tomorrow. Philosophy refuses to accept it. For philosophy it has to come as the conclusion of an argument. "All the Suns that set in the West rise in the East; this Sun has set in the west; therefore, it rises (will rise) in the East." "But here the first proposition, the so-called major premise is unwarranted. Sun's rising in the East is merely probable; there is no guarantee about it. There is no 'reason' for an absolute statement on this issue. This statement is not logically warranted. The refusal to believe in the rising of the Sun as a 'certainty' is a good philosophy but bad common sense. For common sense thrives on what is given by senses. It does not go deeper into our beliefs and understanding. It rests contended with the prima facie. Philosophy is a deep inquiry and asks for the reason for making any statement about any phenomenon.

1.7 SCOPE OF PHILOSOPHY

By the term 'scope' of anything you have to mean 'the area of work' of that thing. When you ask 'what is the scope of art'- you mean with what kind of things is art connected, what are the different works that are does, what are the causes, what are the uses and abuses etc. In the same way, when you ask "what is the scope of philosophy", you mean the type of works that philosophy does. There may be a huge member of works that any study or discipline might be doing and yet there are only some works which constitute the core of a particular study. There are certain core areas in which philosophical investigation is active. If these are demarcated, we shall have found the scope of philosophy. You should take this as a tentative information, for the final information is not available. The scope keeps on increasing

or expanding. Just as you cannot completely specify the scope of science: whether it is physics, or physics and chemistry; or it includes botany and biology and anthropology and psychology and sociology……. You are not sure. But about physics and chemistry, you are sure. In the same way, though you cannot have a detailed scope has to include the core areas of philosophy.

These are:

(a) Epistemology
(b) Metaphysics
(c) Ethics
(d) Aesthetics
(e) Theology

(And the extensive list will be quite long)

We (I) introduce each of these branches of philosophy to you very briefly.

(a) Epistemology is the philosophy of knowledge. It is often called theory of knowledge also. We have the experience or concept or phenomenon of knowledge. Philosophy explains that concept. And that is called epistemology. It is not knowledge of any other thing, but discussion on the problem of knowledge itself. If you know about 'atoms' in physics, that constitutes the 'knowledge' of atoms. In epistemology, you do not consider knowledge of anything –atom or knowledge or whether- about the fact of knowledge itself. Here you study what is knowledge, how does it originate, what is its limitation, can we know everything about a phenomenon, etc.

(b) Metaphysics is the philosophy or theory of the 'real'**.** Knowledge that is studied in epistemology automatically leads us to the question of the 'known'. You know, but what do you mean? Knowledge is different from mere thought or imagination. Hence, like thought is related to thing in order to be complete, knowledge is linked with the known in order to be meaningful. So, philosophy has a distinct branch devoted to understanding 'what is known'. It considers the nature of the real. Whether the real completely reveals itself in the process of knowing or a notion of it remains beyond the reach of knowledge? That is, is there a scope for assuming that the known world and the real world are fundamentally different? This is the famous problem of metaphysics technically known as 'appearance and reality.' It is at the heart of every metaphysical

enquiry. It is not necessary that you subscribe to any preconceived idea. You may have reason to believe that the real completely unbehaves itself in the knowledge system. You can also come to the conclusion that the real is totally different from the appearance, but it can be the appearance, but it can be known through some sort of insight. You will be a realist then. You can also come to the conclusion that the real is totally different from the appearance, but it can be known through some sort of insight. You will be an idealist then. You may also reach a position that the real is there and it upholds the apparent but it cannot be finally known then you will be an agnostic. You can also have many more philosophically tenable positions. You can also argue quite powerfully against the possibility and use of any subject like metaphysics. It is virtually a philosophers' paradise with epistemology, metaphysics terms the core of any philosophical inquiry.

(c) Ethics: After knowing what knowledge is and after grappling with the issue of the known, you have learnt a quite bit about the world and your life in it. A question will naturally arise in your mind. If the world is what it seems to be- then how shall I live in this world? How do I believe in it? For you will be continuously facing more than one alternative courses of action and you will be forced to choose among them. And you have to use your direction while choosing. Any consideration that you will bring to bear on your choices will have what is commonly called the 'moral' implication. If you are walking on the pavement and an old man has fallen down- you will have to choices before you: (a) let me pick up the person, (b) why should I waste my time? Let me hurry up in my work. But you will see that there is an instinctive or rational (I cannot specify what it is at this point) impulse in you to help the person. This your voice of conscience or your wisdom or whatever you might call it. But you feel like doing 'good'. This sense of goodness or propriety or duty is central to all human thought and behaviour. Ethics is the study of human conduct based on this moral impulses and wisdom.

(d) Aesthetics and (e) theology are also important branches of philosophy. The first is concerned with the inquiry into the nature of beauty and the second investigates the nature of religious experiences. In fact, aesthetics is concerned with the creation and appreciation of all arts. Theology, which

constitutes a deep inquiry into religious phenomena, is mere commonly called philosophy of religion.

Starting with epistemology up to theology, you have seen what actually constitute the subject matter of philosophical inquiry. This does not constitute the entire scope of philosophy. There are other areas like society, politics, human rights, feminism, environment etc. which can be important aspects of philosophical enquiry.

1.8 UTILITY OF PHILOSOPHICAL STUDY

You may be wondering as to why someone should inquire into the concept of knowledge and reality and duty. What is the use of such abstract thinking? Perhaps you are right. Only 'perhaps' –for you are not sure if at all you are right. This is the philosophical attitude - the attitude of curiosity, the attitude of doubt and the urge to reach position beyond doubt. You see, knowledge is power. If you know, you are confident. If you do not know, you are, in spite of your good health, not at all confident. Philosophy empowers you. It gives you the power of ideas. When you know the logic or rationale of an event or phenomenon-you can handle it judiciously. That is why, though apparently philosophy does not seem to add to your life-it actually adds a lot. It broadens your horizon of understanding.

The philosophical attitude, which is even more broad-based and open than the so-called scientific hamper, gives you the reason for adopting a particular posture vis-a- vis life's situations. The gains may not be immediate, but they are deep and lasting.

Philosophy is a free inquiry end does not guarantee 'gain' to an inquirer. That is, utility is not a part of the concept of philosophy. Here it is the same with science. Science becomes useful when it is converted to technology. Philosophy becomes useful when it orients us to a more meaningful and satisfying life.

If you say, philosophy is merely theoretical, then you have to also that all great inquiries are theoretical. Proof or verification or action these theories come later. In order to have meaningful practice- you should have meaningful theory. Even this piece of logic is philosophical.

Therefore, you see that philosophy has enormous implication for our life. If we do not raise some searching questions about the world and other life in it-we shall have lived in vain. It is philosophy raises such questions and answers these. Hence

there not be any doubt about it's use. However, it is the only useful thing. There are a lot more others. If you have no time for philosophy, do some other thing that appears to be useful for you. There will be philosophers thinking about important problems of life on behalf of you. You can always reach out them and derive benefit from their thoughts.

ACTIVITY

- Can we think of science without philosophy? Discuss.

  ……

  ……

- "Now a days philosophical studies have been given importance". What do you think?

  ……

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q 4: What are the methods of science?

……

……

Q 5: State the method of philosophy.

……

……

Q 6: Mention the branches of philosophy.

……

……

Q 7: Define: a) Aesthetics

b) Theology

Q 8: Fill up the blanks:

a) The scope of philosophy is ……than that of science.

b) ……is the philosophy of knowledge.

c) ……is the theory of the real.

1.9 LET US SUM UP

- The word 'philosophy' is derived from two Greek words philos and sophia. Philos stands for love and Sophia for wisdom.
- Philosophy is that branch of study which systematically investigates not only the well-known experiences, but all experiences leading to concepts, ideas, communication, and meaning. In this context, philosophy is a speculative discipline.
- Philosophy is also regarded as linguistic analysis or "A critique of Language." (Wittgenstein) Here philosophy is restricted to conceptual study centering round language. It is considered a second order study-not going to things or realities but remaining confined to clarification of concepts.
- The philosophers which are concerned with essences of things ignoring their existences. And they consider it as the correct method of philosophy. Here philosophy is phenomenology.
- The concept which studies of human existence in all its limitation and grandeur, pains and anguishes, freedom and responsibilities - become the nature of philosophy. Here philosophy is existentialism.
- Philosophy and science are two intellectual enterprises, but they differ in their essential nature and methodology. Science is an objective study of the world supposedly existing independently of any thinking mind. Hence by nature it is realistic. But philosophy does not have any compulsion to the realistic-though there are realists among philosophers. There are idealists too-who declare that the world outside the thinking mind depends on human experience.
- The method of science is observation, experiment, calculation, prediction, verification etc. The only method in philosophy is logical and systematic analysis and debate. It is a discourse based on rational description and study of events and facts.
- Epistemology is the philosophy of knowledge. It is often called theory of knowledge also. We have the experience or concept or phenomenon of knowledge. Philosophy explains that concept. And that is called epistemology.
- Metaphysics is the philosophy or theory of the 'real'.
- Ethics is the study of human conduct based on moral impulses and wisdom.

- Aesthetics and theology are important branches of philosophy. The first is concerned with the inquiry into the nature of beauty and the second investigates the nature of religious experiences.

1.10 FURTHER READING

a) Cunningham, G.W.: *Problems of Philosophy*

b) Ewing, A.C.: *Fundamental Questions of Philosophy*

c) Hospers, John.: *An Introduction to Philosophical Analysis* Revised Edition,London, Rout ledge& Kegan Paul, 1973

d) Jadunath Sinha: *Introduction to Philosophy*, New Central Book Agency, 1985

e) Hari Mohan Bhattacharyya: *The Principles of Philosophy*

f) G.E. Moore and Broader: *Philosophy-The Power of Ideas*

1.11 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Answer to Q No 1:. Philos and Sophia

Answer to Q No 2: a) Ans. Rational

b) Ans. Intellectual

Answer to Q No 3: a) Ans. Knowledge is empirical and wisdom is practical. It also can be said that knowledge is theoretical and wisdom is practical. Here we can say that science strives for knowledge and philosophy runs after wisdom.

Answer to Q No 3: b) Ans. Philosophers are intellectuals. While saints relate to holiness or absolute goodness. Philosophers are normal human beings like you and me.

Answer to Q No 4: The methods of science are observation, experiment, calculation, prediction, verification.

Answer to Q No 5: The only method in philosophy is logical and systematic analysis and debate.

Answer to Q No 6: The branches of philosophy are:

a) Epistemology

b) Metaphysics

c) Ethics

d) Aesthetics

e) Theology

Answer to Q No 7: a) Ans. Aesthetics is concerned with the inquiry into the nature of beauty.

b) Ans. Theology deals with the nature of religious experience

Answer to Q No 8: a) Wider

b) Ans. Epistemology

c) Ans. Metaphysics

1.12 MODEL QUESTIONS

A. Very short questions

Q 1: What is philosophy?

Q 2: What is epistemology?

Q 3: What is metaphysics?

Q 4: What is Ethics?

Q 5: What is meant by wisdom?

Q 6: What are the central issues of philosophy?

B. Short questions (Answer in about 100-150 words)

Q 1: How is philosophy different from Science? Explain in brief.

Q 2: How is philosophy different from Common sense? Explain in brief

Q 3: What are the branches of philosophy? Discuss in brief.

C. Long questions (Answer in about 300- 500 words)

Q 1: Explain the nature of philosophy.

Q 2: Discuss the scope of philosophy?

Q 3: What are the uses of studying philosophy? Discuss

UNIT 2: NATURE AND KINDS OF KNOWLEDGE: 'KNOWLEDGE BY ACQUAINTANCE' AND 'KNOWLEDGE BY DESCRIPTION'

UNIT STRUCTURE

2.1 Learning Objectives
2.2 Introduction
2.3 Knowledge by Acquaintance
2.4 Knowledge by Description
2.5 Relation between "knowledge by acquaintance" and "knowledge by description"
2.6 Let us Sum Up
2.7 Further Reading
2.8 Answers to Check Your Progress
2.9 Model Questions

2.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to-

- define what is knowledge
- analyse types of knowledge as "knowledge by acquaintance" and "knowledge by description"
- explain its similarity with related concepts.
- distinguish between "knowledge by acquaintance" and "knowledge by description"

2.2 INTRODUCTION

In this unit we shall discuss two types of knowledge as "knowledge by acquaintance" and "knowledge by description". Keeping in mind the various stages of knowledge, knowledge is classified into two types: "knowledge by acquaintance" and "knowledge by description". In western philosophy this distinction was given a definitive form by Bertrand Russell. Actually, this classification arises as a critical reaction to the theory of idealism propounded by George Berkeley. There are different classifications of knowledge as specified by different philosophers trying to analyse the nature and types of knowledge in philosophy. Epistemology, being the most

significant branch of philosophy, is always concerned with such analysis of the nature and classification of knowledge. What way we may know something and what sort of knowledge we may have from that? What does the expression "I know" stands for? These are some of the issues that epistemology deals with.

While analysing the nature of knowledge we see that knowledge is a relation between the knower and the known. The knower is the subject who knows and the known is the object intended to be known. Philosophy is concerned with the problem of the known or with the nature of the object of knowledge otherwise called reality. It seeks to answer whether reality, for its existence is dependent on the knowing mind or it exists independently. As reply to this problem there occur two basic theories of reality called Realism and Idealism. Russell's division of knowledge is a development of his criticisms labelled against the idealism of Berkeley. Berkeley's idealism denies the existence of the external objects and reduces them to the ideas of the finite minds that perceive them. He claims that the so called external objects are sensations produced in the finite minds by God according to some fixed laws. It is, therefore, called subjective idealism or mentalism.

According to Russell, Berkeley's argument is substantially wrong when he says that whatever we apprehend must be in our mind. There cannot be any reason to maintain that whatever does not have any practical importance for us are not valid. It has to be admitted that everything real which are of theoretical importance may be of equal significance for us. According to Russell, it is false that we cannot know that anything exists which we do not know. Knowledge does not mean only to have direct experience of something. It is quite wider in scope. The word "know" may be used as having two meaning according to Russell.

1) In the first sense the word know may stand for our knowledge of the things, otherwise called the knowledge by acquaintance.

2) In the second sense it may refer to the sense which is applicable to our beliefs or convictions. In this sense of the word we know that something is the case. This type of knowledge is called the knowledge of truth. This is called knowledge by description by Russell.

This difference is called the difference between the conna?tre and savoir in French.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q 1: Who classifies knowledge into "knowledge by acquaintance" and "knowledge by description"?

Ans: ……...…….....

Q 2: The difference between "knowledge by acquaintance" and "knowledge by description" emerges as a criticism to which theory of reality

Ans:……...…….....

2.3 KNOWLEDGE BY ACQUAINTANCE

Knowledge acquired through acquaintance are those in which the sense data are cognized directly. Here the knower is immediately aware of such things as colours, sounds, smells, hardness, softness, taste etc. On the other hand, in knowledge by description, there is an element of inference and interpretation. Knowledge by acquaintance is free from all sorts of inference and interpretation. It is the process to get direct knowledge by our sense experience.

Acquaintance, as Russell defines is the converse of presentation. It is the direct and infallible apprehension of some sort of object. All knowledge, be it of things or truth start from the knowledge by acquaintance as foundation. Even every knowledge of universal also starts from the particular things of acquaintance. Here we can get some details of the things with which we may have direct acquaintance.

According to Russell, sense data are the most significant things that we are acquainted with. These are the most striking and direct examples of knowledge by acquaintance. But, sense data supplies us knowledge of those things that are present to our senses now. Knowledge in this sense becomes restricted as the past cannot be known this way. Russell then moves forward explaining that beyond sense data, the first thing that we may be acquainted with is memory. Whatever was present to our senses in the past gets stored as memory and even being past events, we experience these memories as immediate as present experiences whenever we remember them. This immediate knowledge by memory is the source all our knowledge concerning the past. The second kind of acquaintance is acquaintance by introspection. This is the kind of self consciousness that we experience while

getting acquainted with our feelings, desires, thoughts etc. This kind of acquaintance is called self consciousness that helps us to know our mental states.

Thus, Russell holds that as a whole knowledge by acquaintance covers up our acquaintance in sensation with the sense data provided by our outer sense, the data provided by the inner sense through introspection like feelings, thoughts and desires and further, our acquaintance with the past experiences through memory. Furthermore, apart from our acquaintance with the particular sense data we also have acquaintance with the universals or general ideas constructed through the particulars. However, our knowing process is not limited to this kind of direct acquaintance alone. Beyond this, there is another kind of knowledge that Russell emphasises on.

LET US KNOW

In the Nyaya school of Indian philosophy a parallel division of knowledge is found. Here the distinction between "knowledge by acquaintance" and "knowledge by description" is presented as the distinction between Nirvikalpa Pratyaksa and Savikalpa Pratyaksa. While the former is a direct awareness without name and form or any characteristics, the later is awareness with name and form. The former is pre-judgemental knowledge while the later is judgemental knowledge.

2.4 KNOWLEDGE BY DESCRIPTION

Russell here figures out the significance of another kind of knowledge that is knowledge by description. Even if we acquire significant section of knowledge by acquaintance, we are not able to know the physical things or objects directly, rather we are acquainted with the sense data. Further, knowledge by acquaintance provides us with knowledge of oneself through introspection, but it deprives us from having the knowledge of the mental states of others. In such cases we rely on knowledge by description, the second order of knowledge. In this sense knowledge stands for our judgements or our beliefs and convictions. This is otherwise described as knowledge of truths. Russell insists on having not an ambiguous but definite description of a thing, that specifically signifies one thing in particular. A description is definite when it stands for a singular thing as defined as "the so and so". In this sense the thing is known to me by description and that in virtue of some general principle, the existence of a thing answering to this description can be inferred from the existence of something

with which I am acquainted. Thus, all proper names, all names of places involve descriptions which again start from some particular sense data which we are acquainted with.

According to Russell, the words with which we refer to things we are not acquainted with can be defined or explained in terms of those connected with objects of acquaintance. This however, Russell prefers to explain as understanding rather than knowledge. Russell's version of theory of acquaintance presents him as an empiricist philosopher. Russell's principle of acquaintance is "Every proposition which we can understand must be composed wholly of constituents with which we are acquainted".

However, even being acquaintance as the basis of almost all knowledge, knowledge by description is significant as it helps us to know and help others know a particular thing with description related to the thing as its name, characters, significance etc. It helps us to have some truths about something which we have never directly experienced but known it through the judgements made by others about it. For example, I have never seen the Great Wall of China, but I truly believe that it exists. This knowledge I have got from the words of other people who have acquaintance with it. This is having a true judgement or knowledge by description without acquaintance. When one explains something using words, they carry some meaning whenever used. These meanings are again attached to these words through acquaintances or direct experiences.

Further, the chief importance of knowledge by description is that it allows us to move beyond our private experiences and imagine and explain the mental states of others. There is no way to directly experience the mental state of others the way we experinece our own feelings emotions etc. However, it can be inferred through knowledge by description when it is conveyed through language. This is possible because knowledge by description is basically a judgemntal knowledge that gets expressed in words.

Thus, Russell presents these two stages of knowledge as having equal significance sharing interdependent nature.

ACTIVITY : 2.1

Q 1: Explain how Russell presents his classification of knowledge as a critical response to the Subjective Idealism of Berkeley.

Ans:.....

.....

.....

.....

2.5 RELATION BETWEEN "KNOWLEDGE BY ACQUAINTANCE" AND "KNOWLEDGE BY DESCRIPTION"

Russell's division of knowledge is to be understood as extension of his empiricist ideals expressed in the form of knowledge by acquaintance as the foundation of our true knowledge. Knowledge by description takes place as the second stage in this process. In the following we discuss the relation between these two types of knowledge as specified by Russell.

1. "Knowledge by acqauintance" and "knowledge by description" are not two totally different types of knowledge but can be termed as two stages of knowledge. The first is acqiaintance with the sense data and the second is the knowledge of something with names, characters etc.
2. Knowledge by acqauintance is the direct knoweledge of sense data and knowledge by description being indirect, involves the element of inference in it. It is not direct knowledge but understanding something in refernce to the data we are already acqauainted with. It is not present in one's experience but propositional kind of knowledge. Hence, it is different from "knowledge by acquaintance".
3. Knowledge by acquaintance is the direct and infallible apprehension of some sort of object that exists. Whereas, the object of knowledge by description need not necessarily exist. It may fail to exist in some case.
4. It is to be noted that while knowledge by acquiantance, being direct knowledge does not depend on any other knowlege, "knowlege by description" depends on acqaunitance. According to Russell, "the fundamental principle in the analysis of

propositions containing descriptions is this: Every proposition which we can understand must be composed wholly of constituents with which we are acquainted". Hence, any reference to a particular must involve some reference to a particular with which we are acquainted. All knowledge concerning knowledge by description is reducible to knowledge concerning acquaintance.

5. The most significant feature of knowledge by description is that it allows one to know the mental states of others. The feelings and emotions of other person can be inferred through knowledge by description when it is conveyed through language. Whereas, knowledge by acqauaintance being dierct experience of something does not allow us to move beyond our private experiences.

These are some of the important points expressing the similarlities and differences between knowledge by acqauintance and knoweldge by description discussed by Russell.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q 3: Find out the correct one

a) According to Russell knowledge by acquaintance gives us knowledge of sense data/ physical objects.

b) Knowledge by description is direct/ inferential knowledge.

c) Knowledge by acquaintance provides us with knowledge of particulars/universals/ both

Q 4: State two points of difference between "knowledge by acquaintance" and "knowledge by description".

.....

.....

2.6 LET US SUM UP

In this unit we have discussed Russell's classification of knowledge in the form of "knowledge by acquaintance and "knowledge by description". Let us review the unit through the following points:

- Russell classifies knowledge on the basis of two basic themes- knowledge of things and knowledge of truth.

- This classification is his critical reply to Berkeley's subjectivism that reduces everything to ideas of the mind.
- Knowledge of things always proceeds with knowledge by description.
- Knowledge by acquaintance works as the foundation of all knowledge.
- Knowledge by acquaintance is direct knowledge whereas knowledge by description is derived or inferential knowledge.
- Knowledge by description is propositional knowledge that may express one's beliefs and convention etc.
- Knowledge by description depends on knowledge by acquaintance as its foundation.

2.7 FURTHER READING

1) Russell, B. (1984). The Problems of Philosophy. New Delhi: Oxford.

2.8 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Ans.to Q. No. 1: Bertrand Russell

Ans.to Q. No. 2: Subjective Idealism of George Berkeley

Ans.to Q. No. 3:

a) Sense Data

b) Inferential

c) Both

Ans. to Q. No 4:

The difference between "knowledge by acquaintance" and "knowledge by description" can be discussed as follows:

1. Knowledge by acquaintance is the direct knoweledge of the sense data, whereas knowledge by description involves the element of inference in it. It is not direct knowledge but understanding something in refernce to the data we are already acquainted with.

2. Knowledge by acquaintance, being direct knowledge does not depend on any other knowlege, but, knowlege by description depends on acquaintance. All knowledge concerning knowledge by description is reducible to knowledge concerning acquaintance.

2.9 MODEL QUESTIONS

Q 1: Objective questions

Q 1: What are the two types of knowledge, according to Russell?

Q 2: What is mentalism?

Q 3: What is 'knowledge by acquaintance?

Q 4: What is 'knowledge by description'?

Q 5: What is sense-data?

Q 2: Short questions (Answer in about 100-150 words)

Q 1: What is 'knowledge by acquaintance? Explain briefly

Q 2: What is 'knowledge by description'? Explain briefly

Q 3: Write a short note on sense data.

Q 4: Distinguish ‘Knowledge by acquaintance’ and ‘knowledge by description’.

Q 3: Long questions (Answer in about 300-350 words)

Q. 1. Knowledge by acquaintance is the foundation of all sorts of knowledge. Discuss after Russell.

Q. 2. ‘Knowledge by Description’ helps us to know other minds. Discuss

*** **** ***

UNIT-3 THEORIES OF KNOWLEDGE: RATIONALISM AND EMPIRICISM

UNIT STRUCTURE

3.1 Learning Objectives
3.2 Introduction
3.3 Origin and Sources of Knowledge
3.4 Theories of Knowledge
3.5 Rationalism
3.5.1 Standpoints of Different Philosophers
3.6 Empiricism
3.6.1 Standpoints of Different Philosophers
3.7 Criticism
3.7.1 Standpoints of Different Philosophers
3.8 Let Us Sum Up
3.9 Further Readings
3.10 Answers to Check Your Progress
3.11 Model Questions

3.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After reading this Unit you will be able to:

- Name the philosophers associated with different theories regarding the origin of knowledge
- Explain the theories of knowledge, namely, Rationalism, Empiricism and Criticism
- Discuss the different views of philosophers associated with theories of Rationalism, Empiricism and Criticism
- Mention the merits and demerits of experience and reason as sources of knowledge

3.2 INTRODUCTION

The branch of philosophy that studies the nature, source and limits of knowledge is known as epistemology. It is the theory of knowledge. The basic questions of epistemology can be put down in the following manner:

1. What is the nature of knowledge: this question asks what does it mean to say that someone knows. How do we distinguish between cases in which someone knows something and cases in which someone does not know something?
2. How do we acquire knowledge: here we try to find the sources and origin of our knowledge. How can we use our various faculties like reason, senses, or other resources to acquire knowledge? We try to find out how we gain the concepts we use in our thought.
3. What is the scope of knowledge or what can we know: this query tries to answer whether there are limits to what we can know. For example, whether there are things which are unknowable for us. Is it possible that we do not know as much as we think we do?

This Unit will introduce you to the second question of epistemology, that is, how we acquire knowledge.

3.3 ORIGIN AND SOURCES OF KNOWLEDGE

There are many ways that one might come to know something or acquire knowledge. We acquire our knowledge of empirical facts about physical world through perception, that is, by using our senses. Science is the best example of empirical knowledge with its collection of data. Our everyday knowledge also mostly comes from the senses, as we look, listen, smell, touch, and taste the various objects in our environments.

But knowledge is not simply made up of sensations. All knowledge requires some amount of reasoning. Data collected by scientists must be analyzed before knowledge is yielded, and we draw inferences based on what is given to us by our senses. In case of knowledge of abstract or non-empirical facts one has to rely exclusively upon reasoning.

Some philosophers regard memory also as a source of knowledge. In memory we come to know something which we knew in the past but which is no longer present to our senses now. Knowledge can also be acquired through testimony, that is, from the words of some trusted person or books that can be believed to be true.

3.4 THEORIES OF KNOWLEDGE

There are four main theories of origin of knowledge.

1. Rationalism: It is a theory that regards reason as the chief source of knowledge. Descartes, Spinoza and Leibniz are advocates of Rationalism.
2. Empiricism: It is a theory that regards experience as the source of knowledge. Locke and Hume are the chief exponents of this theory.
3. Criticism: It is also called the Critical theory of knowledge. It is advocated by Kant. He advocated the view that both experience and reason together yield knowledge.
4. Intuitionism: It regards intuition as the source of knowledge. Henry Bergson is an advocate of this theory.

3.5 RATIONALISM

Rationalism is the theory of knowledge according to which reason or intellect is the main source of knowledge. Rationalism rejects all knowledge derived from sense experience. Socrates and Plato are the earliest rationalist philosophers. According to them true knowledge originates from reason. The Rationalism that was advocated by these two philosophers became articulate in the philosophy of Descartes, Spinoza and Leibniz. However, the rationalist philosophers differ among themselves regarding how much importance should be given to experience in yielding knowledge. Some rationalists regard experience as wholly misleading while others attach some values to it. They say that the knowledge given by experience is confused knowledge. But inspite of their differences they all agree that reason alone can give us certain and perfect knowledge. Rationalism is also called a priori theory of knowledge as according to this theory knowledge is prior or independent of experience.

3.5.1 Standpoints Of Different Philosophers

RENE DESCARTES (1596-1650)

As it has been mentioned above, modern rationalism begins in the philosophy of Descartes. Descartes is considered as the father of modern western philosophy. Descartes was a mathematician and according to him the perfect form of knowledge can be gained only through mathematical demonstration. Such demonstration consists in starting with self-evident principles and deducing other truths from these self-evident principles.

Descartes divides ideas into three kinds: adventitious, factitious and innate. Adventitious ideas are imposed on the mind from without. They are not clear and

distinct. Factitious ideas are created by the mind by the conjunction of ideas. These are created by imagination. They are also not clear and distinct. But innate ideas are clear and distinct. They are implanted in the mind by God at the time of birth.

According to Descartes, knowledge is given by clear vision of intellect or reason. Descartes calls it intuition. For him intuition is the undoubted, immediate apprehension of self-evident truth by reason. God imprints certain *innate ideas* in the mind at the time of birth. They are self-evident. The idea of causality, infinity, eternity, perfect Being or God and the like are innate ideas. They are clear and distinct. Clearness and distinctness is the test of their truth. The development of true knowledge consists in the logical deduction of other truths from these principles. Thus Descartes applies mathematical method to philosophy. Therefore, Paulsen, has characterized Descartes' philosophy as *Mathematical Rationalism.*

According to Descartes, certainty is the criterion of truth. Therefore, he rejects knowledge derived from sensation. He starts with universal doubt. He doubts all knowledge including mathematical demonstration. One can doubt everything, but in doubting one cannot doubt the doubting itself. To doubt is to think. To think is to exist. "*Cogito ergo sum*". "I think, therefore, I exist".

Once he establishes the existence of the self, Descartes moves to prove the existence of the external world. Each one of us has the innate ideas of which God is the most important. From this idea of God Descartes proves the existence of God. The idea of God is the idea of infinite Being. But I being finite cannot produce this idea of infinite Being in me. Another human being cannot produce it, as he too is finite. This idea also cannot be produced by addition of finite beings and things as the sum of finite is also finite. So, this idea of the infinite Being must be produced by that which itself is infinite, that is, by God himself. So God must exist. Now God is benevolent and truthful. As such he cannot deceive us. And we have conviction that external things exist. So they must exist. For otherwise God will turn deceitful. Descartes thus proves the existence of the external world.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q 1: State whether the following statements are True or False

a) Theory of origin of knowledge is studied in the branch of philosophy known as Metaphysics. (True/ False)

b) Plato's philosophy cannot be claimed to be rational in nature. (True/ False)

c) A priori means 'knowledge is after experience'. (True/ False)

d) Innate ideas are implanted in the mind at the time of birth by God. (True/ False)

Q 2: What are three kinds of ideas according to Descartes?

……

Q 3: What is the criterion of truth according to Descartes?

……

……

……

BENEDICT SPINOZA (1632-1677)

Spinoza gave a developed form to the rationalism initiated by Descartes in modern western philosophy. Like Descartes, Spinoza had immense faith in reason. Like a true rationalist Spinoza holds that we can know truth through reason. Reason can give us knowledge of reality because reality itself is rational in nature. According to Spinoza, God himself creates the world rationally and intuition is the realization of true knowledge. It is intuition by which one knows the necessary relations between different phenomena.

According to Spinoza, the goal of philosophy is to get complete knowledge of things. He holds that this is possible only by clear and distinct thinking. Like Descartes he believed that if we start with self-evident principles and prove the steps involved in the argument then we will be able to reach certain and universal knowledge.

Spinoza uses geometrical method to philosophy to arrive at certain truths. His method is geometrical because he lays down certain definitions, axioms and postulates and from these principles he deduces propositions with proofs

Spinoza starts with the innate principle or idea of God or Substance. According to him, a substance is that which exists by itself and is conceived by itself. This substance is infinite and it has infinite attributes. Out of these attributes we can know only thought and extension which themselves are infinite. They are parallel and co-exist with each other. These attributes are modified into infinite intelligence and will and infinite extension and motion. They are the infinite modes of Substance. Infinite intellect and will are again modified into finite intellects and will or finite minds. Infinite extension and motion are modified into finite extension and motion or finite objects. Thus finite minds and finite objects are modification of the one and same Substance.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q 4: The method in philosophy used by Spinoza is: a. mathematical b. geometrical

……

Q 5: According to Spinoza, God has

a. two attributes b. three attributes c. infinite number of attributes

……

GOTTFRIED WILHELM LEIBNIZ (1646-1716)

Leibniz was a famous mathematician. He held that the world has logical and mathematical order. Laws that govern this world order are rational. Therefore, the world can only be comprehended by reason.

Leibniz's theory of knowledge is based on his metaphysical theory. Leibniz established that the world is composed of dynamic units or immaterial, unextended, simple units of force. These are called monads. According to him, monads are windowless and hence they cannot receive any knowledge from any external source. Leibniz holds that we cannot derive any invariable law concerning the functions of the universe on the basis sense experience. Knowledge is simply brought out and manifested by experience. He holds that nothing can exist in the intellect that did not first exist in sensation- except, he adds, the intellect itself. The rational laws governing the world are to be found only in reason because the world has been created by God on the basis of reason.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q 6: State whether the following statements are True or False

a) Monads are extended. (True/ False)

……

b) According to Leibniz, the role of experience in knowledge is to manifest it. (True/ False)

……

ACTIVITY : 3.1

a) State three characteristics of Rationalism

.....

.....

.....

.....

b) Name one important book written by each rationalist philosopher.

.....

.....

.....

.....

3.6 EMPIRICISM

Empiricism is a theory according to which experience is the source of true knowledge. It is a reaction against rationalism. In direct opposition to rationalism, empiricism holds that knowledge is derived from sense experience. The empiricists hold that the so-called a priori rational principles are actually derived from experience. As contrasted with rationalism, empiricism is called a posteriori theory of knowledge because according to this theory knowledge is posterior or dependent on experience.

3.6.1 Standpoints of Different Philosophers

JOHN LOCKE (1632-1704)

Locke revolted against Descartes' rationalism and criticised his theory of innate ideas. he criticised the the theory of innate ideas on the following grounds:

1. If there were innate ideas they should be equally present in all minds. But there are no such innate ideas which are equally present in all minds. For example, we do not find that savages, children or idiots are concious of so called innate ideas like causality, infinity, eternity etc.
2. If there were innate ideas they should be the same in all minds. But the ideas of morality, God and the like are not the same in all minds. Different ideas are held in different socities. Sometimes the same society may hold different view at different times or ages.

3. Even if there were the same ideas in all minds, it would not make them innate on that account. Everybody has the same idea of fire. But all of us get the idea of fire from experience. It is not an innate idea. Universality of an idea does not prove the innateness of it.

According to Locke, at the time of birth the mind is a tabula rasa or blank sheet. Mind is a clean slate in the beginning on which expereince writes. According to him, 'there is nothing in the intellect that was not previously in the senses'. Mind receives ideas from expereince. This expereince is two fold: sensation and reflection. Sensation is the source of our knowledge of the sensory qualities of objects. Reflection is the source of our internal states of mind, such as, perception, belief, thought and reasoning etc. We get our first ideas from sensation and then we reflect upon it. Sensations are the material on which the mind thinks.

According to Locke, the mind is passive in receiving ideas. But it is active in comparing and combining these ideas. The ideas that are passively received by the mind are the simple ideas. These simple ideas are combined by the active power of the mind into varieties to make complex ideas. Locke says that there are four simple ideas: Firstly, the ideas which enter our minds through one sense organ only. For example, colour, sound, taste, heat, cold solidity. Secondly, the ideas which enter the mind by more than one sense organ. For example, space, figure, rest, motion which enter through both sight and touch. Thirdly, the ideas that are received by reflection only. For example, perception, retention, discerning, comparing, compounding, naming and abstracting. Fourthly, the ideas that we receive both through sensation and reflection. For example, pleasure, pain, power, existence, unity, succession and duration.

According to Locke, the power that an object has to produce idea in our minds is a quality. But he makes an important distinction between *primary* and *secondary qualities.* Primary qualities belong to the objects themselves. They cannot be separated from the object. As such he calls them objective. Examples of primary qualities are solidity, extension, motion, shape, size, impenetrability etc. Secondary qualities on the other hand are mere sensations or ideas in the mind of the knower. They are sensations produced in the mind by the primary qualities. They vary under different conditions. They are subjective.

Locke is an empiricist, but he believes in existence of matter, mind or soul and God though they are not given in experience. He says that we have to assume the existence of matter as the substratum of primary qualities of objects though we do not perceive it. Similarly, the existence of mind is inferred from various mental operations. Its existence must be assumed as the substratum of power of perceiving, thinking, feeling and willing. Similarly, we infer the existence of God as the maker of the external world. Locke being empiricist refuses to believe that knowledge can be derived from any other source than sense-experience, but he crosses the bounds of empiricism by accepting the existence of matter, mind and God.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q 7: Why empiricism is called a posteriori theory of knowledge? (Answer in about 50 words)

.....

Q 8: State whether the following statements are True or False

a) Locke maintains that at the time of birth we are born with innate ides. (True/ False)

b) Reflection is prior to sensation. (True/ False)

c) Locke is a thorough going empiricist. (True/ False)

d) Mind is given in experience and therefore according to Locke we should believe in its existence. (True/ False)

DAVID HUME (1711-1776)

Hume developed Locke's empiricism to its logical conclusion. Hume is a true empiricist and he does not accept the existence of anything that is not given in experience. As such he denies the existence of mind, matter and God, because these are not given in experience. According to him, all knowledge comes from impressions and ideas. Impressions are lively perceptions and images are their faint copies. There are impressions of sensations or external perceptions and impressions of reflection or internal perception. They constitute the original materials of knowledge.

Impressions and ideas are discrete or disconnected from one another. Impressions and ideas are automatically combined with one another by the laws of association, such as law of contiguity, similarity and causality. A picture suggests the

object it represents due to law of similarity. An inkpot suggests a pen due to law of contiguity in space. A lightening suggests a thunder due to law of contiguity in time. Fire suggests burning due to law of causation. Thus discrete impressions get connected with one another due to the laws of association. Thus our knowledge is composed of impressions and ideas combined by the laws of association. Our knowledge does not owe anything to reason or intellect. However, these laws are subjective in nature. As such the connection they provide to the impressions are also subjective.

Hume rejects the idea of material substance, mind and God, as we do not have any empirical evidence of them. He also rejects all metaphysical entities, as we cannot have any ideas of these entities. Hume admits only particular and contingent truths as they alone are given in experience. It is not possible to go beyond sensation to know reality outside them. Hume's theory thus lands up in sensationism and scepticism.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q 9: Why does Hume deny the existence of matter, mind and God?

.....

.....

Q 10: State whether the following statements are True or False

1) Experience can give us necessary truths. True/ False

ACTIVITY

What do you mean by scepticism? Discuss

.....

.....

3.7 CRITICISM

The doctrine of criticism is synthesis of rationalism and empiricism. As we see neither rationalism nor empiricism is a satisfactory theory of knowledge. By denying the role of experience rationalism has become one sided. Empiricism also is one sided as it denies the role of reason in knowledge. However, rationalism rightly emphasizes the universality or necessity of knowledge. But it is wrong in accepting innate ideas. If we accept innate ideas then we also will have to accept that there is

no progress in knowledge as knowledge consists simply in analytical deduction of innate principles. Therefore, empiricists are right in emphasizing that knowledge is acquired through experience. But the problem with empiricism is that it denies universal and necessary knowledge as experience gives us only contingent truths. However, true knowledge should be universal and at the same time it should be novel.

Immanuel Kant tries to reconcile rationalism and empiricism in criticism and give a satisfactory view of knowledge that is both universal and contains novelty.

3.7.1 Standpoints of Different Philosophers

IMMANUEL KANT (1724-1804)

According to Kant, no knowledge is possible without sensation. But he also holds that knowledge is not wholly derived from experience, as it cannot give us universality. The part of knowledge that is not given by experience is a priori.

According to Kant, human mind receives sensation from without. The sensations are produced by noumena or things-in-themselves. These are the material of knowledge. These sensations are discrete or disconnected from one another. As such they cannot give us knowledge unless they are connected with one another by the mind with its synthetic activity. Thus the form of knowledge is supplied by the mind from within itself. According to Kant, both forms and matter of knowledge always go together. In the words of Kant: "Conception without perception is empty; perception without conception is blind".

Kant divides the faculty of knowing into three subordinate faculties: the faculty of sensibility, the faculty of understanding and the faculty of reasoning.

Faculty of sensibility: When we perceive a thing, we perceive it in space and time. Space and time are the forms of perception that sensibility applies to the disconnected sensations and converts them to intelligible objects. Space and time do not belong to the things-in-themselves. They are the forms of perception. They are the a priori ways of perceiving things.

Faculty of understanding: Categories of understanding are the universal necessary characteristics of experience which are found in all mental experience. Understanding applies its categories, namely, substance, causality, unity, plurality etc., to the sensations that are already arranged in space and time by sensibility. Like the forms of perception they also do not apply to things-in-themselves.

Faculty of reason: Reason is the faculty by which the mind tries to employ its innate forms and categories where there is no sensuous experience. Sensations arranged in space and time by sensibility and subsumed under the categories of understanding are co-ordinated by reason. Reason co-ordinates sensibility and understanding according to its ideas of the world, soul and God. These three ideas of reason are *regulative ideas*. These are the ideas by which reason organizes the facts of experience into a system. The discrete sensations supplied by experience are reduced to a unity by the synthetic activity of the mind.

According to Kant, sensations are the materials of knowledge, while the faculties of knowing-forms of sensibility, categories of understanding and Ideas of reason are supplied by the mind itself. Thus our knowledge is confined to phenomena or appearances only. Noumena or the things-in-themselves remain unknown and unknowable. Human mind cannot know them.

All thinkers before Kant regarded that our perceptions correspond to the characteristics in the external world. Kant, on the other hand, maintains that objects in order to be known must conform to the constitution of our minds. Thus according to Kant, in knowledge, instead of mind conforming to an independent nature, it is nature that conforms to mind. This is known as the Copernican Revolution in philosophy.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q 11: State whether the following statements are True or False

a) Forms of knowledge are a priori. (True/ False)

b) Mind can know only phenomena. (True/ False)

Q 12: Why, according to Kant, we cannot know noumena? (Answer in about 50 words)

Ans:……...

....……..

……

Q 13: What are the faculties of knowing, according to Kant ?

Ans:……...

....……..

……

ACTIVITY : 3.3

Why Kant's philosophy is called critical? Discuss

.....

3.8 LET US SUM UP

- Rationalism is a theory which holds that reason is the only source of knowledge. Descartes, Spinoza and Leibniz are the supporters of Rationalism
- Empiricism as a theory of as a theory of knowledge views that experience is the source of knowledge. Locke, Berkeley and Hume are the chief exponents of this theory.
- Criticism theory is also known as the Critical theory of knowledge. It is advocated by Immanuel Kant. He opined that both experience and reason together produce knowledge
- Intuitionism as a theory of knowledge holds that intuition is the source of knowledge. Henry Bergson is an advocate of this theory.
- In the words of Kant: "Conception without perception is empty; perception without conception is blind".
- Kant divides the faculty of knowing into three subordinate faculties: the faculty of sensibility, the faculty of understanding and the faculty of reasoning
- Space and time do not belong to the things-in-themselves. They are the forms of perception. Therefore, they are so called as the a priori ways of perceiving things.
- According to Kant, in knowledge, instead of mind conforming to an independent nature, it is nature that conforms to mind. This is known as the Copernican Revolution in philosophy.

3.9 FURTHER READING

1) Copleson, Frederick.(1964) *A History of Philosophy* (Vol. IV, V, VI) Image Books
2) A. Morton.(2001). *A Guide Through the Theory of Knowledge.* Oxford, Blackwell
3) Thrilly, Frank.(1994). *A History of Philosophy.* Central Publishing House, Allahabad

4) Trusted, J.(1997). *An Introduction to the Theory of Knowledge*, Macmillan
5) William, M. (2001). *Problems of Knowledge*: Oxford, OUP

3.10 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Ans to Q No 1:a) False b) False c) False d) True

Ans to Q No 2: Adventitious, factitious and innate

Ans to Q No 3: Certainty

Ans to Q No 4: Geometrical

Ans to Q No 5: Infinite number of attributes

Ans to Q No 6: a) False b) True

Ans to Q No 7: Empiricism is called a posteriori knowledge. It holds that knowledge is not independent, rather knowledge is dependent means that knowledge is derived from experience. As contrasted with empiricism, rationalism is called a priori theory of knowledge.

Ans to Q No 8: a) False b) False c) False d) False

Ans to Q No 9: Because we do not have any impressions of mind, matter and God.

Ans to Q No 10: False

Ans to Q No 11: a) True b)True

Ans to Q No 12:

Kant holds the view that sensations are the materials of knowledge. Our knowledge is confined to phenomena or appearance only. Noumena or the-things-in-themselves remain unknown and unknowable. Human mind cannot know them, therefore, noumena or the things-in-themselves is unknown and unknowable.

Ans to Q No 13: Faculty of sensibility, faculty of understanding, and faculty of reason

3.11 MODEL QUESTIONS

A) Very short questions

Q 1: What is epistemology?

Q 2: Is testimony a source of knowledge?

Q 3: What is rationalism?

Q 4: What do you mean by empiricism?

Q 5: Define critical theory of knowledge.

Q 6: State the name of the philosopher who advocates the critical theory of knowledge.

Q 7: What is intuitionism?

Q 8: Mention the other names of empiricism and rationalism.

Q 9: Give examples of innate ideas.

Q 10: According to Descartes, What is the criterion of truth?

Q 11: State the meaning of Cogito-ergo-sum.

Q 12: What are the two folds of experience, to Locke?

Q 13: Locke mentions that there are four simple ideas, what are they?

Q 14: According to whom, "conception without perception is empty, perception without conception is blind".

Q 15: What are the three divisions of the faculties of knowing put forward by Kant?

B) Short Questions (Answer each question in about 150 words)

Q 1: Briefly explain the critical theory of knowledge.

Q 2: Who are the advocates of empiricism? Explain in brief the concept of empiricism.

Q 3: Briefly comment on the concept of rationalism.

Q 4: Explain briefly the kinds of ideas formulated by Descartes.

Q 5: Who is the profounder of Geometrical method? Briefly explain on it.

Q 6: What are the grounds of Locke's refutation of Descartes' Rationalism? Explain in brief.

Q 7: Distinguish between primary and secondary qualities.

C) Write short notes on (Answer in about 150 words)

a) Innate ideas

b) Descartes' mathematical method in philosophy

c) Locke's refutation of innate ideas

d) Primary and secondary qualities

e) Faculties of knowing

f) Doctrine of criticism

C) Long Questions (Answer in about 300-500 words)

Q 1: Discuss Empiricism as a theory of knowledge.

Q 2: Explain Rationalism as a theory of knowledge.

Q 3: Give a comparison of Empiricism and Rationalism. Discuss

Q 4: Discuss Criticism as a theory of knowledge.

Q 5: What are the divisions of the faculties of knowing given by Kant? Discuss

Q 6: How does Locke criticize theory of innate ideas? Discuss

UNIT 4: CRITICISM: KANT

UNIT STRUCTURE

4.1 Learning objectives

4.2 Introduction

4.3 What is Criticism?

4.4 Kant's Preliminary Clarifications on The Kinds of Knowledge and Judgments

4.5 Kinds of knowledge

- 4.5.1 A priori knowledge
- 4.5.2 A posteriori knowledge

4.6 Kinds of judgments

- 4.6.1 Analytic judgment
- 4.6.2 Synthetic judgment
- 4.6.3 Synthetic a priori
- 4.6.4 Synthetic a posteriori

4.7 Possibility of synthetic a priori judgment

4.8 Copernican Revolution

4.9 Let us sum up

4.10 Further readings

4.11 Answers to Check Your Progress

4.12 Model Questions

4.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to-

- explain what is Criticism
- explain and distinguish a priori and a posteriori knowledge
- explain and distinguish analytic and synthetic judgments
- evaluate the possibility of synthetic a priori judgment
- discuss the concept of copernican revolution

4.2 INTRODUCTION

In the previous unit you have already learned about the theories of knowledge. Now, you will study the concept of criticism.

Skepticism leads to criticism of knowledge. Skepticism doubts the possibility of knowledge. But, the human mind finds it difficult to go on doubting. Human mind starts enquiring into the limits and conditions of knowledge. And, enquiry into the limits and conditions of knowledge is what epistemology does. In other words, criticism of knowledge means epistemology. As such, any system of philosophy based on epistemological reflections may be called critical. However, this critical method was fully used by Kant in modern times. Hence the expression 'criticism', 'critical method' and 'critical philosophy' are generally used nowadays to generally signify the method and thought of Kant.

4.3 WHAT IS CRITICISM

Kant could not agree with Hume that knowledge is wholly built on sensations. He enquired more precisely into the conditions of knowledge. The way Kant presents his analysis of process of knowledge has been described as Criticism. Kant himself stated that Criticism is the philosophy which criticizes and examines everything before reaching a definite judgment and finds out the limit of knowledge before trying to know anything. It is on the basis of sound criticism that Kant discovered the process of knowledge and its limits. He believed that both experience and intellect played important roles in the acquisition of knowledge. Kant is generally introduced as the philosopher who synthesized rationalism and empiricism. This however does not mean that Kant simply picked up the central theses of both schools of thought, and formulated his own philosophy. For, there are fundamental disagreements between the two schools of thought. The rationalists (Descartes and Leibnitz, for example) argue that knowledge can be attained only through the exercise of the reason independently of sense-experience - which they regarded as unreliable and the source of error. Reason gives us access to innate ideas and ultimate truths. Knowledge in the rationalist sense is often referred to as a priori, because it is logically prior to and not dependent on experience. Empiricists (Hume and to some extent Locke) on the other hand rejected these claims, maintaining that it is through senses that we acquire our knowledge and that we cannot strictly know anything beyond what our senses tell us. For them knowledge is a posteriori, that is, roughly derived 'afterwards' from the 'particulars' given in experience. Both rationalist and the empiricists claimed to have discovered a foundation of knowledge, respectively, in an 'innate intuition' characterized by clarity and distinctness (Descartes) and in 'impressions' (Hume)

Kant selected certain doctrines of the rationalists and certain doctrines of the empiricists and put them together into his own philosophy. He incorporated elements of rationalist and empiricist thought but he changed those views to have their meanings and implications altered and created a new approach, which he called critical philosophy.

According to the rationalists, it is possible for man to have knowledge of certain entities (such as God, immortal souls and substances) which are not objects of any possible experience, that is, that can never be presented to us either in sense perception or in introspection. Kant rejected this claim of the rationalists and he tried to show that there cannot be knowledge of any non-empirical reality. In this respect, Kant is as much of an empiricist as David Hume.

The fundamental principle of empiricism is that it is through senses that we acquire our knowledge and that we cannot strictly know anything beyond what our senses tell us. Kant does not accept this principle. Empiricism, especially Hume's empiricism leads to skepticism, a theory which makes impossible not only metaphysical knowledge but even scientific knowledge and everyday 'commonsense' knowledge. Kant upholds the possibility of scientific and commonsense knowledge against Hume's skeptical empiricism. In his attempt to liberate science form the skepticism of Hume, Kant posits that there are special concepts that do not originate in experience but have what he calls 'objective validity'. Kant calls them "Pure Concepts" or "Pure Categories of Understanding". Kant's basic argument here is that all our knowledge begins with experience but is not derived from it.

ACTIVITY : 4.1

- Which is the point of disagreement between Kant and the empiricist philosophers? Discuss.

  .....

  .....

- How did Kant synthesize rationalism and empiricism? Discuss

  .....

  .....

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q 1: State whether the following statements are 'True' or 'False'

a. The rationalists argue that knowledge can be attained only through the exercise of the reason independently of sense-experience. (True/False)

b. For empiricist knowledge is a priori. (True/False)

c. Hume's empiricism leads to skepticism.(True/False)

d. Knowledge in the rationalist sense is often referred to as a priori. (True/False)

Q 2: What is the fundamental principle of empiricism? (Answer in about 30 words)

.....

Q 3: What did Kant posit to liberate science from skepticism? (Answer in about 30 words)

.....

4.4: KANT'S PRELIMINARY CLARIFICATIONS ON THE KINDS OF KNOWLEDGE AND JUDGMENTS

Traditionally, before Kant, philosophers had identified the a priori knowledge and a posteriori knowledge and had been divided over them as to the sure way of knowledge acquisition. It has been characteristic of empiricism to hold that our a priori knowledge is confined to analytic propositions. In contrast, rationalism holds that there are some non-analytic or synthetic propositions that we can know a priori. Empiricists thus hold that the scope of our a priori knowledge is narrower than what the rationalists take it to be. Kant put forward a more radical account of a priori knowledge and the nature of necessity.

4.5 KINDS OF KNOWLEDGE

Unlike the rationalist Kant denied that knowledge is wholly a priori and unlike the empiricist he denied that it is solely built on sensations. According to Kant, knowledge involves both a priori and a posteriori elements- it involves both reason and sensation. Sensations are the raw materials which are transformed into knowledge by reason with application of its inherent laws- 'The matter of our ideas is furnished by the senses; their form is the work of reason'.

4.5.1 A Priori knowledge

A priori does not mean knowledge which is explicitly present in the mind before it has begun to experience anything at all. It means knowledge which is not derived from experience though it makes its appearance only on the occasion of experience. Consider the oft-quoted statements: 'That all our knowledge begins with experience there can be no doubt but though all our knowledge begins with experience, it does not follow that it all arises out of experience.'

For Kant the criterion for identifying a priori knowledge is strict universality and necessity.

Necessity and strict universality are therefore secure indications of an a priori cognition, and also belong together inseparably". Necessary truths are just those that obtain in all possible worlds; the universal truths are those that express generalizations about all entities of a particular kind. To see how this criterion is supposed to work, consider the proposition "every even number is divisible by two". Its truth is necessary because there cannot be any counter examples, and strictly universal because there are not only 'are not' but there 'cannot be' any exceptions to it. Strict universality entails necessity, but not vice versa, and that necessity is the fundamental criterion. Kant's adoption of necessity as the fundamental criterion of the a priori knowledge accords with his oft-repeated and important claim that no proposition that rests on experience can be necessary. As he puts it: "Experience tells us, indeed, what is, but not that it must necessarily be so, and not otherwise".

4.5.2 A Posteriori Knowledge

The term 'a posteriori' means 'known posterior to experience', or 'known dependently on experience'. The phrase 'can be known only by experience' requires some clarification, for it does not mean, as one might think, 'can be known just by experience' or 'can be known by experience alone'. Kant had rejected the Humean doctrine that all our knowledge is derived from experience and so to accept the later explanation would be a contradiction. By a posteriori knowledge, Kant referred to knowledge which begins from experience and has roots in them. At least some a posteriori statements require reasoning, as well as experience, in order to be known;

for example, our knowledge of scientific laws rests not only on observations but also on complex inferences or extrapolations from those observations. This point implies that all knowledge requires conceptualization, which is a form of thought that philosophers often contrast with the raw data of experience.

'There can be no doubt that all our knowledge begins from experience. For how should our faculty of knowledge be awakened into action did not objects affecting our senses partly of themselves produce representations, partly arouse the activity of our understanding to compare these representations, and, by combining or separating them, work up the raw material of the sensible impressions into that knowledge of objects which is entitled experience? In the order of time, therefore, we have no knowledge antecedent to experience, and with experience all our knowledge begins'

ACTIVITY : 4.2

- What is the difference between Kant's understanding of a posteriori and Hume's understanding of a posteriori? Discuss

  .....

  .....

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q 4: Fill in the blanks

a) It has been characteristic of empiricism to hold that our a priori knowledge is confined to _____ propositions.

b) A priori means knowledge which is not derived from _____ though it makes it appearance only on the occasion of experience.

c) For Kant the criterion for identifying a priori knowledge is_____ and necessity.

d) Necessary truths are just those that obtain in all _____worlds.

e) The universal truths are those that express _____about all entities of a particular kind

f) The term 'a posteriori' means 'known posterior to experience', or 'known _____on experience'

4.6 TYPES OF JUDGMENT

Kant divides propositions into two types: analytic and synthetic. However in making the distinction, he restricts his attention to statements that are affirmative subject-predicate judgments.

4.6.1 Analytic judgment

Analytic judgments are those in which the predicate is contained, at least implicitly in the concept of the subject. They are said to be 'explicative' judgment because the predicate does not add to the concept of the subject anything which is not already contained in it, explicitly or implicitly. And their truth depends on the law of contradiction. We cannot deny the proposition without involving ourselves in logical contradiction. An example of analytic proposition as Kant has given is: 'all bodies are extended'. Here the idea of extension is contained in the idea of the body.

4.6.2 Synthetic judgment

Synthetic judgments unlike analytic judgment affirm or deny of a subject a predicate which is not contained in the concept of the subject. Therefore, they are called 'ampliative' or 'augmentative judgment', because they add something to the concept of the subject. According to Kant, 'all bodies are heavy' is an example of synthetic judgment for the idea of weight or heaviness in not contained in the concept of body as such.

Synthetic judgments are again subdivided into two types:

1. Synthetic a posteriori and
2. Synthetic a priori

4.6.3 Synthetic a posteriori

In all synthetic judgments something is added to the concept of the subject. A connection is affirmed between predicate and subject but in such judgment the predicate cannot be got out of the subject by mere analysis of the subject. Now this connection may be purely factual and contingent: it is then given only in and through experience. And when this is the case the judgment is synthetic a posteriori. Let us consider the proposition, 'All members of the tribe X are short', and let us suppose

that this is a true proposition. It is synthetic because we cannot obtain the idea of shortness by mere analysis from the concept of membership of tribe X. But the connection between shortness and membership of tribe is given only in and through experience. And the judgment is simply the result of as series of observation. Its universality is not strict. Even if there does not happen to be at the moment any member of the tribe who is not short, there may be one or more tall members in the future. We cannot know a priori that all members are short. It is simply a matter of contingent fact.

4.6.4 Synthetic a priori

According to Kant, there is another class of synthetic propositions, in which the connection between predicate and subject, though not knowable by mere analysis of the concept of the subject, is nonetheless necessary and strictly universal. These are called synthetic a priori propositions. Kant gives us an example: 'everything which happens has a cause'. The proposition is synthetic because the predicate, having a cause, is not contained in the concept of what happens, that is, of an event. It is thus an ampliative and not an explicative judgment. But it is at the same time a priori for it is characterized by necessity and strict universality. The proposition, 'everything which happens has a cause', does not mean that, so far as out experience goes, all events have had cause and that it is reasonable to expect, until experience shows otherwise, that future events will also have causes. It means that every event, without any possible exception, will have a cause. The proposition, however, is dependent on experience in one sense, namely, that it is by experience that we become acquainted with things happening, with events. But the connection between the predicate and the subject is given a priori. It is not a mere generalization from experience, reached by induction. We know a priori or in advance that every event must have a cause and the observation of such a connection in the case of events within the field of an experience adds nothing to the certainty of the judgment.

4.7 POSSIBILITY OF SYNTHETIC A PRIORI JUDGMENT

Kant was convinced that there are synthetic a priori propositions, that is, propositions which are not merely explicative but which extend our knowledge of reality and which are at the same time a priori. The problem how is a priori cognition

possible can be expressed thus: How are synthetic a priori propositions possible? or How is it that we can know anything at all about reality a priori? This general question can be split up into several particular questions by considering where synthetic a priori propositions are to be found.

They are to be found, in the first place, in mathematics. First of all it must be noted that mathematical propositions are always judgments a priori and not empirical, because they include the concept of necessity, which cannot be derived from experience. The proposition 7+5=12 is not an empirical generalization. It is a necessary proposition. At the same time, however, this proposition, according to Kant, is not analytic but synthetic. It is synthetic because the concept of twelve is not obtained, and cannot be obtained, by mere analysis of the idea of the union between seven and five. For this idea does not itself imply the concept of twelve as the particular number resulting from the union. We cannot arrive at the notion of 12 except with the aid of intuition. Mathematical propositions are synthetic a priori for it is a necessary proposition and so cannot be synthetic a posteriori.

Similarly the propositions of geometry are also synthetic a priori propositions. For example, 'the straight line between two points is the shortest', is a synthetic proposition. For the concept of straight contains no notion of quantity, but only of quality. The concept of the shortest is thus wholly an addition, and it cannot be derived by any analysis from the concept of straight line. Synthesis is possible in this proposition with the help of intuition. But besides being synthetic the proposition is necessary and therefore a priori. It is not an empirical generalization.

In the second place, synthetic a priori propositions are also found in physics. For instance, the proposition, 'in all changes of the corporeal world the quantity of matter remains unchanged'. This proposition, according to Kant, is necessary and therefore a priori. But it is also synthetic for in the concept of matter we do not think its permanence, but merely its presence in space, which it fills. Physics in general does not consist simply of synthetic a priori statements but it contains within itself synthetic a priori judgments as principles.

Let us consider the possibility of synthetic a priori judgment in metaphysics. When we consider metaphysics, we find that it does not aim simply at analyzing concepts. It contains indeed, analytic propositions but they are not properly speaking metaphysical proposition. Metaphysics aims at extending our knowledge of reality.

Its propositions must therefore, be synthetic. At the same time, if it is not an empirical science, its propositions must be a priori. It follows, therefore, that if metaphysics is possible, it must consists of synthetic a priori propositions.

But the claim of metaphysics as a science is in doubt. The question, therefore, is not so much how metaphysics as a science is possible as whether it is possible. Kant believes that the human reason is naturally impelled to raise problems which cannot be answered empirically and as such one can ask how metaphysics, considered as a natural disposition is possible. But Kant doubts whether the claim of metaphysics to constitute a science is justified - the question here is really whether metaphysics considered as a science is possible.

ACTIVITY : 4.3

- What, according to Kant, is an analytic judgment? Give an example of analytic judgment.

  .....

  .....

- Why does not Kant accept the possibility of synthetic a priori judgments in metaphysics?

  .....

  .....

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q 5: State whether the following statements are 'True' or 'False'

a) Analytic judgments are said to be 'ampliative' judgment'. (True/False)

b) We cannot deny analytic proposition without involving ourselves in logical contradiction. (True/False)

c) Synthetic judgments are also called 'augmentative judgment'(True/False)

d) 'Everything which happens has a cause', is an example of synthetic a posteriori judgment. (True/False)

e) Kant accepts synthetic a priori judgment in metaphysics. (True/False)

4.8 COPERNICAN REVOLUTION

Kant solved the problem of the synthetic a priori judgment by substituting a new hypothesis concerning the relation between the mind and its objects. It was clear to him that if we assume, as Hume did, that the mind, in forming its concepts, must conform to its objects, there could be no solution to the problem. Hume's theory would work for our idea of things a posteriori. But a synthetic a priori judgment cannot be validated by experience; if I say, for example, that every straight line is the shortest way between two points, I certainly cannot say that I have had an experience of every possible straight line. If as Hume believed, the mind is passive and simply receives information only from the objects, it follows that the mind would have information only about that particular object. But the mind makes judgments about all objects, even those that it has not yet experienced, and in addition, objects do in fact behave in the future according to these judgments we make about them. This scientific knowledge gives us reliable information about the nature of things. But since this knowledge, which is both synthetic and a priori, could not be explained on the assumption that the mind conforms to its objects (as in the case of how it could conform to every straight line), Kant was forced to try a new hypothesis regarding the relation between the mind and its objects.

Kant therefore suggested the hypothesis: 'Hitherto it has been assumed that all our knowledge must conform to objects. But all attempts to ascertain anything about them a priori by concepts, and thus to extend our knowledge, came to nothing on this assumption. Let us try the, whether we may not make better progress in the task of metaphysics if we assume that objects must conform to our knowledge. This at all events accords better with the possibility which we are seeking, namely of a knowledge of objects a priori, which would determine something about them before they are given to us.'

This hypothesis, Kant observes, is analogous to that proposed by Copernicus. That latter saw that though the sun appears to move across from earth from east to west, we cannot justifiably conclude from this that the earth is fixed and that the sun moves round fixed earth, for the very good reason that the observed movement of the sun would be precisely the same if it were the earth which was moving round the sun, and the human observer with it. The immediate phenomenon would be the same on either hypothesis. The question is whether there are not astronomical phenomena

which can only be explained better and more economically on the heliocentric than on the geocentric hypothesis. And subsequent astronomical investigation showed that this is indeed the case. In an analogous manner, Kant suggests, empirical reality would remain what it is on the hypothesis that for the object to be known they must conform to the mind rather than the other way about. And if a priori knowledge can be explained on the new hypothesis, this certainly is an argument in favor of the new hypothesis.

Kant's Copernican revolution does not imply the view that reality can be reduced to the human mind and its ideas. He is not suggesting that the human mind creates things, as far as their existence is concerned, by thinking them. What he is suggesting is that we cannot know things, that they cannot be objects of knowledge for us, except in so far as they are subjected to certain a priori conditions of knowledge on the part of the subject. If we assume that the human mind is purely passive in knowledge, we cannot explain the a priori knowledge which we undoubtedly possess. Let us assume, therefore, that the mind is active, this activity does not mean creation of beings out of nothing. It means rather that the mind imposes, as it were, on the ultimate material of experience its own form of cognition, determined by the structure of human sensibility and understanding, and that things cannot be known except through the medium of these forms. But if we speak of the mind imposing its own cognitive forms on the raw material of knowledge, this must not be taken to mean that the human subject does this deliberately, consciously and of set purpose. The object as given to conscious experience, the object about which we think is already subjected to those cognitive forms which the human subject imposes by a natural necessity, because it is what it is; that is, because of its natural structure as a knowing subject. The cognitive forms thus determine the possibility of objects, if 'objects' is taken to refer to things in themselves, that is, to things as they exist part from any relation to the knowing subject, we could not, of course, say that they are determined by the human mind. The situation can be compared to a case where a person who wears colored glasses sees everything in that color. Every human being by virtue of being human possesses the faculty of thought, having which he inevitably thinks about things in accordance with the natural structure of the mind.

ACTIVITY : 10.4

- Which hypothesis in his philosophy, according to Kant, can be compared to the view of Copernicus?

  .....

  .....

- Why did Kant call his view a 'Copernican Revolution' in philosophy?

  .....

  .....

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q 6: a) Why, according to Kant mind cannot be accepted as passive as Hume assumed? (Answer in about 75 words)

.....

b) How does the mind impose its form of cognition on the ultimate material of experience? (Answer in about 35 words)

.....

4.9 LET US SUM UP

- What is generally meant by skeptical is that the person is not easily convinced and doubts any claim that is not well-founded. Skepticism is also a term which is used for a philosophical school of thought which had its origin in ancient Greece.
- Skepticism comes in many forms. We may distinguish skepticism about knowledge from skepticism about justification. Skepticism about knowledge denies that people have, or can have, certain kinds of knowledge. Skepticism about justification denies that people are, or can be, justified in believing certain sorts of things.
- We can again distinguish between global skepticism and local skepticism. Global skepticism about knowledge denies that we do, or can, have any knowledge at all. In contrast, local skepticism about knowledge holds that we do not, or cannot, have knowledge about some particular domain, such as knowledge about other minds, the past, or the external world.

- Pyrrhonian skepticism employs techniques instead of arguments in trying to undermine claims to know. According to the Pyrrhonian, we can claim knowledge only if we have good grounds for believing that what is, is exactly as we think it is or perceive it to be. But we are never aware of any object as it is independent of us. We are always aware of objects as it stands in relation to us. Therefore, we cannot know how any object really is in itself.
- Descartes employed skepticism as a method of achieving certainty. He started with doubting everything. His idea was that if everything was doubted, whatever was left that could not be doubted anymore would be absolutely certain. Then he would enquire into what it is that made this absolutely certain such that it cannot be doubted. This was supposed to reveal the criterion of certainty. With this criterion than he would measure what could be accepted as truth and what would fall short of truth.
- Humean skepticism put up by considerations about the limit of inductive knowledge. It is motivated by considerations about the limits of knowledge based on induction. According to Hume, inductive arguments are never justifying and the central problem is how we can ever have a non-circular or non-question-begging justification for our use of it. But we have natural or instinctive belief in the existence of external bodies, continuous selves and real causal connections in nature. However, for Hume we are dealing here with probabilities: we do not have knowledge in the strict sense.
- Skepticism leads to criticism of knowledge. Skepticism doubts the possibility of knowledge. But, the human mind finds it difficult to go on doubting. Human mind starts enquiring into the limits and conditions of knowledge. And, enquiry into the limits and conditions of knowledge is what epistemology does. In other words, criticism of knowledge means epistemology. As such, any system of philosophy based on epistemological reflections may be called critical.
- The way Kant presents his analysis of process of knowledge has been described as Criticism. Kant himself stated that Criticism is the philosophy which criticizes and examines everything before reaching a definite judgment and finds out the limit of knowledge before trying to know anything.
- Kant selected certain doctrines of the rationalists and certain doctrines of the empiricists and put them together into his own philosophy. He incorporated elements of rationalist and empiricist thought but he changed those views to have

their meanings and implications altered and created a new approach, which he called critical philosophy.

- A priori does not mean knowledge which is explicitly present in the mind before it has begun to experience anything at all. It means knowledge which is not derived from experience though it makes it appearance only on the occasion of experience.
- The term 'a posteriori' means 'known posterior to experience', or 'known dependently on experience'.
- Analytic judgments are those in which the predicate is contained, at least implicitly in the concept of the subject. They are said to be 'explicative' judgment because the predicate does not add to the concept of the subject anything which is not already contained in it, explicitly or implicitly.
- Synthetic judgments unlike analytic judgments affirm or deny of a subject a predicate which is not contained in the concept of the subject. Therefore, they are called 'ampliative' or 'augmentative judgment', because they add something to the concept of the subject.
- In all synthetic judgments something is added to the concept of the subject. A connection is affirmed between predicate and subject but in such judgment the predicate cannot be got out of the subject by mere analysis of the subject. Now this connection may be purely factual and contingent: it is then given only in and through experience. And when this is the case the judgment is synthetic a posteriori.
- According to Kant, there is a class of synthetic propositions, in which the connection between predicate and subject, though not knowable by mere analysis of the concept of the subject, is nonetheless necessary and strictly universal. These are called synthetic a priori propositions.
- Synthetic a priori are to be found, in the first place, in mathematics. Similarly, the propositions of geometry are also synthetic a priori propositions. In the second place, synthetic a priori propositions are also found in physics.
- Metaphysics aims at extending our knowledge of reality. Its propositions must therefore, be synthetic. At the same time, if it is not an empirical science, its propositions must be a priori. It follows, therefore, that if metaphysics is possible; it must consist of synthetic a priori propositions. But the claim of metaphysics as a science is in doubt.

- Kant believes that the human reason is naturally impelled to raise problems which cannot be answered empirically and as such one can ask how metaphysics, considered as a natural disposition is possible. But Kant doubts whether the claim of metaphysics to constitute a science is justified - the question here is really whether metaphysics considered as a science is possible.
- Kant solved the problem of the synthetic a priori judgment by substituting a new hypothesis concerning the relation between the mind and its objects. He suggested the hypothesis: 'Hitherto it has been assumed that all our knowledge must conform to objects. But all attempts to ascertain anything about them a priori by concepts, and thus to extend our knowledge, came to nothing on this assumption. Let us try the, whether we may not make better progress in the task of metaphysics if we assume that objects must conform to our knowledge. This at all events accords better with the possibility which we are seeking, namely of a knowledge of objects a priori, which would determine something about them before they are given to us.'
- Kant's Copernican revolution does not imply the view that reality can be reduced to the human mind and its ideas. He is not suggesting that the human mind creates things, as far as their existence is concerned, by thinking them. What he is suggesting is that we cannot know things, that they cannot be objects of knowledge for us, except in so far as they are subjected to certain a priori conditions of knowledge on the part of the subject.

4.10 FURTHER READING

1) Descartes, R. 1975. The Philosophical Writings of Descartes. Ed. J. Cottingham, R. Stoodhoff, and D. Murdoch, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
2) Fogelin, R. 1994. Pyrrhonian reflections on Knowledge and Justifications, Oxford: Oxford University Press
3) Hume, D. Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding and Concerning the Principles of Morals ed. P. Nidditch, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
4) Kant, Immanuel. 1929. Critique of Pure Reason trans. Norman Kemp Smith. New York: St. Martin's Press
5) Dicker, Georges. 2004. Kant's theory of knowledge; an analytic introduction. Oxford University Press,

6) Guyer, Paul (ed.) 2006. The Cambridge Companion to Kant and Modern philosophy. Cambridge University Press

4.11 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Ans to Q 1: a)True b) False c) True d) True

Ans to Q 2: a) The fundamental principle of empiricism is that it is through senses that we acquire our knowledge and that we cannot strictly know anything beyond what our senses tell us.

Ans to Q 3: b) In his attempt to liberate science from the skepticism of Hume, Kant posits that there are special concepts that do not originate in experience but have what he calls 'objective validity'.

Ans to Q 4: a) analytic b) experience

c) strict universality d) possible

e) generalizations f) dependently

Ans to Q 5: a) false b) true

c) true d) false e) false

Ans to Q 6: a) Scientific knowledge gives us reliable information about the nature of things. But this knowledge, which is both synthetic and a priori, could not be explained on the assumption that the mind conforms to its objects.

Ans to Q 6: b) When we speak of the mind imposing its own cognitive forms on the raw material of knowledge this must not be taken to mean that the human subject does this deliberately or consciously. It rather means that the object as given to conscious experience, the object about which we think is already subjected to those cognitive forms which the human subject imposes by a natural necessity because of its natural structure as a knowing subject.

4.12 MODEL QUESTIONS

A. Short Questions

Q 1: What is meant by Pyrrhonian Skepticism?

Q 2: Define skepticism

Q 3: What is global skepticism?

Q 4: What are the different kinds of skepticism?

Q 5: Who wrote the book Meditations?

Q 6: What are the two skeptical hypothesis put forward by Descartes?

Q 7: State the meaning of Cogito ergo sum.

Q 8: Who is the author of 'essay concerning human understanding'?

Q 9: Name the philosopher who synthesized rationalism and empiricism.

Q 1O: Name the two philosophers, who are rationalists?

Q 11: What are the two types of propositions? According to Kant.

Q 12: State the kinds of synthetic judgments.

Q 13: Give an example of synthetic proposition.

Q 14: Write the name of the philosopher who brought out Copernican revolution.

B. Short Questions (Answer in about 100-150 words)

Q 1: Write a short note on Copernican revolution.

Q 2: Distinguish between analytic and Synthetic judgments.

Q 3: Briefly explain the distinction between a-priori knowledge and a-posteriori Knowledge.

Q 4: Explain briefly on Synthetic a posteriori judgments.

C. Long Questions (Answer in about 300-500 words)

Q 1: Discuss Kant's theory of Criticism

Q 2: Is synthetic a priori statement possible? Discuss

Q 3: Explain the Copernican revolution.

Q 4: What are the different kinds of knowledge? Discuss

Q 5: Discuss the different types of judgments.

*** **** ***

UNIT 5: SCEPTICISM

UNIT STRUCTURE

5.1 Learning objectives
5.2 Introduction
5.3 What is Skepticism?
5.4 Different Kinds of Skepticism
    5.4.1 Pyrrhonian Skepticism
    5.4.2 Cartesian Skepticism
    5.4.3 Humean Skepticism
5.5 Let us sum up
5.6 Further readings
5.7 Answers to Check Your Progress
5.8 Model Questions

5.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to-

- explain what skepticism is
- distinguish between knowledge skepticism and justification skepticism
- distinguish between global and local skepticism
- explain the role of skeptical hypotheses in Descartes' skepticism
- explain and evaluate different kinds of skepticism;
- analyse the role of doubt in philosophy.

5.2 INTRODUCTION

When we say that a person is skeptical, what is generally meant is that that person is not easily convinced and doubts any claim that is not well-founded. Skepticism is also a term which is used for a philosophical school of thought. Skepticism as a school of thought had its origin in ancient Greece. We all have doubts about some areas of alleged knowledge, although these doubts will vary among persons and groups. Accordingly, philosophers and others have long debated the limits, the scope, of human knowledge. The more restricted we take the scope to be, the more skeptical we are. So, if we restrict knowledge claims to claim about our subjective experience,

for example, we are very skeptical. Famous skeptical debates in philosophy have concerned knowledge of, among other things, the mind independent world, other minds, inductive inferences, historical events, and unobservable entities countenanced by science.

5.3 WHAT IS SKEPTICISM

While most of us are skeptical about some knowledge claims, skeptical arguments in philosophy try to show that we do not know or are not justified in believing many of the things we ordinarily assume we know or reasonably believe. These arguments often conclude that we do not know or are not justified in believing anything about the external world, or the past, or other minds

Skepticism comes in many forms. We may distinguish skepticism about knowledge from skepticism about justification. Skepticism about knowledge denies that people have, or can have, certain kinds of knowledge. Skepticism about justification denies that people are, or can be, justified in believing certain sorts of things. One can be skeptic about knowledge without being skeptic about justification. One might hold that people are justified in believing various sorts of things, but maintain that the level of justification people have for believing those things is not high enough for knowledge. One might hold, for example, that people are somewhat justified in believing many things about the external world, but deny that these beliefs ever reach the level of justification needed for knowledge. Similarly, one might be a skeptic about justification without being a skeptic about knowledge. Suppose, for example, one held that knowledge does not require justification, but only reliably produced true belief. One might deny that beliefs of a certain kind were justified, but still amounted to knowledge.

We can again distinguish between global skepticism and local skepticism. Global skepticism about knowledge denies that we do, or can, have any knowledge at all. If global skepticism about knowledge is true, then no one knows anything at all. But again, if global skepticism about knowledge is true, then no one knows even that this skeptical claim is true. Moreover, if global skepticism were true, then no belief in it could be based on premises which are known. In contrast, local skepticism about knowledge holds that we do not, or cannot, have knowledge about some particular

domain, such as knowledge about other minds, the past, or the external world. The local skeptic need not deny that we have some kinds of knowledge. Such a skeptic might allow, for example, that we know our own mental states and some simple logical truths. Similar is the case with global and local skepticism about justification. So, for example, if global skepticism about justification were true, no one would be justified in believing it. If global scepticism were true, then no one would have any good reason for accepting it; no one would be justified in believing any premises which support it.

ACTIVITY : 9.1

- What is your own opinion on the concept of skepticism? Discuss

  .....

  .....
- Distinguish between global and local skepticism. Discuss

  .....

  .....

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q 1:State whether the following statements are true or false

a. Skeptical arguments often conclude that we can know or are justified in believing anything about the external world, or the past, or other minds

b. One can be skeptic about knowledge without being skeptic about justification.

c. Local skepticism about knowledge denies that we do or can, have any knowledge at all.

d. If global skepticism about justification were true, no one would be justified in believing a proposition.

5.4 DIFFERENT KINDS OF SKEPTICISM

With respect to global skepticism, there are various important schools. First, there is the ancient Pyrrhonian skepticism (associated with the work of Sextus Empiricus). Pyrrhonian skepticism employs techniques instead of arguments in trying to undermine claims to know. Second there is Cartesian skepticism (associated with Descartes). Crucial in this type of skepticism is the use of skeptical hypothesis to cast doubt on much of what we ordinarily think to know. Third, there is Humean skepticism

(associated with the work of Hume). This kind of skepticism is put up by considerations about the limit of inductive knowledge.

5.4.1 Pyrrhonian Skepticism

In the Hellenistic period a kind of skepticism developed which was advocated by the Pyrrhonians (the disciples of Pyrrho of Elis, c. 360-270 B.C.E). The central claim of the Pyrrhonians was that one should not advance any philosophical thesis; they maintained that they did not know whether knowledge was possible. The most famous of the Pyrrhonian skepticism was Sextus Empericus. According to the Pyrrhonian, we can claim knowledge only if we have good grounds for believing that what is, is exactly as we think it is or perceive it to be. But we are never aware of any object as it is independent of us. We are always aware of objects as it stands in relation to us. Therefore we cannot know how any object really is in itself. For example, when we think of an object we think of it as possessing the qualities which we have perceived. But the question remains whether the object has only those qualities or does it have additional qualities which are not known to us? It may also so happen that the object has fewer qualities than which we have perceived. There is no way of confirming which are the qualities that are really have had by the object. The senses cannot tell which qualities are really and which are not there in the object. And as the senses cannot tell, the mind too cannot tell.

St Augustine refuted total or global skepticism on three grounds: First, skepticism is refuted by the Principle of non-contradiction. According to this principle, a proposition and its contradiction cannot both be true one of the other must be true. The propositions "The stick is bent" and "It is false that the stick is bent" cannot both be true. Thus we can at least know this much that the man is not both tall and not-tall. Second, Augustine held that the act of doubting reveals one's existence as something absolutely certain: from the fact I am doubting, it follows automatically that I am. Finally, Augustine also held that sense perception itself gives rudimentary kind of knowledge. According to him, deception in sense perception occurs when one "gives assent to more than the fact of appearance." For example, in the case of perception of bent stick immersed in water, the stick appears bent at the point when it enters the water. If we agree only to the appearance of the stick and consequently say that it looks

bent, we do not commit any mistake. It is only when we say that stick is actually bent that we commit error.

ACTIVITY : 5.1

- What is the basic claim made by the Pyrrhonian skeptics? Discuss

  .....

  .....

- Is it possible to compare the knowledge of an object as it is and knowledge of it as related to us? Discuss

  .....

  .....

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q 2: Fill in the gaps

a. The school pf Pyrrhonian skepticism is named after ….. of. ……
b. The most famous of the Pyrrhonian skeptics is……..
c. Augustine refuted skepticism on …… grounds.
d. The first principle on which Augustine refuted skepticism is principle of …….
e. From the fact that 'I am doubting' it follows automatically that 'I ……'

5.4.2 Cartesian Skepticism

Historically, Descartes' skepticism is one of the most two influential skepticisms, the other being Pyrrhonian skepticism. His doubt can be applied universally to all that can be doubted. Descartes discusses his skepticism in his book Meditations. Descartes was concerned with skeptical questions as to the possibility of knowledge. However, he was not a skeptic. In fact, Descartes' aim was to formulate a unified science of nature that was as certain as mathematics. His doubt or skepticism was methodic. It was methodic in the sense that Descartes employed skepticism as a method of achieving certainty. He started with doubting everything. His idea was that if everything was doubted, whatever was left that could not be doubted anymore would be absolutely certain. Then he would enquire into what it is that made this absolutely certain such that it cannot be doubted. This was supposed to reveal the criterion of certainty. With this criterion than he would measure what could be accepted as truth and what would fall short of truth.

To doubt every proposition, Descartes employed two skeptical hypotheses: possibilities of error that are both incompatible with what we think to know and that cannot be subjectively distinguished from normal circumstances. The first is the dream hypothesis and the second is the evil-demon hypothesis.

One can doubt everything that has been given through the senses. Senses sometimes deceive us regarding the nature of things. However, here it can be objected that from it we are not supposed to conclude that we cannot have knowledge through senses. For, there are instances of perception, for example, regarding my knowledge about my body right now, where we do not doubt our knowledge, that is, we do not think that we are deceived. But, Descartes said, for all I know I may now be dreaming - this is Descartes' dream hypothesis. It might be the case that the perceptual experiences that I now I am having are mere dreamt experiences. This may look at the first sight to be capable of being disproved easily. But let us look into it more closely. I pinch myself to ensure whether I am dreaming or not. But the next question that would arise is whether I am dreaming that I am pinching myself. The awareness I am having that I am awake now may also be a dream experience. There is no evidence which can conclusively tell me that my experiences are not dream but real experiences; nothing to tell me that all the things that I see in front of me have existences outside my mind.

However, the dream hypothesis is not applicable in certain cases. It may be argued that even if I am dreaming, there are still many things which cannot be doubted. For example one cannot doubt even when one is dreaming that two plus three make five; that a square can never have more than four sides. These propositions seem absolutely certain to me. In other words, such propositions do not seem to be affected by doubt as 'advnetitious ideas' (derived through the senses) seem to be. Empirical propositions, one may say are doubtful while analytical propositions are not so. But it is possible to doubt even such analytical propositions. Some propositions that have seemed absolutely certain to me on certain previous occasions turned out to be false later. So, in these cases too I cannot the possibility of the propositions turning out to be false later. For it is possible that a deceitful and all powerful intelligence has so programmed me that I find myself regarding certain propositions as absolute certainties which are as a matter of fact false. This is Descartes' evil demon hypothesis.

The two skeptical hypotheses are incompatible with ordinary experiences and Descartes was very much aware of it. In fact this is what Descartes wanted to show. Descartes was looking for that kind of certainty which will escape even the kinds of possibilities falsehood as presented by skeptical hypotheses. Descartes put to test everything he knew against these two possibilities, singly or together. When he did that he found that whatever he had been considering as certain till that time turned to be something he could doubt, except one thing: he found that he could doubt everything to save the indubitable truth of "I think, therefore I am" -cogito ergo sum.

According to Descartes, one could doubt everything but any attempt to doubt one's existence as a thinking being is impossible, because to doubt is to think and to think is to exist. What Descartes meant was that the self that doubts its existence must exist to be able to doubt in the first place. Descartes examined his single indubitable truth to find out what guarantees its certainty and saw that it is 'clarity and distinctness which lends a proposition its immunity to doubt. Descartes discovered in the certainty of his own existence an essential characteristic of certain truth: anything that was clear and distinct as his own existence would be certain.

Descartes' approach to the problem of certainty and knowledge is characteristic of rationalism. Whatever may be their differences, the rationalists agree that sense experience is untrustworthy and that certain knowledge is to be obtained by exercise of pure reason. Descartes seems to be claiming to have discovered certainty in both 'objective' and 'subjective' sense. When he equated existence with thinking he claimed certainty in the objective sense, while criterion of 'clarity and distinctness' can be considered as an example of subjective certainty. But unfortunately Descartes' own interpretation regarding cgito ergo sum is ambiguous. If the cogito is regarded as an inference of some kind, then it can be argued that it commits the error of arguing in a circle. The 'I' of 'I am' is already pre-supposed in the 'I' of 'I think'. Any necessity it possesses is a matter of logic which has nothing to say about actual existent things.

Descartes says that as long as he is doubting (thinking) the certainty of the cogito is assured. Now there are certain occasions when he is not thinking. Does he have any guarantee that he continues to exist as a potentially thinking thing at that time? Descartes does not give any clear explanation regarding this.

ACTIVITY : 5.3

- Can we regard Descartes as a skeptic? Discuss

  .....

  .....

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q 3: State whether the following statements are True or false:

a. Descartes discusses his skepticism in Meditations. (True/False)

b. Descartes' aim was to formulate a unified science of nature that was as certain as mathematics. (True/False)

c. One cannot doubt anything that has been given through the senses. (True/False)

d. 'Cogito ergo sum' means 'I am, therefore I think'. (True/False)

5.4.3 Humean Skepticism

Hume is one of the best known philosophers who proposed skepticism (Treatise On Human Nature; An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding). One important element of his skepticism is that it is motivated by considerations about the limits of knowledge based on induction. According to Hume, inductive arguments are never justifying and the central problem is how we can ever have a non-circular or non-question-begging justification for our use of it.

Since the time of Descartes, most philosophers have distinguished between propositions of mathematics and statements about the empirical world. Hume referred to these propositions as Relations of Ideas and Matters of Facts respectively. The first kind of propositions expresses a relation between numbers or geometrical figures. According to him, they are intuitively or demonstratively certain. Their truth can be discovered by the operation of thought - it does not depend on anything of the world. Matters of fact are quite different from them. Firstly we can deny them without contradiction (whereas we cannot deny the truth of 'two and two make four'). Secondly their truth seems to be founded on the relation of cause and effect. But how do we arrive at the knowledge of cause and effect? This truth, says Hume, is attained by experience and not by a priori reasoning. It is true that we can trace particular effects back to general causes, for example, gravity. But common human curiosity does not enquire into these principles. What then is the foundation of all conclusions from

experiences? What justifies the inference from past conjunction of cause and effect to similar conjunction in the future? The reasoning involved here is not 'demonstrative, that is, it does not involve logic. It is also not inferred intuitively. The only alternative left is that the justification lies in the supposition that the future will resemble the past. But how will we know this without arguing in circularity? To take a concrete example: Let us assume that an object, say bread, exhibiting sensible qualities like colour weight and so on, possesses 'secret powers' which nourish us. Because a cause (secret power) has always been followed by a particular effect (nourishment) in the past, we argue that eating of bread will nourish us in the future as well. There would be no contradiction in denying this as 'relation of ideas' is not involved here. now if we claim that we know that bread will nourish us when next we eat it, it is only because we are assuming the truth of the general proposition 'All future conjunctions of causes and effects will resemble past conjunctions of similar causes and effects. But how can this be known without begging the question? Thus, for Hume we do not know that the future will resemble the past. What we have is just belief.

According to Hume, we also do not have intuition of a power or necessary connection between cause and effect. The idea we have of necessary connection is derived from imagination and our experience of uniformity in sequence of events.

Hume's conclusion is that we can have knowledge of mathematical propositions to of statements derived from them by means of deductive inference and the sciences, which deal with general facts. Thus he rules out theology, ethics, aesthetic, and metaphysics as constituting legitimate fields of knowledge.

Hume himself was dissatisfied with the conclusion his arguments led him to. But still Hume's skepticism is regarded to be example of superior argument. Hume distinguished firstly between 'antecedent' and 'consequent' skepticism. In the former we start by doubting everything and then look for some certain, infallible criterion to provide the basis of knowledge - in Descartes' case it was the cogito. Hume's position was one of consequent skepticism, which involved a thorough-going examination of the reliability of human faculties. But whether one's skepticism is of antecedent type of consequent type, Hume rejected extremism, which he regarded as self-destructive. He was aware of the consequences for the philosophers if his assumptions and arguments were followed through to their logical conclusion. Hume thought there is no answer to skepticism, but skepticism should be ignored outside the study. As an

ordinary man he dines, plays a game of backgammon, converses and is merry with his friends. But when after these amusements, he returns to his philosophical speculations they appear 'cold', 'strained', and 'ridiculous.

Hume believed that we cannot help but believe skepticism to be false, even when presented with most convincing arguments. We have natural or instinctive belief in the existence of external bodies, continuous selves and real causal connections in nature. We have to believe in such entities for our daily living. But for Hume we are dealing here with probabilities: we do not have knowledge in the strict sense. The reason for this is that Hume regards belief as result of our natural impulses rather than as something regulated by reason.

ACTIVITY : 5.4

- What do you understand by 'antecedent' skepticism? Give your viewpoint

  .....

  .....

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q 4: Fill in the gaps

a) One important element of Hume' skepticism is that it is motivated by considerations about the limits of knowledge based on…….

b) According to Hume, ……..are intuitively or demonstratively certain.

c) The truth of Matters of Facts seems to be founded on the relation of ……..

d) According to Hume, we also do not have intuition of a power or…… between cause and effect.

e) Hume regards belief as result of our……..rather than as something regulated by reason.

5.5 LET US SUM UP

- What is generally meant by skeptical is that the person is not easily convinced and doubts any claim that is not well-founded. Skepticism is also a term which is used for a philosophical school of thought which had its origin in ancient Greece.

- Skepticism comes in many forms. We may distinguish skepticism about knowledge from skepticism about justification. Skepticism about knowledge denies that people have, or can have, certain kinds of knowledge. Skepticism about justification denies that people are, or can be, justified in believing certain sorts of things.
- We can again distinguish between global skepticism and local skepticism. Global skepticism about knowledge denies that we do, or can, have any knowledge at all. In contrast, local skepticism about knowledge holds that we do not, or cannot, have knowledge about some particular domain, such as knowledge about other minds, the past, or the external world.
- Pyrrhonian skepticism employs techniques instead of arguments in trying to undermine claims to know. According to the Pyrrhonian, we can claim knowledge only if we have good grounds for believing that what is, is exactly as we think it is or perceive it to be. But we are never aware of any object as it is independent of us. We are always aware of objects as it stands in relation to us. Therefore we cannot know how any object really is in itself.
- Descartes employed skepticism as a method of achieving certainty. He started with doubting everything. His idea was that if everything was doubted, whatever was left that could not be doubted anymore would be absolutely certain. Then he would enquire into what it is that made this absolutely certain such that it cannot be doubted. This was supposed to reveal the criterion of certainty. With this criterion than he would measure what could be accepted as truth and what would fall short of truth.
- Humean skepticism put up by considerations about the limit of inductive knowledge. It is motivated by considerations about the limits of knowledge based on induction. According to Hume, inductive arguments are never justifying and the central problem is how we can ever have a non-circular or non-question-begging justification for our use of it. But we have natural or instinctive belief in the existence of external bodies, continuous selves and real causal connections in nature. However, for Hume we are dealing here with probabilities: we do not have knowledge in the strict sense.

- Skepticism leads to criticism of knowledge. Skepticism doubts the possibility of knowledge. But, the human mind finds it difficult to go on doubting. Human mind starts enquiring into the limits and conditions of knowledge. And, enquiry into the limits and conditions of knowledge is what epistemology does. In other words, criticism of knowledge means epistemology. As such, any system of philosophy based on epistemological reflections may be called critical.
- The way Kant presents his analysis of process of knowledge has been described as Criticism. Kant himself stated that Criticism is the philosophy which criticizes and examines everything before reaching a definite judgment and finds out the limit of knowledge before trying to know anything.
- Kant selected certain doctrines of the rationalists and certain doctrines of the empiricists and put them together into his own philosophy. He incorporated elements of rationalist and empiricist thought but he changed those views to have their meanings and implications altered and created a new approach, which he called critical philosophy.
- A priori does not mean knowledge which is explicitly present in the mind before it has begun to experience anything at all. It means knowledge which is not derived from experience though it makes it appearance only on the occasion of experience.
- The term 'a posteriori' means 'known posterior to experience', or 'known dependently on experience'.
- Analytic judgments are those in which the predicate is contained, at least implicitly in the concept of the subject. They are said to be 'explicative' judgment because the predicate does not add to the concept of the subject anything which is not already contained in it, explicitly or implicitly.
- Synthetic judgments unlike analytic judgments affirm or deny of a subject a predicate which is not contained in the concept of the subject. Therefore, they are called 'ampliative' or 'augmentative judgment', because they add something to the concept of the subject.
- In all synthetic judgments something is added to the concept of the subject. A connection is affirmed between predicate and subject but in such judgment the

predicate cannot be got out of the subject by mere analysis of the subject. Now this connection may be purely factual and contingent: it is then given only in and through experience. And when this is the case the judgment is synthetic a posteriori.

- According to Kant there is a class of synthetic propositions, in which the connection between predicate and subject, though not knowable by mere analysis of the concept of the subject, is nonetheless necessary and strictly universal. These are called synthetic a priori propositions.
- Synthetic a priori are to be found, in the first place, in mathematics. Similarly the propositions of geometry are also synthetic a priori propositions. In the second place, synthetic a priori propositions are also found in physics.
- Metaphysics aims at extending our knowledge of reality. Its propositions must therefore, be synthetic. At the same time, if it is not an empirical science, its propositions must be a priori. It follows, therefore, that if metaphysics is possible; it must consist of synthetic a priori propositions. But the claim of metaphysics as a science is in doubt.
- Kant believes that the human reason is naturally impelled to raise problems which cannot be answered empirically and as such one can ask how metaphysics, considered as a natural disposition is possible. But Kant doubts whether the claim of metaphysics to constitute a science is justified - the question here is really whether metaphysics considered as a science is possible.
- Kant solved the problem of the synthetic a priori judgment by substituting a new hypothesis concerning the relation between the mind and its objects. He suggested the hypothesis: 'Hitherto it has been assumed that all our knowledge must conform to objects. But all attempts to ascertain anything about them a priori by concepts, and thus to extend our knowledge, came to nothing on this assumption. Let us try the, whether we may not make better progress in the task of metaphysics if we assume that objects must conform to our knowledge. This at all events accords better with the possibility which we are seeking, namely of a knowledge of objects a priori, which would determine something about them before they are given to us.'
- Kant's Copernican revolution does not imply the view that reality can be reduced to the human mind and its ideas. He is not suggesting that the human mind creates

things, as far as their existence is concerned, by thinking them. What he is suggesting is that we cannot know things, that they cannot be objects of knowledge for us, except in so far as they are subjected to certain a priori conditions of knowledge on the part of the subject.

5.6 FURTHER READING

1) Descartes, R. 1975. The Philosophical Writings of Descartes. Ed. J. Cottingham, R. Stoodhoff, and D. Murdoch, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
2) Fogelin, R. 1994. Pyrrhonian reflections on Knowledge and Justifications, Oxford: Oxford University Press
3) Hume, D. Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding and Concerning the Principles of Morals ed. P. Nidditch, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
4) Kant, Immanuel. 1929. Critique of Pure Reason trans. Norman Kemp Smith. New York: St. Martin's Press
5) Dicker, Georges. 2004. Kant's theory of knowledge; an analytic introduction. Oxford University Press,
6) Guyer, Paul (ed.) 2006. The Cambridge Companion to Kant and Modern philosophy. Cambridge University Press

5.7 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Ans to Q 1: a) False b)True c) False d) True

Ans to Q 2: a) Pyrrho/ Elis b) Sextus Empiricus c) Three

a). Principle of non-contradiction b) Am

Ans to Q 3: a) Yes b) Yes c) No d) No

Ans to Q 4: a) Induction b) Relations of Ideas

c) Cause and effect d) Necessary connection

e) Natural impulses

5.8 MODEL QUESTIONS

A. Short Questions

Q 1: What do you mean by Pyrrhonian Skepticism?

Q 2: Define skepticism

Q 3: What is global skepticism?

Q 4: What are the different kinds of skepticism?

Q 5: Who wrote the book Meditations?

Q 6: What are the two skeptical hypothesis put forward by Descartes?

Q 7: State the meaning of Cogito ergo sum.

Q 8: Who is the author of essay concerning human understanding?

B. Short Questions (Answer in about 100-150 words)

Q 1: Write a short note on Copernican revolution.

Q 2: Distinguish between analytic and Synthetic judgments.

Q 3: What is skeptical hypothesis? Explain in brief.

Q 4: Do you find any distinction between 'Antecedent' and 'Consequent' skepticism? Briefly discuss.

Q 5: Briefly explain the distinction between a-priori knowledge and a-posteriori Knowledge.

Q 6: What are the distinctions between Global and local skepticism? Explain briefly.

Q 7: What are three grounds on which St. Augustine refuted total or global skepticism? Briefly explain.

Q 8: Write a brief note on Humean Scepticism.

Q 9: Explain briefly on Synthetic a posteriori judgments.

C. Long Questions (Answer in about 300-500 words)

Q 1: What do you understand by skepticism? Discuss

Q 2: Explain and examine different kinds of skepticism.

Q 3: Discuss Kant's theory of Criticism.

Q 4: Is synthetic a priori statement possible? Discuss.

Q 5: Explain the Copernican revolution.

Q 6: What is skepticism? Explain the viewpoints of Cartesian skepticism.

Q 7: What are the different kinds of knowledge? Discuss.

Q 8: Discuss the different types of judgments.

UNIT: 6 THEORIES OF TRUTH

Unit structure

6.1 Learning Objectives

6.2 Introduction

6.3 Truth in Philosophy

6.4 Correspondence theory of truth

6.5 Coherence theory of truth

6.6 Pragmatic theory of truth

6.7 Let Us Sum Up

6.8 Further Reading

6.9 Answers to Check Your Progress

6.10 Model Questions

6.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit you will be able to:

- Define truth in Philosophy
- Identify what are the theories of truth
- Describe 'The Correspondence Theory' of truth
- Explain 'The coherence theory' of truth
- Describe 'The Pragmatic Theory' of truth

6.2 INTRODUCTION

This unit introduces to you the different Theories of truth. You know that a judgment may be true or false. But the question is how truth and falsity are known or tested in philosophy. Philosophers admit three principal Tests of truth. They are:

- Correspondence theory of truth
- Coherence theory of truth
- Pragmatic theory of truth

Realists support the Correspondence and Pragmatic theories of truth while the idealists support the Coherence theory of truth.

The Correspondence theory of truth considers correspondence to be the test of truth. It advocates that a judgment is true if there is a correspondence between the judgment and fact; otherwise the judgment will be false. The Coherence theory

considers coherence to be the test of truth. It views that a judgment is true if it coheres with a system. On the other hand, the Pragmatic theory of truth considers workability or meaningfulness and utility or usefulness as the test of truth. So, the pragmatic theory says that a judgment is true if it is workable or meaningful or useful.

To sum up, correspondence, coherence and workability or meaningfulness are the three tests of Truth.

6.3 TRUTH IN PHILOSOPHY

Before we talk about the theories of Truth, let us think about what is truth in philosophy. Philosophers view that Truth is an attribute of beliefs, opinions, theories, doctrines, statements, etc. According to philosophers, there are mainly three theories of Truth.

- Correspondence theory of Truth
- Coherence theory of Truth
- Pragmatic theory of Truth

6.4 CORRESPONDENCE THEORY OF TRUTH

The Correspondence theory is the oldest among the theories of truth. It is found in Aristotle's *Metaphysics*. He formulates the theory such as: –'to say of what is that it is, or of what is not that is not, is true'. This formulation can be symbolically represented in modern logic as ' "p" is true if and only if p'. The Correspondence theory holds that there is a direct correspondence between judgment and reality. As for instance, 'grass is green' is a judgment. But the question is, whether the judgment is true or false. Correspondence theory holds that there is a direct correspondence between grass and green. It is not the case that grass is not green. That is why it can be held that the judgment 'grass is green' is true.

It is a common sense theory of truth. Common sense holds that objects exist independently of knowledge in the external world. Our sense organs directly perceive that grass is green. In this context our sense organs do not depend on previous knowledge of things which idealism advocates. Therefore, this theory of truth is known as direct realism or naive realism. Common sense holds that our mind comes in direct contact with the objects. As for instance, people perceive-'The Sun revolves around the Earth'. It is indeed correct in perception. But in reality it is not correct. On the other hand, 'the Earth revolves around the Sun' is a true judgment.

Therefore, naive realists view cannot be accepted which asserts a direct correspondence between judgment and reality.

Neo- realism is an improvement upon naive realism. Because neo-realists view that truth consists in the correspondence between knowledge and its object. According to neo-realism, the contents of knowledge are numerically identical with things known. As for instance, when we know a tree we say that it is the same object which is present in the external world and also in our consciousness. Some neo-realists say that it is not the case that the tree bodily enters into our consciousness, rather there is a structural identity between the tree and consciousness.

This theory is also not satisfactory. Here also the correspondence between knowledge and its object is confusing. Because we do not see in what sense we can speak of a correspondence between the two. It can be said that there is no subjective content of the mind that might correspond to the object.

Another form of the correspondence theory is known as the copy theory of ideas. It is found in Locke's book *Essay Concerning Human Understanding*. He says that the ideas constituted by the objects are the copies of objects. But this theory is also not satisfactory. Because objects are external to the mind and its ideas. So, knowledge cannot be directly known by us. Ideas are subjective in the sense that they are private. And objects are objective in the sense that they are public or can be known. Therefore, it will be wrong to say that knowledge is a direct correspondence between ideas and objects.

Another form of the correspondence theory is the logical theory of correspondence. It is advocated by Bertrand Russell. This theory holds that truth is defined by correspondence to fact and not by experience. A proposition is true when it corresponds to fact. But a proposition may be true without our knowing it as true. As for instance, the proposition, 'it is raining' is true if it is actually true. It may be the case that you may be sleeping at that time when it is raining and do not realize that it is true. But that will not make the proposition any less true. If you wake up and look out of the window of your room you would know that the proposition "it is raining" is true. So, the logical theory of correspondence holds that truth depends on the character of correspondence to some real facts. And the knowledge of truth depends on its verification by experience. But it is not that all true propositions are verified. As for instance, general propositions like 'All men are mortal' are true in so far as they

correspond to facts. But it cannot be verified by experience because we can have no experience of the unlimited number of instances. Hence, we conclude that the truth of a proposition does not depend on its verification by experience. Rather, we can say that truth of a proposition depends on its correspondence to fact.

ACTIVITY : 6.1

- Do you find any relationship between correspondence theory and realism?

  ……

  ……

  ……

  ……

- Do you accept the correspondence theory of truth?

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q 1: Name the supporters of the correspondence theory of truth.

……

Q 2: How do philosophers view truth?

……

Q 3: Say true or false:

a. There are three principal tests of truth (T/F)

b. Correspondence theory is found in Aristotle's *Metaphysics* (T/F)

Q 4: What is meant by correspondence theory of truth?

……

6.5 COHERENCE THEORY OF TRUTH

By now you have an idea about the concept of correspondence theory of truth. Now let us look at the Coherence theory of truth.

The Coherence theory of Truth is another form of the theories of truth. According to this theory, a judgment is true if it coheres with our beliefs within a system. It is generally accepted by the idealists. Idealists like Berkley, Hegel, Bradley and Bosanquet accept this theory of truth. It also has been accepted by logical positivists like Neurath, Hempel. But there is a difference between logical positivists and idealists.

The logical positivist theory of coherence is found among a system. It is the totality of all possible systems and is true by itself. On the other hand the Hegelian

form of the Coherence theory is the theory of absolutists. It differs from logical positivists in two important ways.

- It is not the consistency of formal logic which may characterize a system and make it valid, but not true. A system of thought may be formally consistent but materially false and therefore not correct. As for instance, think about gold mountain. This example is formally and logically correct but not materially in the sense that gold mountain is not found in experience.
- The Hegelians do not advocate the view given by the logical positivists. According to the logical positivists, there are different systems of truth. The different systems of truth are inconsistent with one another. Because a proposition which is true in one sense may be false in another. Against this view, the Hegelians say that the ideal of knowledge is a 'system, not of truths, but of truth'. They advocate that truth is all inclusive and harmonius whole.

Coherence theory also admits degrees of truth. Because a judgment which is consistent and coheres with the all comprehensive system of knowledge is absolutely true. But the problem is that we cannot attain such type of absolute truth. We know that an absolute truth is an ideal truth. A judgment becomes more true if it coheres with the whole system of knowledge. So, coherence admits degrees of truth. Bradley, an absolutist idealist therefore, views that judgments are partially true and partially false. His view is that "truth must exhibit the mark of expansion and all-inclusiveness." He through this saying admits degrees of truth.

From the ordinary view point, it can be said that individual statements lead to degrees of truth in comparison to the whole system of truth. So, a judgment may be partially true or partially false. That is why all human errors may be said to be partial truths. Hence, it can be said that Coherence theory of truth admits degrees of truth.

The Coherence theory of truth is also not satisfactory. Because this theory of truth leads to relativism in the sense that it admits different degrees of truth. So, the question comes to our mind, what is the objectivity of truth then? In answer it can be said that truth cannot be varying. If it is, then telling lies by someone will be true. And as a result we fail to distinguish between truth and falsity in our practical life. But the advocates of the coherence theory do not accept this objection. Because at first people thought that 'the Earth is the center of the universe'. This was accepted as true knowledge until the truth being discovered that not the Earth, rather the Sun is

the center of the universe. So, it can be said that the first view was inconsistent when the later view is being proved to be true by Galileo (the Sun is the center of the universe).

ACTIVITY : 6.2

- Do you find any relationship between coherence theory and idealism?

  ……..
- Do you accept the coherence theory of truth?

  ……..

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q 5: Define coherence theory of truth (Answer in about 50 words)

……

Q 6: State whether the following statements are true or false

a. Coherence theory of truth is generally accepted by idealists (T/F)

b. Coherence theory is also accepted by logical positivists (T/F)

6.6 PRAGMATIC THEORY OF TRUTH

Now you have some idea about the concept of Coherence theory of truth. Let us know about the Pragmatic theory of truth.

Pragmatism asserts that usefulness or workability is the test of truth. An idea is true if it works. If it leads to fruitful consequence, it is true. On the other hand, if it leads to unfruitful consequence, it will be false. As for instance, fire burns. This judgment is true if fire burns. On the other hand, the above mentioned judgment will be false if fire does not burn in experience. Therefore, the test of truth is pragmatic usefulness, successful activity, fruitful consequence or utility.

The supporters of the pragmatic theory are William James, Schiller and Dewey.

William James in his book *Pragmatism* states: 'Truth is a property of certain of our ideas. It means their agreement, as falsity means their disagreement with reality.' By the agreement of ideas he does not mean that our ideas copy reality. It also does not mean that there is a fixed relation of correspondence between ideas and objects. Therefore, it cannot be said that ideas are true because they copy or correspond to

reality. That is why it is clear that pragmatic theory goes against the correspondence theory of truth.

The truth of ideas depends on verifiability. "True ideas are those that we can assimilate, validate, corroborate and verify. False ideas are those that we cannot." Ideas and judgments are not true until they are verified by their fruitful consequences. When they lead to successful activities they are true. An idea is not true by itself. This means that the truth of an idea is constituted by verifiability. William James in his book *Essays in Pragmatism* says: 'True ideas are that we assimilate, validate, corroborate, and verify. False ideas are those that we cannot.'

Schiller points out that the question of truth is primarily a practical one. Our success in practical life depends on our ability to predict and control the course of events in the world. We want to discover truth. The test of truth depends on our ability to predict and control the course of events in the world. Predictions which are formally valid, but practically inapplicable are only truth-claims. Truth claims are not considered as truths. So, predictions become true only when it turns to success. Here we find a distinction between positive value of successful prediction and negative value of unsuccessful prediction.

According to Dewey, truth or knowledge is the outcome of adequate enquiry. 'Knowledge is related to enquiry as a product of the operations by which it is produced.' Enquiry is a process of investigation which is evoked by a doubtful situation. It begins in doubt and proceeds to remove doubt through proper investigation. A proposition is true means it is warranted by competent and controlled enquiry. Dewey prefers to use the words 'warranted assertability' for knowledge or truth.

The pragmatic theory has been criticized by critics. According to them, pragmatic theory reduces the true to be useful and obliterates the distinction between truth and error. It is a matter of common experience that what is not useful and what is false may sometimes be useful for certain purposes.

Again the pragmatic theory makes truth appear as subjective. If the test of truth is utility or usefulness, then the truth will depend on people's interest. That is why, it is clear that pragmatic theory cannot provide us objective test of truth. So, it can be said that pragmatic theory is not satisfactory.

ACTIVITY : 6.3

- Is pragmatic theory practical? Give answer

  .....

  .....

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q 7: Fill up the blanks:

a. ————————————————————is the test of pragmatic theory of truth.

b. Pragmatic theory is supported by————————————————————.

Q 8: State whether the following statements are true or false:

a. James wrote, *Essays in Pragmatism* (T/F)

b. Pragmatic theory is free from criticism (T/F)

Q 9: What is pragmatic theory of truth? (Answer is about 50 words)

.....

6.7 LET US SUM UP

- Aristotle formulates the theory of truth such as: –'to say of what is that it is, or of what is not that is not, is true'.
- The Correspondence theory holds that there is a direct correspondence between judgment and reality. It is a common sense theory of truth. Common sense holds that objects exist independently of knowledge in the external world. As for instance, 'grass is green' is a judgment. But the question is, whether the judgment is true or false.
- Correspondence theory holds that there is a direct correspondence between grass and green. It is not the case that grass is not green. That is why it can be held that the judgment 'grass is green' is true.
- The Coherence theory of Truth is another form of the theories of truth. According to this theory, a judgment is true if it coheres with our beliefs within a system.
- It is generally accepted by the idealists. Idealists like Berkley, Hegel, Bradley and Bosanquet accept this theory of truth.
- Pragmatism asserts that usefulness or workability is the test of truth. An idea is true if it works. If it leads to fruitful consequence, it is true. On the other hand, if it leads to unfruitful consequence, it will be false. As for instance, fire burns. This

judgment is true if fire burns. On the other hand, the above mentioned judgment will be false if fire does not burn in experience. Therefore, the test of truth is pragmatic usefulness, successful activity, fruitful consequence or utility. The supporters of the pragmatic theory are William James, Schiller and Dewey.

6.8 FURTHER READING

- Chatterjee, S.C. (1949) The Problems of Philosophy, (Das Gupta & Co. Ltd., Calcutta
- Patrick, G.T. (2006) Introduction to Philosophy: (Surjeet Publications, Delhi)
- Datta, D.M. (1961) Chief Currents of Contemporary Philosophy: Bharati Printing Books, Calcutta, University Press
- Hosper, J. (1973) An Introduction to Philosophical Analysis. (Revised Edition, London Routledge &Kegan Paul).

6.9 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Answer to Q No 1: Aristotle, John Locke, Bertrand Russell support correspondence theory of truth.

Answer to Q No 2: Truth is an attribute of beliefs, opinion, theories, doctrines, statements, etc.

Answer to Q No 3. a) Ans: True.

b) Ans: True.

Answer to Q No 4: This theory says that a judgment is true if it coheres with our beliefs within a system.

Answer to Q No 5: According to this theory, a judgment is true if it coheres with our beliefs within a system.

Answer to Q No 6: a) Ans. True.

b) Ans. True

Answer to Q No 7: a) Pragmatic usefulness, successful activity, fruitful consequence or utility is the test of truth.

b) Ans: William James, Schiller, Dewey

Answer to Q No 8: a) Ans: True

b) Ans: False

Answer to Q No 9: According to Pragmatism, usefulness or workability is the test of truth. An idea is true if it works. If it leads to fruitful consequence, it is true. On the other hand, if it leads to unfruitful consequence, it will be false. As for instance, fire burns. This judgment is true if fire burns. On the other hand, the above mentioned judgment will be false if fire does not burn in experience. Therefore, the test of truth is pragmatic usefulness, successful activity, fruitful consequence or utility.

6.10 MODEL QUESTIONS

A) Objective questions (Answer in about 50 words)

Q 1: Name two supporters of pragmatic theory of truth.

Q 2: What is pragmatic theory?

Q 3: What are the theories of truth?

Q 4: What is the logical theory of correspondence formulated by Aristotle?

B) Short questions (Answer in about 100-150 words)

Q 1: Explain in brief the pragmatic theory of truth.

Q 2: Is pragmatic theory satisfactory? Explain in brief.

Q 3: Explain in brief the coherence theory of truth.

Q 4: Explain in brief the correspondence theory of truth.

C) Long questions (Answer in about 300-500 words)

Q 1: Explain the correspondence theory of truth. Is it satisfactory?

Q 1: Explain the pragmatic theory of truth.

Q 2: Explain the coherence theory of truth.

UNIT 7: REALISM: NAIVE AND SCIENTIFIC

Unit Structures:

7.1: Learning Objectives

7.2: Introduction

7.3: Classification of Realism

7.4: Naïve Realism

7.5: Scientific Realism

7.6: Difference between Naïve and Scientific Realism

7.7: Conclusion

7.8: Let us sum up

7.9: Further Reading

7.10: Answer to check your Progress

7.11: Model Questions

7.1: LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit you will be able to:

- define realism
- explain the characteristics of realism.
- discuss the concept of Naive realism
- discuss the concept of Scientific realism
- explain the difference between Naïve and Scientific Realism.

7.2: INTRODUCTION

Philosophy deals with knowledge and reality. In philosophy various analyses of reality are found. Realism is a philosophical theory according to which, objects of our knowledge are real. This view is also called Objectivism. Realism as a metaphysical theory is concerned with existence of objects or things. Epistemological analysis of Realism is that objects are independent of knowing minds or the knower. According to Realism, knower and the object of knowledge are only externally related. The reality of an object is not affected by its relation with the knower. Therefore, the basic principle of Realism is that, the object and its qualities are independent of knowing mind.

A few characteristics of Realism are,

- Existence of objects is independent of knowledge.
- Qualities of objects are inherent in the objects.
- Knowledge does not affect an object.

7.3: CLASSIFICATION OF REALISM

There are various types of Realism. Two chief forms of Realism are, Naïve Realism and Scientific Realism. The supporters of common sense view propounded the Naïve Realistic view. According to this view, an object is precisely what it is seen to be. On the other hand Scientific Realism is basically based the scientific view. John Locke put forwarded the scientific theory, according to which objects exist mind-independently. It is a positive epistemic attitude.

7.4: NAIVE REALISM

Naive Realism is the most common and simple form of Realism. A perceived object independently exists. It neither depends on our perception nor on our knowledge. This is the Realistic approach for all common individuals. Therefore, it is also called Natural Realism and Commonsense Realism. The central theme of Naïve or popular Realism is that the knower of the objects knows something directly with all its qualities.

The term Naïve Realism was firstly coined by Durant Drake in his "Invitation to Philosophy". The chief characteristics of Naïve-Realism are,

- Objects exist independently of knowledge of them:
  Objects do not come into existence after being known or perceived. All the objects of the world continue to exist independently. They can exist without the knowing mind. For example, a stone has its independent existence. We may or may not know about it or may not perceive it. And this perception or knowledge in no way, influence its existence.
- Objects possess their own qualities:
  Each object has its quality and characteristics. And these qualities are inhered by the object. The perceiver or the knower does not impose qualities upon the object. For example hardness is a quality of a stone. This quality resides in the stone. Thus, just like an object qualities and characteristics of objects also exist independently.

- Knowledge does not influence objects:
  Knowledge of an object in no way influences the object and its existence. It has its own independent existence. For example as mentions above, a stone and its qualities are never affected by its knowledge of a person.
- The object is that what appears to be:
  The form and the nature of an object cannot be differentiated. An object is that what appears to be. In the same way, a person can not show any difference between the knowledge and experience of an object. While perceiving an object our knowledge and perception of it will be the same.
- Objects are public:
  Objects are always public. Therefore, the knowledge of an object is also public and not limited by an individual. Different people can have knowledge of the same object. For example everyone can experience an object and also can acquire knowledge of that.
- World of external objects:
  There is a self existent external world which is outside of human mind and knowledge.
- Objects can be known directly:
  Objects are known directly. Individuals can directly experience an object. Both knower and the known can have direct relation.

Thus, according to Naïve Realism, our ideas are the copies of the objects of the external world. All the qualities of the objects are real. They have objective existence of their own. All the qualities of the objects are also equally essential and real.

7.5: SCIENTIFIC REALISM

Scientific Realism is, primarily the view that the world described by the science is the real world as it is. Thus, Scientific Realism is basically, a) Positive epistemic attitude towards the content of our best scientific theories and models and b)Basically, it is the idea that science, although not perfect, is doing a decent job of explain the world. Scientific Realism is a form of Realism which was established by John Locke. The origin of Scientific Realism has come with a negative approach by criticising the limitations of Naïve Realism. As a kind of Realism, Scientific Realism believes in the existence of an external world independent of human mind. Locke in his analyses

tried to give a scientific account of the experiences of the external world. Locke was an empiricist philosopher. In his book, "*An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*", he describes the nature of knowledge. According to him, knowledge proper is certain, instructive and real. He believed in the independent world of objects. As an empiricist philosopher Locke believes that, there is nothing in the intellect that was not previously present in the senses. Thus, Locke explains knowledge in terms of experience.

The chief characteristics of Scientific Realism are,

- Objects are independent of knowledge:

  As a form of Realism, Scientific Realism believes that objects exist independently of the knowledge of them. They exist by themselves.

- Objects are not known directly:

  One can know an object by its qualities. In explaining, this Locke introduced the idea of primary and secondary qualities. Locke describes knowledge as an indirect process.

- There is a distinction between the primary and secondary qualities of objects:

  John Locke distinguishes between primary and secondary qualities of objects. The primary qualities are immune to any influence of knowledge, because they belong to the object itself. A few examples of primary qualities are shape, size, length, solidity, number and mobility etc. These are primary qualities, because they belong to the objects. On the other hand, the qualities those do not exist in the objects, are called secondary qualities. For example, colour, taste, smell, heat etc are secondary qualities and they vary to different person or same person at different time.

- The primary qualities of the objects do not depend on the knower:

  As the primary qualities belong to the object, therefore knowledge cannot influence the primary qualities. The primary qualities are objective and general. Mind does not conjure up the primary ideas, because they are images of primary qualities. But, secondary ideas are copies of secondary qualities and they are influenced by knowledge.

- Primary ideas originating in objects are public:

  For primary ideas objects are public. As the fundamental criterion on

realism, objects do not depend on knowledge for their existence. By differentiating between primary and secondary qualities, Scientific Realism holds that objects, primary qualities and primary objects are public or objective. They do not differ from person to person.

In this way, by showing the distinction between primary and secondary qualities, Locke tried to give away a scientific interpretation of the nature of external world. Knowledge is obtained as a representation of the objects of the external world. Hence, his view of knowledge is also known as Representationalism.

7.6: DIFFERENCE BETWEEN NAÏVE AND SCIENTIFIC REALISM

Naive and Scientific Realism are two types of realism, which put forward their own versions of Realism. Both types of Realism possess the Realistic attitude. But, Naïve and Scientific Realism differ in the following points,

- According to Naïve Realism, objects exist independently of knowledge of it. Scientific Realism also accepts that objects are independent of knowledge, but also accepts that metaphysical speculation depends upon the mind.
- According to Naïve Realism, qualities of objects exist in it. But, in Scientific Realism, the secondary qualities of the objects are imposed by the mind in the objects.
- According to Naïve Realism, knowledge does not influence the objects. But according to Scientific Realism, ideas can influence the objects in some cases.
- According to Naïve Realism, object is what appears to be. But, in Scientific Realism, there is a difference between the actual object and its ideas, which is only an image of the real object.
- According to Naïve Realism, knowledge is direct. But, in Scientific Realism, knowledge is indirect.
- According to Naïve Realism, objects are known directly. But, Scientific Realism holds that, knowledge of an object is in its complex form through the help of simple ideas.
- Naïve Realism holds that objects are public. But Scientific Realism states that primary ideas are public. But, in case of secondary idea, objects are not public. Because, they differ from person to person for the same object.

7.7: CONCLUSION

The basic criterion of Realism is that object of knowledge is independent of the knowing mind. But, on the basis of whole or partial independence of the objects on the knower's mind, Realism is divided into different types. Naïve or Popular Realism is the simplest form of Realism. It is called Natural Realism and it put forward the commonsense view of the external world. For the Naïve Realists, nature of the object is just like as we perceive. On the other hand, empirical interpretation of John Locke establishes to the Scientific Realistic view, according to which there is a real world of the objects. But, unlike the Naïve Realists, these objects are not directly known. They are known by the qualities of objects. All objects possess their own qualities. The qualities of the objects are divided into two types by the Scientific Realistic thinkers. They are primary and secondary qualities. Primary qualities are unchanging and objective properties of mind. On the other hand, secondary qualities are changing and subjective. Locke in his attempt to reform the limitations of Naïve Realism established a new version of Realism, which is called Scientific Realism or Representationalism. Although Scientific Realism is also criticised by some later thinkers, yet it bears a lot of significance in the history of epistemology.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q1: What is Realism?

.....

Q2: What are the two different types of Realism?

.....

Q3: What is Naïve Realistic approach?

.....

Q4: How the Naïve Realistic thinkers describe the status of the objects?

.....

Q5: Who for the first time coined the term Naïve Realism?

.....

Q 6: "Naïve Realism is also known as Representationalism" – True or false?

.....

Q 7: Who established Scientific Realism?

.....

Q 8: How the Scientific Realism described the status of the objects?

.....

Q9: "For the Scientific Realism objects are directly known" – true or false?

.....

Q10: What is primary quality according to Locke?

.....

Q11: What is secondary quality of an object, according to Locke?

.....

Q12: Are primary qualities of an object, subjective or objective as described by Locke?

.....

Q 13: Are secondary qualities of an object, subjective or objective as described by Locke?

.....

7.8: LET US SUM UP

- Philosophy deals with knowledge and reality.
- Realism is a philosophical theory according to which, objects of our knowledge are real.
- Realism as a metaphysical theory is concerned with existence of objects or things.
- Epistemological analysis of Realism is that objects are independent of knowing minds or the knower.
- Two chief forms of Realism are, Naïve Realism and Scientific Realism.
- Naïve Realism is the most common and simple form of Realism according to which, a perceived object independently exists.
- The term Naïve Realism was firstly coined by Durant Drake in his "Invitation to Philosophy".
- According to Naïve Realism, objects exist independently of the knowledge of them and knowledge does not influence objects
- Scientific Realism was established by the Empiricist philosopher, John Locke.
- In his book, "An Essay Concerning Human Understanding", Locke describes the nature of knowledge according to which, knowledge proper is certain, instructive and real.

- As a form of Realism, Scientific Realism believes that objects exist independently of the knowledge of them and they exist by themselves.
- According to Locke, one can know an object by its qualities.
- Locke introduced the idea of primary and secondary qualities.
- Locke describes knowledge as an indirect process.
- According to Scientific Realism, primary qualities are objective and secondary qualities are subjective
- Scientific Realism of Locke is also known as Representationalism
- Scientific Realism holds that, knowledge of an object is in its complex form through the help of simple ideas.

7.9: FURTHER READING

1) Masih, Y. (1993). *A Critical History of Western Philosophy.* Motilal Banarsidass

2) Sharma,R.M (2010). Western and Indian Metaphysics and Epistemology. Surjeet Publication.

3) Sinha, J. N.(2014). *Introduction to Philosophy.* New Central Book Agency (P)Ltd.

7.10: ANSWER TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Ans to Q 1: Realism is a philosophical theory according to which, objects of our knowledge are real.

Ans to Q 2: Two chief forms of Realism are, Naïve Realism and Scientific Realism.

Ans to Q 3: The Realistic viewpoint, according to which an object is precisely what it is seen to be, is known as Naïve Realism.

Ans to Q 4: According to Naïve Realism, objects exist independently of the knowledge of them

Ans to Q 5: The term Naïve Realism was firstly coined by Durant Drake in his "Invitation to Philosophy".

Ans to Q 6: False. Naïve Realism is also known as Natural Realism or Common sense.

Ans to Q 7: Scientific Realism was established by the Empiricist philosopher, John Locke.

Ans to Q 8: As a form of Realism, Scientific Realism believes that objects exist independently of the knowledge of them and they exist by themselves.

Ans to Q 9: False. According to Scientific Realism, objects are not known directly

Ans to Q 10: According to Locke, the qualities those exist in the object are called primary qualities. For example, shape, size, length, solidity, number and mobility etc are primary qualities and they are immune to any influence of knowledge.

Ans to Q 11: According to Locke, the qualities those do not exist in the object are called secondary qualities. For example, colour, taste, smell, heat etc are secondary qualities and they vary to different person or same person at different time.

Ans to Q 12: According to Locke, primary qualities are objective.

Ans to Q 13: According to Locke, primary qualities are objective; because they exist in the object themselves and they are immune to any influence of knowledge.

7.11 MODEL QUESTIONS

A. Very Short Questions:

Q 1: What is Realism?
Q 2: What are the types of Realism?
Q 3: What is Naïve Realism?
Q 4: What is Scientific Realism?
Q 5: Define primary quality?
Q 6: Define secondary quality?
Q 7: What is the status of objects of external world in Realism?

B. Short Questions: (Write in about 150 words)

Q 1: Write briefly about characteristics of Realism.
Q 2: Write a short note on Naïve Realism.
Q 3: Briefly explain Locke's Representationalism.
Q 4: What are the differences between primary and secondary qualities?
Q 5: Write briefly about the Scientific Realism.

C. Long Questions: (Write in about 300-500 words)

Q 1: What is Scientific Realism? Write the characteristics of Scientific Realism.
Q 2: What is Naïve Realism? Write the characteristics of Naïve Realism.
Q 3: Explain the differences between primary and secondary qualities.
Q 4: Distinguish between Naïve Realism and Scientific Realism.

****

UNIT 8: IDEALISM: SUBJECTIVE AND OBJECTIVE

UNIT STRUCTURE

8.1 Learning Objectives

8.2 Introduction

8.3 Definitions of Idealism

8.3.1 Kinds of Idealism

8.4. Definition of Subjective idealism

8.4.1. Supporters of Subjective Idealism

8.4.2. Viewpoints on Subjective Idealism

8.5 Definition of Objective Idealism

8.5.1 Supporters of Objective idealism

8.5.2 Viewpoints on objective idealism

8.6 Let Us Sum Up

8.7 Further Readings

8.8 Answers to Check Your Progress

8.9 Model Questions

8.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to:

- Discuss the nature of idealism and kinds of idealism
- Explain subjective idealism
- Describe objective idealism
- Explain different philosophers view on subjective and objective idealism

8.2 INTRODUCTION

This unit introduces to you Idealism and its kinds. Idealism is a term used to describe the sort of theory, which claims that something “ideal” or non-physical, or non-material, or non-extended, is the primary reality. Idealism does not quarrel with the naive view that material things exist; rather, it disagrees with the analysis of a material thing that many philosophers have offered, according to which the material world is wholly independent of minds. Idealism is a complex subject with several facets. In this sense, Plato, Berkeley Leibniz and Hegel are the most significant idealists. Idealism is of two kinds. They are respectively:

- Subjective idealism
- Objective idealism

Subjective idealism holds that nothing can exist except being associated to mind and its ideas. George Berkeley is the main exponent of subjective idealism. On the other hand objective idealism holds that objects are identical with ideas. It also can be defined as forms or ideas are the ultimate reality. It is also known as absolute idealism. Hegel and Bradley accept this form of idealism.

8.3 DEFINITIONS OF IDEALISM

Phenomena: It informs an external world. Perceptions of ordinary objects or even rainbows fall into this class.

Idealism is a term that is associated with ideas in the mind. In philosophy the term refers to the view which believes that all objects in nature and experience are representations of the mind. In this sense idealism is opposed to materialism. The Merriam-Webster on line Dictionary puts foreward the following definitions of idealism: '1 a: a theory that ultimate reality lies in a realm transcending phenomena. (2): a theory that the essential nature of reality lies in consciousness or reason (1): a theory that only the perceptible is real. (2): a theory that only mental states or entities are knowable. 2 a: the practice of forming ideals or living under their influence : something that is idealized. 3: literary or artistic theory or practice that affirms the preeminent value of imagination as compared with faithful copying of nature.

Skepticism: Is the denial that knowledge is even rational belief is possible.

Pan Psychism: (Pan- all, Psyche-soul, mind): According to which a mental element is present in everything.

8.3.1 Kinds of Idealism

Philosophical Idealism comes primarily in two forms: Subjective Idealism and Objective Idealism, although Idealism in general comes in several flavors. Plato the "Founding Father" of idealism in Western philosophy claimed that what is fundamentally real are ideas. His doctrine of "Forms', are certainly "ideals" in a broad sense. Plato's "Forms" are not 'beings in any kind', or only 'mind dependent realities'. Rather, he often describes these Forms as having their own mind-independent reality, an existence of their own. So, Plato can not be categorized as a subjective idealist in

the manner of Bishop Berkeley, although his name is associated with the Western Idealism in general, because of the idealistic tendencies of his philosophy. Plato's allegory of the cave addresses the question of our knowledge of the Good or the Real that is different in nature from the philosophical skepticism about the nature of the external world. Even then Plato is branded as an idealist of a different kind. Paul Natrop, a German Neo-Kantian philosopher defines Plato's philosophy as 'Transcendental Idealism, somewhat in the manner of Kant. More than Plato, it is in Plotinus, that we find Idealism proper, who says 'The only space or place of the world is soul'.

Among others most prominent ones are Immanuel Kant and Leibniz. Leibniz is perhaps the most consistent, since he said that all physical things are actually made up of little bundles of consciousness he called "monads", an idea that is close to Panpsychism. Leibniz expressed a form of Idealism known as Panpsychism in his theory of monads. It is exposited in his Monadologie. He held that Monads are the true atoms of the universe. They are also entities having sensation. The monads are "substantial forms of being".They are indecomposable, individual, subject to their own laws, un-interacting, and each reflecting the entire universe. Monads are centers of force; substance is force, while space, matter, and motion are phenomenal.

Immanuel Kant developed a kind of critical or, Transcendental Idealism. He shows that the phenomenal world is constituted by the human understanding. It stands opposed to a world of things-in-themselves (Transcendental). Kant thus emphasized the difference between things as they appear to an observer and things in themselves.This Kantian sort of idealism opens up a world of abstractions (i.e., the universal categories minds use to understand phenomena) to be explored by reason.

Kant's arguments for this conclusion are pretty complicated. One argument for this concerns the nature of space and time. Kant supposed that we know certain things about objects located in space and changing in time, a priori, that is to say not as generalizations from particular experiences but as somehow presenting themselves as necessary. Transcendental Idealism, as developed by Kant, argues that all knowledge originate in perceived phenomena which have been organized by categories. *Critique of Pure Reason, (*1929) presented a formalistic or transcendental Idealism. Kant's particular doctrine that the most general characteristics of the physical world are imposed on it by our minds, are questionable

today. For scientists have come to think that perhaps not every event at sub-microscopic level does have a cause. Kant's view is that how the world appears to us is to considerable extent determined by the nature of our own minds rather than by the nature of what is appearing. It remains a very plausible viewpoint.

The post-Kantian German idealism of ***J. G. Fichte*** and ***Friedrich von Schelling***, which culminated in the absolute or objective idealism of ***G. W. F. Hegel***. It began with a denial of the unknowable thing-in-itself, thereby enabling these philosophers to treat all reality as the creation of mind or spirit. Samuel Coleridge developed forms of post-Kantian idealism in Germany. Arthur Schopenhauer and Hermann Lotze too, did in England. T. H. Green, Victor Cousin, and C. B. Renouvier developed forms of post-Hegelian idealism in England and France.

8.4 DEFINITION OF SUBJECTIVE IDEALISM

According to Subjective Idealism, only ideas can be known or have any reality. Nature has no objective existence independent of the minds that perceive it. Berkeley is known as a subjective idealist in western thought. The subjective idealism of George Berkeley holds that the apparently objective world has no existence apart from the consciousness of individuals.

8.4.1 Supporters of Subjective Idealism

According to Berkeley, reality is only within the mind. All that is outside the mind can't be perceived or even thought about. Berkeley is the main advocate of Subjective Idealism. It was developed in various ways by Schopenhauer, J J.M.E.Mc Taggart etc. Among some prominent idealists who were influenced by both Kant and Hegel, and indeed also by Berkeley, are the British philosophers T.H. Green, Edward Caird, F.H. Bradley, Bernard Bosanquet, the American Philosopher Josiah Royace and james Ferrier.

8.4.2 Viewpoints on Subjective Idealism

The Subjective Idealism of George Berkeley in the 18th century denies that material objects exist independently of human perception. So, idealism stands opposed to both realism and naturalism. In this theory, there is a relation between the perceiver and the perceived object. This theory shows that the object is nothing more than a collection of sense data in the perceiver. For George Berkeley there was

indeed no "real" knowable object behind one's perception, that what was "real" was the perception itself. This is characterised by Berkeley's slogan: "Esse est aut percipi aut percipere" or "To be is to be perceived or to perceive". It means that something only exists, in the particular way that it is seen to exist when it is being perceived (seen, felt etc.) by an observing subject. It creates the problem of explaining how it is that each of us apparently has much the same sort of perceptions of an object. He solved this problem by having God to intervene the process as the immediate cause of all of our perceptions, all as permanent ideas in God's mind.

Schopenhauer defined the ideal as being mental pictures that constitute subjective knowledge. The ideal, for him, is what can be attributed to our own minds. The images in our head are what comprise the ideal. British Idealist Bradley asserted that assertion that we cannot think of anything that really exists unless we have a thought of it in our mind. J.M.E.Mc Taggart of Cambridge University argued that minds alone exist. They only relate to each other through love. Space,Time and and material objects are for McTaggart unreal.

ACTIVITY : 8.1

Do you accept the idea that goes against materialism'? Give reasons in favour of your answer.

Answer:……..…….....

…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…

…….

…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…

…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…

Do you find any gap between subjective idealism and transcendental idealism of Kant? Discuss

Ans: ……..…….....

…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…

…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…

…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….…….

ACTIVITY : 8.1

Q 1: Who is the main exponent of subjective idealism?

……

……

Q 2: Write the name of two philosophers who advocate absolute idealism?

……

……

Q 3: What are the two forms of idealism?

……

Q 4: Who is the founding father of idealism?

……

Q 5: Who propounds the theory of monads?

……

Q 6: What is subjective idealism? (Answer in about 30 words)

……

……

……

Q 7: State whether the following statements are True or False

a) Kant advocates transcendental idealism. (True /false)

b) Plotinus says "The only space or place of the world is soul" (True /False)

c) 'To be is to be perceived'- said by Berkeley. (True/False)

d) Bradley is a supporter of subjective idealism. (True/False)

8.5 DEFINITION OF OBJECTIVE IDEALISM

According to Objective Idealism, all objects are identical with some idea and the ideal knowledge is itself the system of ideas. Unlike the other forms of idealism, this is monistic — **there is only one mind in which reality is created**. Objective idealism supposes the world to consist of exemplifications of universals which have their being independent of the mind. Objective idealism accepts common sense Realism (the view that material objects exist) but rejects naturalism (according to which the mind and spiritual values have emerged from material things).

8.5.1 Supporters of Objective Idealism

When compared to Berkeley's Idealism, the German Idealists (Kant, Fichte, Schelling, Hegel, etc.), who had a great influence on the British Idealists. They hold the viewpoints of objective idealism. Objective Idealism is better known as Absolute Idealism. It is associated with the philosophy of Hegel who holds the view that all objects are identical with some idea. And the ideal knowledge is itself the system of ideas. British philosopher Bradley was a notable follower of Hegel's philosophy of objective idealism. American philosopher Josiah Royce described himself as an objective idealist.

8.5.2 Viewpoints of Objective Idealism

Absolute idealism, or objective idealism, comes to fruition in Hegel. Hegel began with a denial of the unknowable thing-in-itself. It enables philosophers to treat all reality as the creation of mind or spirit. Hegel whose system has been called *idealism*, argued in his *Science of Logic* (1812-1814) that finite qualities are not fully "real". Because they depend on other finite qualities to determine them. Qualitative *infinity*, on the other hand, would be more self-determining, and hence would have a better claim to be called fully real. Hegel called his philosophy absolute Idealism. In contrast to the "Subjective Idealism" of Berkeley and the "transcendental idealisms" of Kant and Fichte, which were not based (like Hegel's idealism) on a critique of the finite. The "idealists" listed above whose philosophy (Hegel's philosophy) most closely resembles that of Plato and Plotinus. None of these three thinkers associates their idealism with the epistemological thesis that what we know are "ideas" in our minds.

This form of Absolute Idealism explains all of reality in terms of an Absolute Mind or Spirit reveals itself to our finite minds in every area of human knowledge. Absolute Mind is seen as a unified totality of all rational truth organizing all areas of knowledge and experience into a coherent whole. Full understanding of reality will involve uncovering the underlying rational structure, the totality of Mind, an interpersonal consciousness. Berkeleyan subjective idealism and Kantian transcendental idealism, construe reality in terms of the content of individual minds. Absolute idealism, on the other hand, tends to construe it in terms of an interpersonal consciousness.

The distinction between one 'self' and another tends to lapse, leading to a form of *monism.* According to monism, there is only one thing, the mind divided up into

appearances. All reality is in the mind; there is nothing outside it. Fichte, though influenced by Kant, could not accept the notion of things in themselves. He asked, how we could actually postulate hypotheses about a noumenal world that we knew nothing about, and for which we had no proof whatsoever that it existed at all. He decided that the noumenal world had to go; there could be no grounds for asserting something quite unknown, and no meaning in doing so. After this rejection we are left with just minds and objects of experience. Fichte developed the idea further by referring to two parts of mind, the *I* observes what goes on in the 'non—I', thus eliminating an outside the 'non-I'; objective. The 'I' is what the Greeks might have called the soul. In this manner Fichte could be defined as another exponent of Hegelian type of "Absolute" or Objective Idealism.

Absolute Idealism that we have discussed here is based upon five main claims:

1. Every thing stands in real relations to every other thing.
2. Everything which exists is either an experience or a part of an experience.
3. Two (or more) things can be really related to each other if and only if EITHER there is a whole, which is as genuinely concrete as an individual as is each of them, and which they help to constitute parts thereof, OR alternatively, one of them is similarly a part of the other.
4. Each such part of such a whole has a character within its own bounds, which it is impossible that anything not just such a part that whole could possess.
5. If it is never true that an event E occurred then it is thenceforth always true that E occurred.

ACTIVITY : 8.3

• Why objective idealism is so called absolute idealism? Is there any basic similarity between the two? Discuss

Ans: …….....

….……

• Can objective idealism lead to monism? Give reasons in support of your answer.

Discuss.

Ans: ……

……

……

……

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q 8: what is objective idealism? (Answer in about 30 words)

……

……

Q 9: What is universal mind? (Answer in about 40 words)

……

……

Q 10: State whether the following statements are True or False

a) Objective idealism accepts commonsense. (True/False)

b) Objective idealism is known as absolute idealism.(True/False)

c) Hegel is an advocate of objective idealism. (True/False)

d) Kant and Fichte called his philosophy transcendental. (True/ False)

8.6 LET US KNOW

- Idealism, in terms of metaphysics, is the philosophical view that the mind or spirit constitutes the fundamental reality. It has taken several distinct but related forms. Among them are Objective and Subjective idealism.
- Objective idealism accepts common sense Realism (the view that material objects exist) but rejects Naturalism (according to which the mind and spiritual values have emerged from material things).
- Subjective idealism denies that material objects exist independently of human perception and thus stands opposed to both realism and naturalism. Berkeley is the main advocate of subjective idealism. The prominent idealists who were influenced by Berkeley are the British philosophers T.H. Green, Edward Caird, F.H. Bradley, Bernard Bosanquest, the American Philosopher Josiah Royace and James Ferrier.

- Leibnitz holds that all physical things are made up of bundles of consciousness which he called monads. This idea of Leibnitz is close to Panpsychism. It is found
  in his theory of monads. He holds the view that monads are the true atoms of the universe.
- Immanuel Kant propounds transcendental idealism. Regarding this form of idealism he holds that all knowledge originate in perceived phenomena which have been organized by categories.
- Objective idealism holds that all objects are identical with some idea. This form of idealism is monistic in the sense that there is only one mind in which reality is created.
- Objective idealism is known as absolute idealism. It is associated with the philosophy of Hegel who states the view that all objects are identical with some idea. American philosopher Josiah Royace is also known as an objective idealist.

8.7 FURTHER READING

1) Neujahr, Philip J. (1995). *Kant's Idealism*, Mercer University Press, 1995
2) Robert M. Wallace. (2005) *Hegel's Philosophy of Reality, Freedom, and God.* Cambridge University Press
3) Online Dictionary : www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/ idealism
4) Ewing. A. C.(1961) *Idealism*: *A Critical Survey. University of Michigan*
5) Henry E. Allison.(2004). *Kant's Transcendental Idealism: An Interpretation and Defense.* Yale University Press

8.8 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Ans to Q No 1: George Berkeley

Ans to Q No 2: Hegel and Bradley

Ans to Q No 3: Subjective and objective idealism

Ans to Q No 4: Plato

Ans to Q No 5: Leibnitz

Ans to Q No 6: According to this this theory, only ideas can be known or have any reality. It also states that nature has no objective existence independent of the mind

Ans to Q No 7: a) True b) True c) True d) False

Ans to Q No 8: Objective idealism holds that all objects are identical with some idea. And ideal knowledge is considered as the system of ideas.

Ans to Q No 9: The absolute for Hegel was the universal mind, an interpersonal consciousness

Ans to Q No 10: a) True b)True c)True d)True

8.9 MODEL QUESTIONS

A: Very short Questions

Q 1: What is Idealism? What are its different kinds?

Q 2: Mention different kinds of realism.

Q 3: Mention two philosophers who advocate objective idealism.

Q 4: What is objective idealism?

Q 5: Write the definiton Subjective idealism.

B. Short Questions (Answer each question in about 150 words)

Q 1: Explain briefly the concept of subjective idealism.

Q 2: What is objective idealism? Briefly explain.

Q 3: Why objective idealism is monistic? Briefly answer.

Q 4: Briefly comment on Kant's transcendental idealism.

C. Write short notes on (Answer each question in about 150 words)

Q 1: Platonic Idealism

Q 2: Subjective Idealism

Q 3: Transcendental Idealism of Immanuel Kant

Q 4: Absolute Idealism

C. Long Questions (Answer each question in about 300-500 words)

Q 1: What is Subjective Idealism? Critically examine Subjective Idealism as advocated by Bishop Berkeley

Q 2: Who are the exponents of Subjective Idealism? Give a brief description of their philosophical theories.

Q 3: What is objective idealism? What arguments are there in favour of this position and what arguments are against it? Discuss

Q 4: Name some of the critics of Idealsim. Have they succeeded in refuting Idealism? Discuss

*** ***** ***

UNIT 9: MIND-BODY RELATION: DESCARTES AND SPINOZA

UNIT STRUCTURE

9.1 Learning Objectives

9.2 Introduction

9.3 Descartes view on Mind- Body relation

9.3.1 Interactionism

9.4 Spinoza's View on Mind-Body relation

9.4.1 Parallelism

9.5 Leibnitz's view on Mind-Body relation

9.5.1: Russell's view on Leibnitz's concept of Mind and Body relation

9.5.2: Strawson's view on mind and Body relation

9.6 Let Us Sum Up

9.7 Further Readings

9.8 Answers to Check Your Progress

9.9 Model Questions

9.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit you will be able to

- explain Descartes' view on mind-body relation
- describe Spinoza's view on mind and body
- discuss critically Leibnitz's exposition on mind-body problem
- analyse Russell's on Leibnitz's concept of mind-body relation
- discuss Strawson's view on mind-body relation

9.2 INTRODUCTION

This unit introduces to you the different theories forwarded by different philosophers regarding the problem of Mind- Body relation. We will discuss here the theories like Interactionism given by Descartes, Parallelism by Spinoza, Pre-established harmony by Leibnitz, Russell's view on Leibnitz's concept of Mind- Body relation, and Strawson's view on Mind-Body relation etc.

9.3 DESCARTES VIEW ON MIND-BODY RELATION

Descartes' concept of mind and body necessarily follows from his self-imposed doubt, which is the stepping stone of his philosophy. As a rationalist philosopher, Descartes opines that Mind and Body are two independent substances. Regarding the concept of Mind-Body relation we find the different theories like Occasionalism, Parallelism of Spinoza, Pre-established Harmony of Leibnitz and Subjective Idealism of Berkeley. This problem still persists in the philosophical viewpoints of modern philosophy in a different style.

Now, we will discuss Descartes' philosophical viewpoints in the problem of Mind- Body relation. Descartes was a dualist because he divides knowledge into ideas and ideas of things. Locke was the first philosopher to have introduced this epistemological dualism in philosophy which to be followed by Descartes and was to be criticized by Berkley. Apart from this Locke as a dualist also divides ideas into primary and secondary ideas and was criticized by Berkeley.

Now let us turn our attention to Descartes' concept of interactionism

9.3.1 Interactionism

As a staunch dualist Descartes holds that the mind which possesses the quality of consciousness need not refer to extension. In the same way, the body which implies the quality of extension need not refer to consciousness. So, mind and body are the two independent substances of each other.

Human beings have both body and mind. Human body is compared to a machine. Just as a machine moves with the help of energy, so also the body moves with the energy produced in the heart. The death is due to the destruction of some valuable parts of the body machine. Apart from body and mind, God in his Creation additionally puts soul in case of human beings. That is why it can be said that there can be no real relation between body and soul. Body and soul are diametrically opposed to each other. However, the relation between body and mind can be compared to the nature of relation between the pilot and his machine.

Although we speak of no relation between the body and the mind yet we observe that there is somewhere some relation between the two. Descartes, in this context, introduces the concept of Interactionism where we speak of the interaction between the mind and the body. In case of Interactionism the bodily activities are

sometimes influenced by the mind. Similarly, mental activities are sometimes influenced by the body. As for instance, although sense perception, imagination, memory, and act of remembering are all considered as mental activities, yet these acts also refer to material objects which we observe in human beings. Similarly, we observe that the bodily acts like eating, playing, working etc. also refer to mental acts which we cannot ignore. As for instance, when we write something it is not only our body that is associated with this particular action, but also our mind or reasoning power, having an equal participation in this action. Therefore, it can be said that the mind and the body are interacted to each other. Just as we cannot simply talk of mental activities apart from the bodily activities so also we cannot talk of the bodily activities apart from mental activities. We perceive the intimate connection between the two but Descartes is not absolutely clear about the relationship between the two within the framework of dualism. Rather, he warns us against the confusing or mixing of mind and body with one another. In contrast to the opinion supposing the intimate relation of mind and body Descartes opines that the mind (thought) and the body (extension) are combined only in unity of composition and not in unity of nature. So, the union of mind and body should not be compared with a mixture of two bodies. Descartes shows that although thought (mind) is affected by sense organs still it cannot be said to be the product of sense-organs; however, sensations, feelings, and appetites are the products that originate in the soul because of their union with the body. Descartes holds that in spite of the union of soul with the body the two remain distinct and therefore, he brings the concept of God to put them together. He holds the position that the mind and the body are not such that one becomes the cause of the other or vice-versa. But Descartes sometimes also accepts the theory of causal connection in the context of mind and body. Although the soul is united with the body, still it has its principal seat in the pineal gland of the brain. Descartes considers the pineal gland to be the only undivided portion of the brain. The bodily affection moves the animal spirits in the nerves, so the movements in the animal spirits are the results or causes of sensible objects and which are finally transferred to the pineal gland. And in this way sensations are produced in the brain. In the same way, the soul also can move the gland and this movement is transferred to the animal spirits and in this way the movement is conducted by them (animal spirits) over the nerves into the muscles. Here, the relation between the mind and the body is

considered as causal, but this causal relationship takes place through an interaction between the mind and the body of the pineal gland. But Descartes is not successful in showing how this interaction is compatible with his metaphysical dualism of mind and body.

Pineal gland: A small gland at the back of the skull within the brain, producing a hormone like substance. n some mammals.

While discussing Descartes' and Interactionism it will be useful to discuss epiphenomenalism which is also a dualistic theory.

- Epiphenomenalism is a dualistic theory which states that the mind is separate and distinct from the body. This theory allows that the mind is utterly dependent causally upon the body. So, everything which occurs in the mind is a result of events in the body and the mind in this regard is utterly powerless to affect the body. That is why it can be stated that the epiphenomenalist accepts one half of the interactionist contention, which holds that bodily events cause mental events. But, this theory denies the possibility of the other half, that is, the mental events can ever cause the bodily events. It allows that whatever happens in the mind is merely a by-product of bodily activity. This view is known as epiphenomenalism.

Although we observe an interaction between mind and body in cases like appetites of hunger and thirst, emotions and passions of the mind etc. still Descartes seems to conceal the relationship by putting an analogy of the rider and the horse. Just as the rider pushes on the horse to speed up the movement with his energy, so the mind affects the bodily movement without giving its own energy into the material bodies. However, this relationship of mind and body is not free from difficulties because like the metaphorical relation of the rider and the horse, mind and matter cannot not be discussed in concrete terms. The relation between mind and body is not mechanical like the relation between the rider and the horse. Mind and body are different in nature; but the rider and the horse are essentially of the same nature. Although we fail to establish a direct interaction between mind and body still it can be said that there is a watertight relation between body and mind. As the discussion of mind and body deals with human being, so a partial interaction of mind and body cannot be ruled out. Mind and body influence each other through animal spirits. Interaction of mind and body occurs when we admit that the soul is excited to activity

by the animal spirits or the soul moves the animal spirits. If the animal spirit is material that influences the soul, there is no problem in thinking of interaction of mind and body and vice versa. However, Descartes position in this regard is not clear because he takes help of mechanical and spiritual principles in order to explain the corporeal world.

Gilbert Ryle: (19 August 1900- 6 October 1976) A British Philosopher

The difficulty involves regarding the division of the mind and the body. The concept of an analysis of a person into mind and body in Descartes' philosophy fails to provide inclusive information about a person. Generally, we never discuss a human being by analysing into two parts, one is mental and the other is physical. By this division we invite the problem that the mind and the body are two different parts in nature because the mind which has the attribute of consciousness is not extended and the body which has the quality of extension is not conscious. Therefore, it will be difficult to make a bridge between the two diametrically opposed entities. So, Descartes seems to fail in this context to render a satisfactory answer regarding the concept of mind-body relation.

Gilbert Ryle holds that Descartes' concept of dualism (mind and body) leads to a categorical mistake with the sense that while mind stands for consciousness and body for extension, the both belong to two categories. Mind which possesses the attribute of consciousness is mental and the body which possesses the attribute of extension is corporeal or physical. Therefore, the concept of direct or indirect interaction of the body and the mind by which we try to explain the mind through the body and the body through the mind leads to a fallacy which Gilbert Ryle calls categorical mistake.

But the important question is, do the mental acts refer to material bodies? Descartes holds that mental ideas do not refer to material bodies. It simply represents the material objects. According to Descartes, there are real material objects or bodies which are based on the veracity of God. But to know a material body we at first know only the primary qualities of the particular material body. But the secondary qualities, which are so called confused ideas, are caused by the material bodies. That is why, Descartes holds the view that material bodies effect the mental states through human body.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q 1: State whether the following statements are True or False

a) According to Descartes, Mind and Body are two independent substances. (True/False)

b) Locke introduced the concept of epistemological dualism. (True/False)

c) Locke advocates the theory of interactionism. (True/False)

d) Descartes holds that the locus of Soul is the pineal gland of the brain. (True/false)

e) Ryle views that Descartes concept of dualism leads to categorical mistake. (True/False)

Q 2: What do you mean by interactionism? (Answer in about 109 words)

.....

.....

Q 3: Write a critical view on Descartes interactionism. (Answer in about 73 words)

.....

.....

.....

.....

ACTIVITY : 9.1

Do you support interactionism? If yes, give your reasons in support of your answer. Discuss

.....

.....

.....

.....

9.4 SPINOZA'S VIEW ON MIND-BODY RELATION

Spinoza also participated in the discussion of mind-body relation. His view on mind-body relation is to be deduced from his concept of Substance. According to him, Substance is one and an irreducible whole out of which everything is deduced or explained. So, it can be viewed that Spinoza tried to solve the mind-body problem through his concept of Substance. Instead of regarding the two entities or substances

as separate Spinoza holds that mind and body are the two attributes of Substance or God.

9.4.1 Parallelism

Spinoza's theory of mind-body relation is known as Parallelism. He thought that matter and mind, also known as thought and extension, are the two attributes or aspects of the same spiritual reality. In contrast to this Descartes, in his theory of interactionism, had held that mind and body are the two relative substances which were quite independent of each other. Spinoza views that Descartes' theory of interactionism is not satisfactory, because he thought that Substance is one all-inclusive whole. Therefore, there cannot be more than one Substance. If there were more than one Substance, they would limit each other and would ultimately destroy their very nature by which we are familiar with the word 'Substance'.

Panpsychism: In philosophy, panpsychism is the view that all matter has a mental aspect.

Fechner:(1801-1887)A German experimental psychologist

Again, Spinoza holds that Descartes' position is not clear in the context of interactionism. His interactionism of mind and matter goes against his dualistic tendency in his theory. His position further deteriorated when the later Cartesians propounded the theory of occasionalism. This theory of occasionalism holds that matter is not the cause of thought and similarly the mind is not the cause of matter and vice-versa. Rather it is thought that God uses the occasions for His thinking and will. As for instance, when we say that someone performs the work successfully, it is not that he performs the work, because it is God who uses His will as an occasion for His producing change in the world. That is why, it can be said that both the mind and the body are the occasions for God's act and thought. Therefore, this theory propounded by the later Cartesians has been known in the history of philosophy as the theory of Occasionalism. But Spinoza did not accept God's intervention in case of the relation between mind and body. That is why he rejected Cartesian dualism and upheld the theory of Parallelism.

According to this theory, mind and matter or body are considered the two aspects or attributes of a single, all inclusive reality. As the attributes or aspects of one single substance, mind and body or extension and thought cannot interact upon each other. Fechner as another representative of parallelism did not give equal status

to mind and body and also did not show any distinction between them. But Spinoza distinguishes between mind and body and gives equal status to mind and body. Fechner wanted to show that every material object is endowed with consciousness or soul. This view of Fechner indicates that each and every object in the universe has a soul. This position of the supremacy of mind and its control over body makes a distinction between Fechner's and Spinoza's view on Substance. Fechner's view is out and out panpsychistic; but Spinoza's view is parallelstic in the sense that both mind and body run parallel without showing any over-power to one another. This doctrine shows that neither the body can be explained from the mind nor the mind can be explained from the body. Therefore, both mind and matter are the two different manifestations of one and the same universal reality. Again, it can be viewed that neither the mind can be the cause of the body nor the body can be the cause of the mind, as the two are considered to be the two different aspects of one and the same reality. Rather, they are considered as the effects of the same cause which is one indivisible and all inclusive whole that is Substance. That is why mind and matter are the two different aspects of one single indivisible whole. On this ground Spinoza's theory is also known as psycho-physical parallelism.

If mind and matter do not interact upon each other, then the question is, how are they related? Spinoza answers that both mind and matter run parallel. They are independent and infinite in their own nature and can express God infinitely by their own nature without taking help of one another. It indicates that the mind or thinking can express God independently by its own nature and God is in its own unique nature possesses both extension (body) and thinking (mind). That is why they are two inseparable aspects of the same thing like the two lenses, convex and concave of the same spectacles. Similarly, from one point of view God is extended and from another God is thinking. So, they are two inseparable aspects of the same thing. Although the two aspects, namely matter and mind or extension and thinking can run parallel without interfering each other, still none can exist independently without the other. So, Spinoza's theory of parallelism excludes both materialism and idealism without giving due importance to mind over matter and matter over mind.

Spinoza's concept of parallelism is not satisfactory. According to Spinoza, Substance is both extended and thinking. So, human being can know only two aspects or attributes of substance. That is why the question is, why it is that human being can

know only two aspects, namely matter and mind and why not the other aspects? Spinoza, in this context, answers that human beings can know only two attributes because human beings are embodied spirits. Again, if the attributes of Substance are infinite in its own nature, then human beings cannot confine the attribute of mind to thinking alone; because the attribute of mind or thinking can go beyond its boundary. Therefore, the question of strict parallelism cannot be accepted in case of Spinoza's theory of mind and body relation.

Spinoza's Double Aspect Theory offers some difficulty. In case of the mind-body relation he never put importance to one in order to explain the other. Still his theory cannot be said to be free from idealistic bias, because Spinoza categorically announces that Substance is one and an all-inclusive whole. Matter and mind, extension and consciousness, are only the two aspects of Substance. Substance is indeterminate, infinite and an all-inclusive whole and everything is deduced only from Substance. Therefore, it can be said that Spinoza's theory of parallelism is not satisfactory from this point of view.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q 4: Fill in the blanks

a) According to Spinoza, …….and …….are the two attributes of substance.

b) Spinoza's concept of mind and body relation is known as……

c) ……..is one and all inclusive whole, to Spinoza.

d) According to…….., mind and body are the two aspects of one single all inclusive

whole.

Q 5. Who advocates the theory of Occasionalism?

……

Q 6: What is Parallelism? (Answer in about 104 words)

……

……

Q 7: Why is Spinoza's theory known as psycho physical parallelism? (Answer in about 46 words)

……

……

Q 8: Why is Spinoza's theory not satisfactory? (Answer in about 67 words)

……

……

ACTIVITY : 9.2

Do you support parallelism? If yes, reasons in support of your answer. Discuss

……

……

……

……

9.5 LEIBNITZ'S MIND-BODY RELATION

Monad: a single unit

Leibnitz was another philosopher to have introduced the concept of mind-body relation. He goes beyond Spinoza's concept of mind-body relation, because he not only discusses the relationship of mind-and body relation, but also discusses the other things which are related to mind and body. So, it can be said that Spinoza limits his discussion only to his mind and body, but Leibnitz points to the variety which includes other things apart from mind and body.

Macrocosom: The whole of complex structure like the world contrasted with a small part.

Leibnitz introduces the concept of monads in order to discuss the ultimate unity of all things. He holds that there are infinite monads and every monad is real, eternal and indivisible. Monads are real like the eternal substance of Spinoza. Each monad contains the whole infinity of existence. And every monad is potentially a world. It can be called a macrocosm in microcosom. Every monad as an all-inclusive whole mirrors the world. So, each and every monad being a self-contained unit excludes all other monads. Every monad by itself mirrors a world or is potentially a world. Therefore, it can be said that monads are windowless but through them anything might come in or go out. No monads are alike. But they are found in a hierarchical order of existence. There may be bare or lowest monads and highest monads. The

lowest monads are those in which perception, the very characteristic of monad, is obscure. They make the inorganic bodies. Apart from this there are conscious monads. These are called souls which make the plant and the animal world. Over and above, the highest monads are called spirits endowed with reason and universal, necessary knowledge. That is why it can be said that in the hierarchical order of monad the higher monad or the spirits includes the lower. It implies that self-consciousness emerges out of consciousness and excludes certain perceptions which remain obscure. In case of bare monads the force emerges only in the form of mechanical movement. As for instance, the appetite in case of animals is expressed in the form of instincts, where as in case of higher monads the force is found in the form of self consciousness, desire and will.

Microcosom: A thing seen as miniature representation of something much layer.

Therefore, it can be said that Spinoza explained the unity between mind and body and Leibnitz showed the variety of monads. But a very important question is, how can we explain the unity among different kinds of monads? From the very nature of the windowless monad it can be viewed that monads cannot be related. Although it is said that monads are independent or not related, still there is an inner desire of each monad which indicates a harmonious relationship among different kinds of monads. According to Leibnitz, the harmonious relationship among different kinds of monads has been pre established by God who has beautifully arranged the series of monads in a hierarchical order in order to maintain harmonious relationship among various kinds of monads. The change in one monad is the cause of another monad, symbolically or logically the change in A is the cause of the change in B. Leibnitz, in this context, wants to show that monads cannot interact upon one another, because they are considered as windowless. He points out that although monads cannot interact upon each other, still there is a concomitant relation between monads. As for instance, as soon as we press the button the bulb shines. In this context, Leibnitz shows that the change in button or switch is the cause of shining by a bulb. Here, it cannot be said that concomitant relation between the switch (button) and the bulb cannot be showed through an interaction of switch (button) upon the bulb.

So, Leibnitz has brought out the concept of God who has arranged the monads in order to maintain a harmonious relation in the hierarchical order or series of monads

to fulfill a grand plan in His mind. It is true that each monad works independently according to its inner urge or wish, but this inner plan co-incides with the realization of one master plan in the mind of the Creator. It can be opined that each monad tries to realize the same final end in the mind of the creator; therefore, a harmony is involved among monads.

Leibnitz through his concept of pre-established harmony wanted to show that like Spinoza's parallelism, his concept is not confined to mind-body relation. Apart from this he insisted on harmonious relationship among different kinds of monads through the concept of pre-established harmony.

Although Leibnitz seemed to be correct in case of reconciliation between mind and matter, still there are some inconsistencies prevailing in his concept of Pre-established harmony. This is explained as follows:

Leibnitz wants to show the supremacy of God by showing that God is the creator of all monads. If God is the creator of all monads, the view of Leibnitz that monads are independent and self-contained will be self-contradictory. That is why, it can be said that Leibnitz's concept of God seemed to be inconsistent by taking God as the creator of the Pre-established harmony.

Leibnitz by the concept of Pre-established harmony aimed at introducing unity in variety which was lacking in Spinoza's concept of parallelism. Besides, through this concept he wished to reconcile the mind-body problem. Leibnitz views that the body is nothing but an aggregate of bare monads. In other words, the body is nothing but a living organism which indicates a living force. Among the various monads there is a Queen Monad which focuses on the activities of the surrounding monads and also mirrors the changes of all other monads in a clear form of the universe. The Queen Monad is also known as soul which is superior in nature to the other monads. The supreme monad or soul can apprehend the activities of all other monads of the universe. The activities of lower monads are regulated by the Queen Monad or God. That is why lower monads perform the duties as a means and conditions for the realization of the end of the higher monad. When we have a desire for the movement of our hand to take place then there are involved the muscular changes concomitantly in our body. This occurrence shows that the desire is the cause of the muscular changes in the body. It is due to concomitant variation.

This indicates that the relation between mind and body may be illustrated with the help of the simile of two clocks ringing harmoniously. The possibility of the harmonious relationship between the two clocks can be explained in three different ways.

a) The two clocks may be so connected with one another by a joint mechanism in such a way that the motion in one may be communicated to the other for the corresponding movement. Like this relation of the two clocks, Descartes holds that mind and body interact on each other. But Leibnitz goes against this view and holds that mind and body as the windowless monad cannot interact. b)The two clocks may work harmoniously if a technician or mechanic regulates the two in a proper interval. In this context the Occasionalists bring the concept of the interference of God in order to keep harmony in the mind-body relation. But Leibnitz denies the constant interference of God in the context of two winodowless monads, which is mind and body.

c) The two clocks may be designed with such skill and perfection that they may always work harmoniously. Leibnitz accepts this viewpoint and opines that God is considered the creature of the two windowless monads.

To be brief, the doctrine of pre established harmony informs that the bodies act as if there were no souls, and souls act as if there were no bodies, and both act as if one influences the other.

Although monads are independent by their nature or exist by themselves, still every monad imperceptibly leads to others. So, this imperceptible or unseen connection of one monad to another can show the possibility of explaining every variety of experience. Over and above it can also be a helping hand to fill up the gap between mind and matter, men and animals, conscious and unconscious states. Here, the question involved is, if monads are windowless, then how are they related? The answer to the question is that monads can not be so related because they are windowless.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q 9: Fill in the blanks

a) To Leibnitz, monads are……

b) ……advocates the theory of pre-established harmony.

Q 10: Who propounds the concept of monads?

.....

Q 11: What is pre-established harmony? (Answer in about 69 words)

.....

.....

Q 12: Briefly explain the nature of Queen monad? (Answer in about 74 words)

.....

ACTIVITY

Do you support Leibnitz's Pre-established harmony in case of the relation of mind and body? Discuss

Ans:.....

.....

.....

.....

9.5.1 Russell's View on Leibnitz's Concept of Mind and Body Relation

Russell in case of the theory of mind and body relation holds that the essence of matter is not extension, but matter is essentially plural. Russell held the view that Leibniz required a new theory of soul and body, and this new theory was undoubtedly a main motive to the doctrine of pre-established harmony. To Russell, this doctrine in case of the relation of mind and body is an innovative idea. He discusses Leibnitz's concept elaborately and offers his own comment on it.

According to Russell, Leibnitz views that there is nothing real but monads. The body (matter) is the appearance of an infinite collection of monads. Monads differ from one another in the clearness of other perceptions, and the monads which have clearer perceptions are more active. When a change in one monad explains a change in another, the first is said to be active, while the second is passive. Similarly, in the body the monad (in my body) which is myself has clearer perceptions than any of the others and may be said to be dominant in the body in relation to the other monads. The monads which have clearer perceptions are said to be active and others are passive. Here, it can be said that there is no real interaction between monads. It is because of the fact that the soul is one, but the body is many; So, there

is no interaction between them. But the relation between soul and body is due to the pre-established harmony. From this it can said that the soul has clear perceptions and the occurrences in the body are said to be found in the soul. Therefore, the view is that the soul acts on the body and dominates it.

He further discusses the three great classes in the hierarchy of monads as propounded by Leibnitz who says that these classes are merged into each other. These are, mainly, *bare monads*, *souls* and *spirits*. Bare monads have the minimum of perception and desire. Although these are similar to souls, still they cannot be called a soul. *Souls* are distinguished from the first class by memory, feelings, and attention. Animals have souls, but men have *spirits* or *rational souls*. *Spirits* are differing from angels which are superior to man in degree. They are defined by self-consciousness, the knowledge of God and eternal truths, and also by reason. *Spirits,* like souls and God, do not mirror only the universe of creatures. *Spirits* compose the city of God and god possesses goodness in relation to spirits. Spirits are said to be immortal and preserve moral identity, but they depend on members or self. Monads are identical with one another without knowing each other.

Further Russell points out that monads are said to be active or passive in relation to clearness of perception. Monad consists only in the degree of their perfections. To Leibnitz, as the soul is perfect, that is why it has clear perceptions. So far as the body is concerned, it is imperfect. To Leibnitz, again, one creature is more perfect than another. The influence of one on another is purely ideal. God takes notice of the superior monad in regulating others. Russell also explains Leibnitz's views as to how every substance which passes to a lesser degree of perfection acts and also suffers. In any substance which has perception dealing with action brings joy while passion brings pain. The activity is opposed to passivity which differs from essential substance. To Leibnitz, whatever is properly a substance only acts. All substances are capable of pleasure and pain. There is action involved in true substance. And when perception is developed, then substance becomes more distinct. Again, substance becomes more confused when there is passion present in case of a substance. All actions regarding a substance are a step to a pleasure and all passion regarding a substance is a step to pain.

Russell mentions that in Leibnitz's theory that reminds us of Spinoza that there are two elements involved in a substance what is active. These are perfection and

clearness of perception. But he does not confuse these two elements but rather explains them as necessarily connected. He further explains that only spirits are good or bad as ends of themselves and bare monads and souls are simply means to them. In Spirits volition is always determined by the reason of the good. It means that we act rightly if we always judge rightly. As right judgment depends upon clear perception, we are more or less perfect according to our ability to have more or less clear perception.

Moreover, the connection of soul and body is only explicable by means of material prima. Materia prima (as an element in each monad) is that whose repetition produces the material prima of dynamics. It is also identified with the passivity or passive force of each monad with confused perception and finite nature. God could deprive a monad of material secunda, i.e., of the assemblage of monads which constitutes its body. But he could not deprive a monad of materialprima without which it would be actus purus, i.e., God himself. Monads are distinguished from God by materiaprima which denotes that monads are finite, limited etc. Confused perceptions can involve matter or the infinite in number.

According to Russell, Leibnitz says that God alone is above matter. To Leibnitz, spirits would be without required connection, without the order of times and places. Spirits are out of universal connections and order of the world, which is made by relations to time and place. Monads which deal with time and place have confused perceptions or material prima. This is again intimately connected with unconscious perception. The doctrine of monads makes if possible to mirror the whole universe. Monads which consists of perception are composed of an infinite number of insensible perceptions.

Russell thought that the two inconsistent theories (idealism and realism) regarding soul and body are contained in Leibnitz philosophy. And this leads to division among philosophers regarding the viewpoints of the two theories. So, Russell views that there is no way of reconciling all Leibnitz's statements on the matter.

An organic body has a dominant monad by relation to which it requires a certain unity. On the other hand, an inorganic body has no such single dominant monad. Every monad belongs to some organic body either as dominant or as sub-ordinant monad. Every organic body is composed of an infinite number of smaller organic bodies. The smallest organic bodies occupy only a physical point. Leibnitz says that a natural organism is a machine in its smallest perceptible parts.

In the first theory, the dominant monad dominates in the sense that it represents more clearly while the other monads represent very confusedly. The dominant monad represents the things outside itself as a centre. Every monad perceives more clearly what happens in its neighbourhood than what happens at a distance.

But, it cannot be held that the monads composing the organic body are always the same; however, the bodies are in perpetual flux. Leibnitz holds that body and soul do not together form one substance. He in this context views that bodies act as if there were no souls, and souls act as if there were nobodies, and both act as if one influences the other. The soul is ready to act itself when the soul wills it. This produces the so called union of soul and body. Soul and body do not interact but only agree. One is acting out of the two freely according to the rules of final laws of efficient cause. Every agent who acts according to the final cause is free.

To be brief, Russell through his critical remark on Leibnitz's concept of mind and body holds that there are two contradicting views present in his philosophy. They are -idealism and realism. Leibnitz seems to accept the idealistic thesis or view in case of pre-established harmony through the concept of God. But if we study his philosophy or the statements in case of the theory of pre-established harmony then we see that he seems to surpass his earlier view which he accepted through the idealistic view and in place of the earlier view he seems to advocate the realistic view which indicates that the mind and body do not require any extra force to discuss the inherent relationship between the two. So, he mentions that soul and body together are veritably one, though the body is real and many in our perception. Besides, he mentions- "corporeal substance has a soul and an organic body, that is, a mass made up of other substances. It is true that the same substance thinks, and has an extended mass joined to it, but it does not consist of this mass, since all this can be taken away from it without altering the substance." The body by itself, Leibnitz says, 'apart from the soul, has only a unity of aggregation"; and this seems to imply that with the soul the body has a real unity. Again he says that the body, apart from the soul, is not properly a substance, but an aggregate, like a heap of stones.

9.5.2 Strawson's view on Mind and Body

P.F.Strawson: (1919-2006) An Oxford-based philosopher

Strawson also discussed the mind-body problem through the concept of person. Strawson in his book *Individuals* shows that the concept of person is a type of entity. It admits two qualities namely physical and mental. He tries to solve the mind-body problem by taking help of the concept of person. He is against the dualistic account of both the physical and mental in the context of a person. But it does not mean that Strawson advocated the neutral structure in the dualistic account. In contrast to the neutral structure Strawson speaks of the person as a primitive concept which is ontologically prior to the concept of mind-body problem.

Strawson forwarded the concept of person as a solution to the mind-body problem. He does not identify the person either with the mind or with the body, rather he raised the concept of person as an entity with both mental and physical properties. His concept of person is against the two theories- one that tries to explain the concept of person with the help of mind or ego and the other that tries to explain the concept of person with the body. Therefore, Strawson's concept of person is a midway between idealism and gross materialism. Again, the concept of person works as a synthesis of the opposite theories, namely idealism and realism.

Strawson is not in favour of analyzing the concept of person into a body and a mind. He is also against the any attempt to discuss the two elements as the sole element or basic reality in the context of the concept of person. Rather, he accepts the concept of person as a primitive concept to which both physical or corporeal and mental predicates can be applied.

ACTIVITY : 9.4

Is Russell's view satisfactory in case of Leibnitz's concept of mind-body relation? What do you think? Discuss

Ans: ……..

.....

Do you support Strawson's view in case of mind-body relation? Discuss

Ans: ……..

.....

Q 13: What are the two theories present in Leibnitz's concept of mind-body relation?

Ans: .....

.....

Q 14: State whether the following statements are True or False

a) Russell is an idealist. (True/False)

b) To Strawson, the concept of person is a type of entity. (True/False)

c) Strawson views that the concept of person is a primitive concept. (True/False)

d) The concept of person is a midway between idealism and realism. (True/False)

Q 15: Strawson's concept of person is a critique of two theories? What are they?

.....

9.6 LET US SUM UP

- Descartes introduces the concept of interactionism in case of mind-body problem. He holds that bodily activities are influenced by the mind. Similarly, the mental activities are also influenced by the body. So, mind and body are interacted to each other.
- Instead of being regarded as the two entities or substances Spinoza holds that mind and body are the two attributes of Substance or God. Therefore, Spinoza's theory of mind-body relation is known as parallelism.
- Descartes propounded the theory of Occasionalism. It holds that matter is not the cause of thought and similarly mind is not the cause of matter and vice-versa. Rather it is thought that God uses the occasions for his thinking and will.
- Leibnitz introduced the concept of pre-established harmony in order to show a unity among various kinds of monads by bringing the concept of God. He shows that God has beautifully arranged the series of monads in a hierarchical order in order to maintain harmony among monads.
- As a critique of Leibnitz's concept of mind and body Russell holds that there are two contradicting views present in Leibnitz's concept of philosophy. At first Leibnitz seems to accept the realistic attitude through his view that the mind and body do not require any extra force to discuss the internal relationship between the two. Again, Leibnitz seems to advocate the idealistic attitude through pre-established harmony and in this context he brings the concept of God in order to maintain the harmonious relationship among different kinds of monads.

- Strawson is a critic of idealism and realism. He holds the view that the concept of person as a primitive concept is ontologically prior to the concept of mind-body problem.

9.7 FURTHER READING

1. Russell, Bertrand (1900). *A Critical Exposition of the Philosophy of Leibnitz.* London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd.
2. Goswami, S.P(2006). Persons A Strawsonian Study: Guwahati: Anwesha
3. Thrilly, Mark( ). A History of Western Philosophy.
4. Shaffer A. Jerome(1968). *Philosophy of Mind*. U.S.A:Prentice-Hall, Inc., Eaglewood Cliffs, N.J.

9.8 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Ans to Q No 1: a) True b)True c)False d)True e)True

Ans to Q No 2: Interactionism holds that bodily activities are sometimes influenced by the mind; similarly, mental activities are also influenced by the body. As for instance, the act of sensing, imagination, memory, remembering are mental activities that refer to material objects. Similarly, the bodily activities like eating, playing, working etc. refer to mental acts which we cannot ignore. It can be shown that when we play a particular game (football, cricket, tennis ball etc.) not only our body is actively associated with this particular action, but our mind or reasoning power equally participates in this action. That is why it can be stated that mind and body are interacted to each other.

Ans to Q No 3: Gilbert Ryle is a critic of Descartes concept of interactionism. To Ryle, Mind and body belong to two categories. The Mind which ascribes the attribute of consciousness is mental and body which denotes the attribute of extension is corporeal or physical. That is why the process of explaining the mind through the body and the body through the mind alone is erroneous. So, to Ryle, Descartes commits a fallacy that is categorical mistake.

Ans to Q No 4: a) Mind, Body b) Interactionism c) Substance

Ans to Q No 5: a) Spinoza b)Leibnitz

Ans to Q No 6: According to this theory, mind and matter or body are considered the two aspects or attributes of a single, all inclusive whole. He thought that as the

attributes or aspects of one single Substance, mind and body or extension and thought cannot interact upon each other. Rather, he holds that both mind and body go on parallel without showing any over power to one another. Neither body can be explained from the mind nor can mind be explained from the body. That is why mind and body are the two different aspects of one single indivisible whole. Therefore, Spinoza's theory is known as parallelism.

Ans to Q No 7: Spinoza holds that neither mind can be the cause of body nor can the body be the cause of mind. In this regard mind and body are the two different aspects of one single indivisible whole. That is why Spinoza's theory is known as psycho-physical realism.

Ans to Q No 8: Spinoza's theory of parallelism cannot be said to be free from idealistic bias, because he announces that Substance is an all inclusive whole and mind and body are the two aspects of one single all inclusive whole that is Substance. It is indeterminate, infinite and all inclusive and everything is derived from Substance. Therefore, Spinoza's strict sense of parallelism cannot be accepted from this point of view.

Ans to Q No 9: a) Winodowless b) Leibnitz

Ans to Q No 10: Leibnitz

Ans to Q No 11: Leibnitz shows that although monads are independent, still there is an inner desire of each monad which indicates a harmonious relationship among different kinds of monads. Leibnitz in this context shows that the harmonious relationship has been pre-established by God who has beautifully arranged the different kinds of monads in order to maintain a harmony among them. That is why Leibnitz's concept of monad is known as Pre-established harmony.

Ans to Q No 12: The Queen monad focuses on the activities of the surrounding monads and mirrors the changes of all other monads in a clear form of the Substance. It is also known as Soul which is superior in nature to the other monads. The supreme monad can apprehend the activities of all other monads of the universe. The activities of all lower monads are regulated by the Queen monad or God. That is why lower monads perform the duties as a means and conditions for the realization of the end of the higher monad.

Ans to Q No 13: Idealism and Realism

Ans to Q No 14: a) True b)True c)True

Ans to Q No 15: Idealism and realism

9.9 MODEL QUESTIONS

A) Very Short Questions

Q 1: Who propounds the theory of Interactionism?

Q 2: What is Interactionism?

Q 3: Define Parallelism

Q 4: What is Pre-established harmony?

B) Short Questions (Answer in about 100-150 words)

Q 1: Briefly explain the theory of Interactionism?

Q 2: Briefly comment on Spinoza's theory Parallelism.

Q 3: What is psycho-physical realism? Discuss briefly.

Q 4: What do you mean by Strawson's concept of person? Explain briefly.

Q 5: What is pre-established harmony? Briefly explain

Q 6: What do you mean by Queen monad? Discuss briefly

C) Write short notes on (Answer in about 150 words)

Q 1: Occasionalism

Q 2: Interactionism

Q 3: Parallelism

Q 4: Theory of monads

D) Long Questions (Answer in about 300-500 words)

Q 1: What is interactionism? Explain

Q 2: Discuss Spinoza's theory of parallelism.

Q 3: What is Pre-established harmony? Is it a satisfactory theory in case of the relation of mind - body problem.

Q 4: Is Russell a critic of the theory of monads? Discuss it with reference to Leibnitz's theory of pre-established harmony.

Q 5: What according to you are the limitations of Interactionism? Discuss

Q 6: Which one of the three theories like Parallelism, Interactionism, Pre-established harmony would you prefer most in case of the mind-body relation? Explain

Q 7: Do you find any distinction between Interactionism and Parallelism? Discuss

UNIT 10:UNIVERSALS: REALISM & NOMINALISM

UNIT STRUCTURE

10.1 Learning objectives
10.2 Introduction
10.3 Universal: Its nature and theories
10.4 Realism
    10.4.1 Plato's realism
    10.4.2 Aristotle's realism
10.5 Nominalism: What this theory says
    10.5.1 Hobbes' view
    10.5.2 Hume's view
10.6 Let us sum up
10.7 Further reading
10.8 Answers to check your progress
10.9 Model questions

10.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit you will be able to:

- explain the problem of universal
- discuss the relation between universal and particular
- discuss the theories of universal
- define realism
- explain the views of Plato and Aristotle
- explain the theory of Nominalism
- discuss Milder nominalism of Hobbes
- explain Hume's theory of nominalism

10.2 INTRODUCTION

This unit introduces to you the problem of universals sprang from our experience, thought and language. It is matter of common experience that particular things exist in space and time. Particular things like a chair, a table, a red colour, a cow, a tree etc exist in a particular space and in a particular time. They are different

from and exclusive of one another. However, we do not call each one of them by a specific name like we call our friends by their names. Rather we group them, give them a collective name which says they belong to a particular class. Now, questions bound: what makes them come under a particular class? What underpins our attempt to bind them in a group? Why are all cows, to cite an example, named by the term 'cow' regardless of their innumerable differences? Is it essence which is shared in common by all the members of a class? Or, is it simply similarity among them? The problem of universal, so to speak, mainly deals with these questions.

10.3 UNIVERSAL: ITS NATURE AND THEORIES

In nature, we have broadly two kinds of knowledge of things— sensuous and conceptual. Sensuous knowledge presents a thing in a particular part of space and time. Thus we have particular knowledge of manifold of objects viz. chair, a table, a red colour, a cow etc. Conceptual knowledge, on the other hand, presents a thing without any note of particularity. It is not limited to any space and time. However, it is a sort of thing without which we cannot think of particular objects. Though we can see and touch particular objects, we have to use general concepts while thinking or talking about them. For they are perceived by us as belonging to a certain class. The particular things have something common in them by virtue of which they are grouped together in the same class and called by the same name. Red, white, yellow, blue, green etc. have something common in them on account of which they are grouped into the class of colours and called by the same name 'colour'. Similarly cows, dogs, cats, horses etc. have something common in them because of which they are brought under the same class of animal and called by the same name 'animal'. This something which is common to all the members of a class is called universal or generality. Thus the universal may generally be defined as something which is common to and shared in common by all the members of a particular class, and is the ground of their being grouped into the same class and called by the same name.

Now the knotty questions that often churn up the philosophers' mind are— What is common to a group of things (or particulars)? What sort of thing is universal? Does the universal stand for something that is objectively real? Or is it merely a word that we use for a group of things due to their similarity between them? Philosophers answer to these questions from their own stance. And since their views are different,

we have several theories regarding the nature of universal, viz., Realism, Conceptualism, Nominalism etc. All these theories have got supporters from both the corners of Indian and Western philosophy.

Realism is a theory according to which the universal is extra-mental. It has independent reality. It is the essence residing equally in all the members of a class. Conceptualism states that universal is a concept in mind; it is a pure mental entity. There is no universality in things outside mind. According to Nominalism, universals are mere words or names. For this theory, names are made universal by being used for a number of different particulars.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q.1 State whether the statements are true or false (True/False)

a) Womanhood is universal. (True/False)

b) Tree, cow, table, etc are not particulars. (True/False)

c) Sensuous knowledge presents a thing in a particular part of space and time. (True/False)

d) Conceptual knowledge presents a thing without any note of particularity. (True/False)

e) According to the theory of realism, universal is mind-dependent. (True/False)

Q.2. Define universal.

Q.3. What are particulars?

Q.4. Mention the main theories of universal.

Q.5. What is conceptualism?

Q.6. Define nominalism in a sentence.

10.4 REALISM

Realism holds that universal exists independent of the knowing mind. It has objective reality. Universal is the essence that is equally present in all the members of a class. However, this theory has got various forms in the hands of its upholders as they have espoused their views in accordance with their own philosophy. While some regard universals to be substantive, some others hold them to be adjectival even though they all agree on the core notion of realism. Thus we have many supporters of this theory both from Indian and Western camps. They are— Nyaya-Vaisesika and

Mimamsa, Plato, Aristotle, St Augustine, St Thomas Aquinas, Bertrand Russell, G. E. Moore and S. Alexander. Here, however, we shall discuss the views of Plato and Aristotle, the champions in realism, in a brief detail.

10.4.1 Plato's Realism

Plato advocates extreme realism. For him, a universal is substantive, an entity which exists in a non-temporal, non-spatial world without depending on mind. It is not affected by whatever happens to the particulars in the world of space and time. Although the existence of the particulars in the universals logically depends upon the existence of the universals in the particulars, the other way round is not true. Even if there is not any example of perfect square anywhere, perfect squareness exists in the transcendental world of universals. To Plato, a universal is a model to which particular things approximate.

In his theory of Ideas, Plato advocates the existence of universal entities which are different from the particular things. Plato maintains that there must be an essence common to all things of a given kind. For him, a thing will not be a table unless it has the essence of tablehood that all other tables possess in common. A table may differ from other tables in shape, size and colour, but it must possess a single form or essence which constitutes their being table and which distinguishes them from other things like chairs, beds or doors etc. Thus Plato holds that we always postulate one single form for every class of particulars to which we assign the same name. It is not only true of objects indicated by nouns, such as chairs, tables, beds, trees, etc but also of qualities indicated by predicates, such as beautiful, ugly, greater than, less than etc. Just as there must be a form or essence of tablehood common to tables, so there must be a form or essence of ugliness common to all ugly things. Plato gives the name **'Ideas'** or **'Forms'** to these objective essences.

Thus for Plato, there is an absolute difference between the Forms or universals, and sensible objects or particulars. The universals are patterns in the nature of things, while the particular things are made in their image and hence are likenesses of the 'Forms'. The 'Forms' exist in themselves. According to Plato, the universals are substances. A substance is that which has its whole being in itself and which does not derive its reality from anything else except itself. It is the ground of other things, but it does not have any ground except itself. In this sense, the universals are self-

caused and self-determined; they are absolute and ultimate realities. The particulars, on the other hand, are not self-caused or self-determined; they are relative, for they have to depend upon other things for their existence. Unlike the particular things, the universals are thoughts. Universals are not found in nature like any particular thing. There is no such thing as the cow-in-general. However, 'thought', in this case, should not be taken as my thought or your thought or the thought of God. For it is absurd to think that our thoughts can be the cause of the universe. They are not subjective ideas, but are objective Ideas having reality on their own. The universal or the Idea is a unity. It is one amidst many. But the particular things are many. The Idea of horse is one, but the horses are many. There cannot be more than one Idea for every class of things. Universals are immutable and imperishable, while the particulars are ever-changing and perishable.

In spite of these differences, there is a close connection between universals and the particulars. Their relationship is described in two ways: (i) as a participation of the particular thing in the Idea (ii) as an imitation of the Idea by the particular thing, the particular things being the copy of the Idea and the Idea being the exemplar.

Now, as universals are not given in sense-perception, the question pertinent here is: How are they known? Plato's answer, however, is mythical. For, he said that the soul is said to possess the universals (in Plato's words, pure Forms or Ideas) in the incorporeal world before embodying the present body. When we perceive the similar things in the present life, we remember the Forms forgotten in earthly life. Again in the Timaeus, Plato said that God makes the things of this world according to the model of the Forms. God takes the model of the Forms in creating things of the world. This implies that the Ideas or the Forms exist apart, not only from the things of the sensible world, but also from God. Hence, the Ideas are something hanging in the air.

Plato also spoke about different levels of Forms related as higher and lower in a hierarchy. Just as many individual things are presided over by one Idea which is the common element in them, so many lower Ideas are presided over by one higher idea which is the common element in them. Again, over this higher Idea together with many others still a higher Idea will rule. For example, the Ideas of whiteness, blackness, greenness, blueness, yellowness, all come under the Idea of colour. The Ideas of sweetness, sourness, bitterness, all come under the Idea of taste. Now these two

Ideas of colour and taste are subsumed under the still higher Idea of quality. In this way, the Ideas form a pyramid with an apex. Over all these Ideas, there must be one highest Idea which is the supreme of all of them. This is the final and absolutely real being. It is the ground of itself, of other Ideas and of the whole universe. Plato calls this Idea the Idea of Good. Thus we find that though the Ideas are many, they culminate in one single Idea. In brief, the Ideas form one organised system culminating in one supreme Idea which is the highest expression of its unity. And every individual Idea is a many in one. Considered in itself, it is one and as considered in relation to others, it is many.

10.4.2 Aristotle's Realism

Aristotle rejects the mysterious world of substantive universals. He advocates a moderate form of realism. According to him, a universal is not a substantive at all but a property which belongs to particulars. While Plato treats universals as nouns, Aristotle treats them as adjectives. According to Aristotle, there is a logical interdependence between the universals and the particulars. Just as there can be no chairs, unless each chair possesses the property of being a chair, so no such property (chairness) can exist unless there are chairs.

Aristotle sharply criticises Plato's theory of universals and regards the 'Ideas' as quite unnecessary. His objections to Plato's theory of Ideas go like this—

1. Plato unnecessarily doubled the number of things to be explained. The Forms or Ideas are as many as the particular things whose causes are the Ideas themselves. For Plato holds that there is an entity corresponding to each thing bearing the same name with it that exists independently of the particular things. Such postulation does not solve any problem, as it makes repetition on a different level. The same questions that are raised in cases of the particulars may also be raised in cases of the Ideas or Forms. Thus, mere multiplication of objects cannot be said to be a solution to any problem.

2. Plato's Ideas fail to explain the existence of things. The main problem of philosophy is to explain why the things exist. By following Plato's theory of Ideas, we cannot explain this. Even if we accept that the Idea of whiteness exists, we cannot see how it produces white objects.

3. Even if the existence of things is explained, their motion will be left

unexplained. The world of things is a world of change, motion, life and becoming. But Plato's Ideas cannot explain this fact. According to Plato, the Idea of whiteness produces white things, the Idea of beauty beautiful things and so on. But, since the Ideas themselves are changeless, motionless, so the world of things, which are their copies, will be alike. Thus the world will turn into a static one, which is impossible.

4. Plato has not explained properly the relation between the Ideas and particular things. He holds that particular things are the "copies" of Ideas and they "participate" in them. For Aristotle, such a contention is nothing but talking in empty metaphor.

5. The Ideas, which are supposed to be non-sensuous by Plato, are, in fact, sensuous. Plato thinks it necessary to seek a non-sensuous principle to explain the sensible world. But not finding such a principle, he takes the sensible things over again and regards them non-sensuous. In fact, there is no difference between the cow and the Idea of the cow, between the man and the Idea of man, except a meaningless and unnecessary "in-general" or "in-itself" which is attached to each sensible thing to give it a different look. Aristotle holds that Ideas are like the anthropomorphic gods of popular religion. These are nothing but the eternalized things of nature. He alters Plato's version by stating that things are not the copies of Ideas, but Ideas are the copies of things.

6. The view of Plato that the Ideas cause the particular things cannot be said to be true because the Ideas being changeless patterns without any principle of motion cannot function as the efficient cause. Even Plato's recognition of Ideas as the final cause cannot solve the problem, since it does not explain the efficient causality.

7. Plato commits the logical mistake of regarding Form or Idea both as an individual substance and a property. Forms are regarded as individual substances, as they have separate existence, and they are regarded as properties, since they are universals. But the question is: how can one and the same thing be both an individual substance and a property? Aristotle argues that it is impossible for anything 'general' to become an individual substance or a 'primary being', as an individual substance or primary being is such a thing which is peculiar to an individual object and on the other hand, 'general' is something which is common to a group of things. According to Aristotle, a substance is the same as subject to which predicates are assigned. It is not a predicate of something else. So, if Forms or Ideas are treated as individual substances, they cannot be universals, since substances possess

properties. Again, if Forms are treated as universals, they cannot be individual substances, as common property never indicates a "this-something" but a "this-such". Hence it is a logical impossibility to regard Form as both individual substance and a universal.

8. Aristotle's argument of the "Third Man" is noteworthy. The 'Third Man' argument states: An individual man is like the idea of man in being man and so there must be a further Idea, the 'third man', in which both the individual man and the idea of man participate. It leads to infinite regress.

9. If the Ideas are the essences of things, they must reside in the things themselves and not outside them. But Plato has isolated the Ideas from particular things and has placed them in a non-sensuous, non-temporal, mysterious world. Plato seems to have ended in absurdity when he asserts that there is horse-in-general existing independently somewhere beyond the particular horses. Plato's theory of Ideas is self-contradictory as it starts with stating that the universal is real and the particular is unreal and ends by lowering the universal at the level of the particular.

10. Even if Forms are supposed to exist apart, it is not possible to say in which cases it does so and in which it does not. Definitely, it cannot exist apart in the cases of all particulars or individuals, e.g., individual men. It is absurd to say that the essence of all men is the same, because all particular things whose essence is same or one are themselves one. It is also unreasonable to take essence as multiple and different.

All these criticisms against Plato's Ideas or Forms may be subsumed under two headings — first, that Plato introduced an unnecessary and useless duplication by making the Forms perfect and independent or separate substance. Secondly, Plato confused the categories of substance with property.

Thus Aristotle rejects Plato's view that universals exist apart from particular objects. The universal is not something which has a higher reality than the individual things experienced by us. It is a common predicate which resides in many objects of a class. Thus the concept of cow is what is common to all cows. The concept of cow is the same thing as the predicate 'cowness'. Now this 'cowness' cannot exist apart from cows , just as softness cannot exist apart from the soft things. The universal is real in the particular in the sense that it realises itself in particular. Unlike Plato, Aristotle holds that the individual man is not the imperfect copy of the universal man. He is an

actual man. He is called man because he has certain essential qualities of man. These certain essential qualities constitute the nature of man. Likewise, being an object of certain kind is determined by the properties possessed by the object. As the universals cannot exist by themselves, they cannot be called substances; nor are they particular substances, for there is not anything like absolute particular or isolated thing. If cowness does not exist independently of cows, then cows also do not exist independently of cowness. If we take away from cow what it has in common with other cows, we shall find nothing, as all qualities are taken away from it.

Both Aristotle and Plato hold that the knowledge of universal is acquired by the intellect. But while Plato regards it to be a priori, Aristotle regards it to be derived from sense-experience by abstraction.

From the foregoing discussion, what comes in the fore is that Aristotle's theory of universals is more moderate than that of Plato. Moreover, Aristotle's theory is more economical than Plato's, as he recognizes one world instead of two. Plato's theory is a theory of universalia ante rem, i.e., universals independent of particulars and Aristotle's is universalia in rebus, i.e., universals in things.

Aristotle's theory of universals is similar to the Indian realistic theories of universals in certain respects. Like Aristotle, the Nyaya-Vaisesika also holds that the universals do not exist independently of the particulars in a world of their own. They reside in the particular things as their predicates which are the basis of their classification and generalization. However, a subtle difference is there between these two camps. For Aristotle, the universals do not have existence different from and independent of the particular things. But the Nyaya, as differed from Aristotle yet being closer to Plato, holds that the universals are existentially independent of the particulars, although they depend on the particulars for their awareness.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q 7: What is the main thesis of realism?

Q 8: Name some supporters of realism.

Q 9: State briefly Plato's view of realism.

Q 10: How are the Ideas known according to Plato?

Q 11: Define Aristotle's realism.

Q 12: Write whether the following statements are true or false. (True/False)

a) Plato treats universals as properties. (True/False)

b) Aristotle regards universals as adjectives. (True/False)

c) According to Plato, universals exist in a separate world beyond the particulars. (True/False)

d) Aristotle's theory is universalia in rebus. (True/False)

ACTIVITY : 2.1

- Whose view do you think to be more plausible— Plato's or Aristotle's?

Ans. .....

.....

.....

10.5 NOMINALISM: WHAT THIS THEORY SAYS

Nominalism thoroughly denies the objective metaphysical universals. For this theory, there is not any identical thing which resides in a group of particular objects at the same time. According to this theory, the problem of universals can be solved by the mere fact of observed resemblance among different particular things of a group. Thus nominalism defines universal in terms of resemblance or similarity such that the particulars are required only to resemble each other in being called by the same name. Hence this theory is also called the resemblance or similarity theory.

According to this theory, the attributes of any particular object are as particular and localized as the object itself. Nominalism denies the realist theories of universals, both in their Platonic and Aristotelian form. A universal, this theory holds, is not an entity at all — substantive or adjectival. This theory, which has several variations, defines universal in terms of particulars and of the relation of resemblance between them. Thus in one sense, this theory is closer to Aristotle than to Plato, as a universal is definable in terms of particulars, and hence cannot be found in the absence of instances. But it is unlike Aristotle in holding that a universal is not a feature reproduced in a number of particulars as numerically identical in each of them. Thus Nominalism does not deny that things have a common name. What this theory denies is the particular objects as designated by a general term possess a feature which is identical in all of them. The supporters of this theory are the Buddhist, William of Ockham, Hobbes, Berkeley and Hume.

The Western theory of nominalism finds its fullest expression in the hands of some empiricist thinkers. They stress on the observance of the particulars and the avoidance of abstract speculation. Instead of upholding objective metaphysical universals, this theory considers the observed resemblance among various particulars as enough to work out the problem of universals. This view has its origin in the philosophy of William of Ockham. His theory is popularly known as the principle of Ockham's razor. For him, it is wastage of time to employ a number of principles when it is possible to use a few.

10.5.1 Hobbes' view

Nominalism is found in its explicit form in the thought of Thomas Hobbes. Thomas Hobbes advances his nominalism in a milder form. He holds that a group of particulars resemble each other in being called by the same name and that each of these particulars is called by the same name as the rest because it resembles the rest in some other way besides merely being called by the same name. According to Hobbes, there is no universal but a general word, or, there is nothing common to a group of things except their being called by the same name. His theory rejects not only realism but also conceptualism. Universal is not anything that exists in nature, nor is it any idea formed in the mind. It is always the name of some word.

However, Hobbes, in his nominalism, seems to have failed to distinguish between 'type' and 'token'. 'Type' and 'token' have a significant difference between them. The following two sentences exemplify how the same word 'red' is used in the senses of 'type' and 'token' in two different occasions.

(i) 'Red' occurs ten times on this page, and

(ii) His red handkerchief hung down from his pocket.

In uttering the first sentence, the speaker is referring to the type 'red'. Here it has the same meaning wherever it occurs. In uttering the second sentence, the speaker is referring to the token word 'red', i.e., to one of the particular occurrences of the type word 'red'.

Now, as Hobbes fails to make the distinction, he is unable to find that the sense in which a name is common to a set of particulars each of which is called by it is a type sense, and also that each time a different token is used in naming any one

of the group. If he made the distinction between 'type' and 'token', he would have known not only the fact that a numerically different token is used each time, but also that tokens of a single type may vary qualitatively, too. Moreover, to think that there is something literally common to and identical in each instance of a given word is not only to blot out the distinction between type and token, and to reject the qualitative variations in tokens of the same type, but also to reintroduce the Aristotelian theory with its difficulties making the universal not a common feature of a group of instances, but a single identical name common to them.

Thus Hobbes' theory of universal faces some serious questions: Why are different things called by the same name? Is calling certain things by the same name the basis of classification? When everything in the world is singular, how can Hobbes be consistent in talking of the name being the universal? All these difficulties are must to face for anyone holding extreme nominalism. Hobbes seems to have understood this, so he takes the stand of milder nominalism. He takes resemblance between individual things as the basis of their being called by the same name. One universal name is applied to several things because of their similitude in some quality or other. 'A man' refers to any one of the multitude of men and 'a cow' denotes any one of the multitude of cows. There is a relation of similarity between 'this man' and 'that man', and between 'this cow' and 'that cow'. When Hobbes says that a general word is a name common to a group of particulars, what he means to say is a similar token word as used for each of the particulars belonging to the group. The similitude of objects is the basis of classification. Classification is not merely naming, it has a specific foundation, i.e., similarity between things. Thus Hobbes' theory stands or falls with the theory of resemblance.

Hobbes' nominalism differs from the Buddhist nominalism (apohavada). Like the latter, Hobbes' nominalistic position is not extreme. The Buddhist does not recognise any positive similarity amongst particulars. Only the unique particulars (sva-laksana) are real and similarity, names etc. are all mental constructions. Similarity or identity does not have any room except in our imagination. Neither things can be said to be similar, nor can the words be said to be the same. 'Sameness' and 'similarity' — all these are make-beliefs. The Buddhist denies identity or similarity of any kind, for he, being a consistent nominalist, knows that the acceptance of identity or similarity on any plane would be to entertain the realism.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q.13 State whether the statements are true or false (True/False)

a) According to Nominalism, universal is essence. (True/False)

b) Hobbes Nominalism is a milder Nominalism. (True/False)

c) Buddhist Nominalism is called apohavada. (True/False)

Q 14: Define Nominalism.

Q 15: What is type?

Q 16: What is token?

Q 17: How does Hobbes define universal?

10.5.2 Hume's view

Hume's account of general words is found in his celebrated work "A Treatise of Human Nature". Hume holds that general ideas are particulars used in a representative way. He developed this idea— which is pretty similar to that of Berkeley— by formulating the disposition or propensity theory and resemblance theory. Hume starts his doctrine with the view that we cannot generalise without having a particular image in mind. He is against the view of abstraction. For him, the general idea itself is a particular concrete individual. The ideas are the copies or faint images of impressions in thinking and reasoning. Hume does not regard them to be intellectual idea apprehended by reason. There are only those ideas which copy impressions.

Hume appreciates Berkeley's assertion that universals or general ideas are nothing but particular attached to a certain word which assigns them a more extensive signification and makes them remember in cases of other individuals similar to them. He maintains that corresponding to every general word there must be a particular mental idea. While Berkeley holds that a word becomes general by its relation to a particular but representative idea, Hume states it the other way round. For him, a particular idea becomes general by being added to a general term.

Hume puts forward three arguments in support of his view. They are—

Firstly, we cannot have an image of a line which is not of some particular length. Thus we cannot form any idea of quantity or quality without forming a precise notion of degrees of each.

Secondly, since an idea copies impression and every impression being

determinate and definite, an idea must be determinate and definite, even though it is fainter than the impression from which it is derived.

Thirdly, in nature, whatever exists must be individual, i.e., a precisely determined particular. For instance, no triangle can exist without its particular characteristics. It is an absurdity to postulate an existent triangle which is at the same time all and none of the possible kinds and sizes of triangle.

While Berkeley had contended himself with maintaining that an idea becomes general by representing all ideas of the same sort, Hume goes further to give an account of how a particular idea represents others. He finds this explanation in his Resemblance theory. He gives two accounts of resemblance. First, two things resemble when they have one or more elements in common. This is the traditional account of resemblance. Secondly, resemblance may occur where there are no elements in common. This is Hume's additional theory which provides the foundation for the resemblance theory proper. The first theory asserts that two composites are said to resemble each other when at least one simple amongst the simples of which they are formed is found to be common in them. To take an example, if a composite A consists of a b c d and another composite B consists of a b e f, then the composites A and B may be said to resemble each other as they have in common the simples a and b. But this account of resemblance involves a difficulty. For this theory can be observed only in cases of composites possessing common components in the sense explained above and it implies that simples cannot resemble each other and consequently we cannot generalise in their case.

Realising this problem, Hume says that when we find resemblance among several things observed by us, we are in the habit of applying the same name to all of them. For instance, having observed the cows frequently and having noticed resemblances among them, we apply the same word 'cow' to all of them, in spite of the differences among jersey cow, local cows, white cows, black cows, brown cows, tall cows, short cows, and so on. In this way, we may generalise without discovering common elements but by counting resemblance where there are no known identical common qualities. Thus, according to Hume, generalisation is done by finding resemblances. His new account is applied in the cases of composite also.

However, Hume's theory of resemblance in simples is not free from question. Regarding the question what enables us to group all simples together under the

abstract term simple idea, Hume holds that they resemble each other in their simplicity. Now, if we go to interpret the term as per the similarity theory, this would mean that the simplicity of one simple idea resembles, but not identical with, the simplicity of another simple idea. Yet this is not the meaning of what Hume amounts to say. He surely means that the simplicity in both simple ideas is identical. Thus resemblance theory seems failed to keep Hume's position firm.

Again, in Disposition or Propensity theory, Hume discussed vividly about the association of ideas on the one hand and of belief on the other. Hume illustrates the Disposition theory by certain analogies. And by these analogies he wants to establish the following points in relation to the use of general words:

(1) We have to acquire a certain technique in order to use general words successfully. This is a technique of using word to cover a number of things much of which is not in our thought at the time of using the word.

(2) The general word revives a habit. It acts as a stimulus. By using a single word we can revive several instances of habits. For instance, a man who cannot remember the verses can be put in remembrance of the whole by that single word or expression with which they begin.

(3) When we use the general word, its meaning cannot be said to be fixed. It is not precisely defined; it is used in somewhat loose manner. Yet it is not used foolishly, it is used intelligently and significantly in thinking and conversation with others. By conversation and reading we are accustomed to use them properly in appropriate situation, though we can hardly define them precisely.

Thus Hume's theory begins with the finding of resemblances and Hume has also shown that it is possible to observe a resemblance without discovering a common character. Hume replaces the abstraction of a common character by custom and the natural association of ideas. He says that when we find resemblance between the things we come across, we are accustomed to apply the same name to all of them, whatever differences they may have. After we have acquired the habit of applying the same word to the things resembling one another, the hearing of that word revives the idea of one of these things and makes the imagination conceive it. The hearing of the word can call up only one of the things. It cannot call up ideas of all things to which the word applies. But it, at the same time, brings in action 'a certain custom' to produce any other thing resembling this idea, if the occasion demands it. That is, the hearing

of the word or name produces them all before it, though potentially and not actually. They are not present really to the mind, but only in power. We do not place them distinctly in imagination. What we do is to keep ourselves in a readiness to produce any one of them when the situation demands. Generally only a few ideas are recalled. In fact, the recollection of all ideas to which the word or name may be applied is almost impossible. For our mind not only recalls, but also rejects. It is ready to reject anything which it is not accustomed to.

Hume's Disposition or Propensity theory may be regarded as a protest against the view that there is always a conscious selection of common qualities followed by the formation of a universal before the use of general words. We can generalise without discovering the common characteristic or characteristics, and simply by noting resemblances where there are no identical common qualities. Hume was the first among the empiricists who explained the use of general words at the level of daily life below the scientific level. We cannot think in cases of children that they first set out to isolate common characteristics and then abstract them to frame the universal. Here custom is the predominant thing in their cases as in the cases of adults. When the mind observes recurrence of certain resemblances among several things, then it, almost without our knowledge, groups them whose links are strengthened by the assertion of the common name. While determining the meaning of the word 'figure' we may not rest on one image or idea, rather we may revolve in our minds the ideas of circles, triangles, squares, rectangles, parallelograms of different sizes and proportions. Here the mind is doing explicitly what the custom for the most part does for it unknowingly. Thus the mind determines the meaning of the word 'figure' according to what the custom brings forth. Giving much importance on custom and habit debars us from saying that the central feature of the theory is taking one particular and making it stand for all others of the same sort. Here the important thing is not the taking of one particular; rather it is this custom-induced suggestibility of the mind, this habit or 'propensity'.

Hume holds that logic cannot be wholly divorced from psychology. For him, a concept must be thought of in terms of the conceiving of a concept. Conceiving a concept is having a particular expectation on hearing a name, a certain readiness to recognise an instance and to reject that is not an instance. A universal should not be regarded as a solid ideal content possessed by the mind, but as a readiness and expectation which has an emotional aspect along with its cognitive one.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q 18: State whether the statements are true or false (True/False)

a) Hume's view of universal is known as resemblance or similarity theory. (True/False)

b) Hume is associated with Disposition or Propensity theory. (True/False)

c) For Hume, a particular idea becomes general by being added to a general term. (True/False)

Q 19: Write one similarity between Berkeley and Hume regarding universal.

Q 20: Define Hume's Nominalism.

Q 21: What does Hume want to prove by Propensity theory?

ACTIVITY : 2.0

- Is resemblance or similarity theory tenable as a theory of universal? Give reasons in support of your answer.

Ans. .....

.....

10.6 LET US SUM UP

- What we have understood from the foregoing discussion is the problem of universal is a very knotty one.
- The two views discussed here seem to be right from their own perspectives, though none of them are above criticism.
- However, the definition of universal that is commonly held is— universal is something which is common to and shared in common by all the members of a particular class, and is the ground of their being grouped into the same class and called by the same name.
- According to realism, this common element is mind-independent and has objective reality.
- While for Plato, universal exists in a non-spatial and non-temporal world, for Aristotle, it exists in particular things.
- The problem of universal is originated from our experience, thought and language.
- Universal provides the ground of grouping things together. It establishes a unity

among the discrete particulars.

- Realism, conceptualism and nominalism are the some main theories of universal.
- Realism is the theory according to which universals have independent reality. Champions of this theory are Plato and Aristotle.
- According to Plato, universals are substantive, but for Aristotle, they are adjectival. For Plato, universals exist apart from the particulars, but for Aristotle, it is impossible. Thus from the foregoing discussion it is evident that Nominalism thoroughly denies the objective metaphysical universals. It is not ready to admit any identical thing which is supposed to be present commonly at the same time in a group of particular objects. Rather this theory defines universal in terms of resemblance or similarity such that the particulars are required only to resemble each other in being called by the same name. Thomas Hobbes advanced his theory in a milder form. And Hume handled the problem of universal with the formulation of Disposition or Propensity theory coupled with similarity theory.

Some main points of this unit are:

- Nominalism denies outright the common essence identically present in a group of things.
- According to this theory, it is the resemblance or similarity that brings the things in a particular group.
- Hobbes' milder nominalism asserts that a group of particulars resemble each other in being called by the same name and that each of these particulars is called by the same name as the rest because it resembles the rest in some other way besides merely being called by the same name.
- Hume, through his Disposition or Propensity theory, tries to prove that we can form universal without discovering the common characteristic or characteristics, and simply by noting resemblances where there are no identical common qualities.

10.7 FURTHER READING

1) Aaron, R. I. (1952): The Theory of Universals: Oxford.

2) Edman, I. (ed.) (1956): The Works of Plato: The Modern Library: New York.

3) Sarma, Dr. Ramala (2013): Theory of Universals: N. L. Publications: Guwahati.

4) Warrington, J., (ed.) (1961) Aristotle's Metaphysics: Everyman's Library: London.

5) Aaron, R. I. (1952): *The Theory of Universals*: Oxford.

6) Hume, D. (1967): *A Treatise of Human Nature*: Ed. by L. A. Oxford:Selby-Bigge:

7) Sarma, Dr. Ramala (2013): *Theory of Universals*: Guwahati: N. L. Publications:.

8) Woozley, A. D. (1982): *Theory of Knowledge*: New Delhi: B. I. Publications:.

10.8 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROG-RESS

Ans to Q no 1: a) True b) False c) True d) True e) False

Ans to Q no 2: The universal may generally be defined as something which is common to and shared in common by all the members of a particular class, and is the ground of their being grouped into the same class and called by the same name.

Ans to Q no 3: Particular things are those that exist in a particular space and time. For example, a chair, a table, a red colour, a cow, a tree etc.

Ans to Q no 4: Realism, Conceptualism and Nominalism.

Ans to Q no 5: According to conceptualism, universal is a concept in mind; it is a pure mental entity. There is no universality in things outside mind.

Ans to Q no 6: According to Nominalism, universals are mere words or names which are made universal by being used for a number of different particulars.

Ans to Q no 7: The main thesis of realism is that universal exists independent of the knowing mind. It has objective reality. It is the essence that is equally present in all the members of a class.

Ans to Q no 8: Nyaya-Vaisesika amd Mimamsa, Plato, Aristotle, St Augustine, St Thomas Aquinas, Bertrand Russell, G. E. Moore and S. Alexander are the supporters of realism.

Ans to Q no 9: Plato's realism is extreme realism. For him, a universal is substantive, an entity which exists without depending on mind in a non-temporal, non-

spatial world. It is not affected by whatever happens to the particulars in the world of space and time. Particulars depend on universals for their existence, but the other way round is not true.

Ans to Q no 10: According to Plato, Ideas are known through the theory of reminiscence. He said that the soul is said to possess the universals (in Plato's words, pure Forms or Ideas) in the incorporeal world before embodying the present body. When we perceive the similar things in the present life, we remember the Forms forgotten in earthly life.

Ans to Q no 11: Aristotle advocates a moderate form of realism. He rejects the mysterious world of substantive universals. According to him, a universal is not a substantive at all but a property which belongs to particulars. For him, there is a logical interdependence between the universals and the particulars.

Ans to Q no 12: a) False b) True c) True d) True

Ans to Q no 13: a) False b) True c) True

Ans to Q no 14: Nominalism is a theory that defines universal in terms of resemblance or similarity such that the particulars are required only to resemble each other in being called by the same name. Hence this theory is also called the resemblance or similarity theory.

Ans to Q no 15: A word is type when it has the same meaning in all its occurrences.

Ans to Q no 16: A word is token when it refers to its particular occurrence.

Ans to Q no 17: Hobbes' nominalism is a milder one which asserts that a group of particulars resemble each other in being called by the same name and that each of these particulars is called by the same name as the rest because it resembles the rest in some other way besides merely being called by the same name.

Ans to Q no 18: a) True b) True c) True

Ans to Q no 19: For both Hume and Berkeley assertion that universals or general ideas are nothing but particular attached to a certain word.

Ans to Q no 20: According to Hume, universals or general ideas are nothing but particular attached to a certain word which assigns them a more extensive signification and makes them remember in cases of other individuals similar

to them. He holds that corresponding to every general word there must be a particular mental idea.

Ans to Q no 21: Hume's Disposition or Propensity theory may be regarded as a tool to protest against the view that there is always a conscious selection of common qualities followed by the formation of a universal before the use of general words. We can generalise without discovering the common characteristic or characteristics, and simply by noting resemblances where there are no identical common qualities.

10.9 MODEL QUESTIONS

A. Very Short Questions

Q1: Is Russell a supporter of realism?

Q2: Which Indian thinkers advocate realism?

Q3: Which theory of universal admits essence as identically present in all the particulars of a class?

Q4: What is particular?

Q5: Give an example of universal.

Q6: Give some examples of particular.

Q7: Name the theory by which Ideas are known according to Plato?

Q8: According to Aristotle, does universal exist apart from the particulars?

Q9: Which Indian theory assimilates Aristotle's view?

Q10: Which philosopher is associated with the concept the Idea of Good?

Q11: Is Hume a nominalist?

Q12: Who is associated with the theory of Ockham's Razor?

Q13: Name some supporters of Nominalism.

Q14: What is the Buddhist theory of universal known as?

Q15: Give an example to illustrate 'type' and 'token'.

Q16: Which theories did Hume formulate to articulate his view of universals?

B. Short questions (Answer in about 100-150 words)

Q1: Define universal.

Q2: What is realism?

Q3: Write the difference between universal and particular.

Q4: Write short notes on Plato's Idea of Good?

Q5: Write how Aristotle's view assimilates that of Nyaya-Vaisesika.

Q6: Mention some differences between the views of Plato and Aristotle.

Q7: Write short notes on Nominalism.

Q8: What is Ockham's Razor?

Q9: Why is Nominalism is called Resemblance or Similarity theory?

Q10: What is the difference between Hobbes Nominalism and Buddhist Nominalism?

Q11: Write briefly on the analogies which Hume used to illustrate Disposition or Propensity theory.

Q12: '**A** particular idea becomes general by being added to a general term.' What are the arguments put forward by Hume in support of this view?

C. Long questions (Answer in about 300-500 words)

Q1: Discuss critically Plato's theory of universal.

Q2: How does Aristotle criticise Plato's theory of Ideas?

Q3: Give an account of Aristotle's realism.

Q4: In what sense is Aristotle's realism more moderate than that of Plato?

Q5: What do you mean by the hierarchy of universals? Discuss in the light of Plato's view.

Q7: Hobbes Nominalism is a milder Nominalism. Elucidate the statement.

Q8: Give an account of Hume's theory of universals. How does he differ from Berkeley?

Q9: Explain critically Resemblance or Similarity theory of universals.

****

UNIT: 11 OUTLINES OF LOGICAL POSITIVISM

UNIT STRUCTURE

11.1: Learning objectives

11.2: Introduction

11.3: Supporters of Logical Positivism

11.4: Verification theory of meaning

11.5: Elimination of Metaphysics

11.6: Critical Appreciation

11.7: Let us sum up

11.8: Further Readings

11.9: Answers to check your progress

11.10 Model Questions

11.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to:

- Identify the principal aim of logical positivism
- Explain logical positivism as a philosophical movement
- Describe the verification theory of meaning
- Write a critical appreciation

11.2 INTRODUCTION

Logical Positivism is an early twentieth century philosophical movement. The movement started in Vienna in the year 1922 under the leadership of Moritz Schlick. Schlick was a philosopher with a scientific temperament. He also inherited the anti-metaphysical view- point of his predecessor Ernst Mach. A group of scientists and mathematicians joined in Vienna and the result was the birth of the famous “Vienna Circle”. Logical Positivism, or simply Positivism, is the philosophy propounded by this group of philosopher-scientists.

Logical positivism may be said to be an outcome of the British Empiricist tradition. Locke’s thesis that knowledge is derived from experience alone was further developed by Berkeley into subjective idealism. Then in Hume’s hand it took the shape of scepticism according to which there was no sound footing for our knowledge. Hume maintained that

our knowledge of the empirical world is dependent on the law of causation. But the law of causation itself is not beyond doubt. Empiricism, was thus, started with attractive premises but ended in unsatisfactory conclusions. Therefore, the philosophers of the Vienna Circle tried to overcome the difficulties of empiricism. Logical positivism was also influenced by the logical analysis of Moore, Russell, Wittgenstein, Whitehead, Frege and others.

11.3 SUPPORTERS OF LOGICAL POSITIVISM

The school of logical positivism was started under the leadership of Moritz Schlick. Other prominent members of the circle were Otto Neurath, Rudolf Carnap, Hans Reichenbach, A.J. Ayer, E. Nagel and C.W. Morris. In the hands of these philosophers' logical positivism was spread beyond Vienna to Prague, Warsaw, Berlin, Oxford and America. It became popular among the philosophers and came to be recognized as a twentieth century "revolution in philosophy".

11.4 VERIFICATION THEORY OF MEANING

The principal tool of the logical positivists in carrying out their philosophical activities was their theory of meaning. According to this theory, the meaning of a proposition is the method of its verification. A sentence is meaningful if, and only if it is either analytic or empirically verifiable. Sentences of mathematics and logic are called analytic. These sentences are divided into tautologies, that is, those which are true under all possible circumstances, and contradictions, that is, those which are false under all possible circumstances. So, an analytic sentence is either necessarily true or necessarily false. Apart from these, the other class of meaningful sentences according to the theory are empirically verifiable sentences. A sentence that depicts an empirical situation expresses a proposition. And a proposition is true if it corresponds to the fact, and false if it does not so correspond. It appears, therefore, that the criteria of meaning for the logical positivists lies in the capacity of the sentence to be either true or false. A sentence is meaningless if it is neither true nor false.

Logical positivists have developed this verification theory of meaning in the light of the picture theory of meaning of early Wittgenstein. Wittgenstein in his ***Tractatus*** maintained that a sentence is meaningful in so far as it pictures a fact. Language for him is the symbolic representation of empirical facts. The world is composed of facts; a fact is an existing situation that makes a proposition true. The proposition "Ram is an intelligent student" is true if there is fact – a boy called Ram, who is a student and who is intelligent.

The proposition will be false, though meaningful, if either there is no boy called Ram, or if Ram is not a student, or if Ram is a student but is not intelligent. But a sentence that does not depict any actual or possible state of affairs, cannot express any proposition. There is no means of ascertaining whether it is true or false. Therefore, such a sentence is meaningless according to this theory.

However, this verifiability condition does not require that a sentence should be actually verified in order to be classed as meaningful. It only means the logical possibility of verification. Sentences about remote past or future state of affairs, for example, cannot be actually verified; but we can think of situations under which they can be verified. Again a statement like "there is no life in the planet Saturn" is also meaningful in this weak sense of verifiability, because we can theoretically think of visiting the planet Saturn and verify whether there is life there or not. There is a similar problem about general propositions such as "all men are mortal". These propositions are not conclusively verifiable under any possible circumstances. Hence they are also meaningless from the point of view of verification. But since these general propositions are important, Schlick calls them an important type of nonsense.

But verifiability whether maintained in the strong sense or in the weak sense, gives rise to many problems. Because of these difficulties **Karl Popper speaks of falsifiability as the criterion for distinguishing between scientific and non-scientific propositions. According to him, a proposition is scientific if and only if we can think out the logical possibility of falsifying it.** This theory can successfully accommodate general propositions under the head of scientific propositions. Because, although no amount of positive instances can conclusively verify a general proposition, a single negative instance can falsify it.

ACTIVITY

- Do you find any relationship between logical positivism and empiricism? If so,
  what?
  ……
  ……

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q 1: What is Vienna circle?

……

……

Q 2: State four supporters of logical positivism.

……

……

Q 3: What is verification theory of meaning?

……

……

Q 4: Define: a) Weak sense of verification

b) Strong sense of verification

c) Logical Positivism

Q 5: Fill up the gaps:

5. a) According to logical positivists, the meaning of a proposition is the method of its ——————————.

b) Logical Positivism is an early——————————————————————.

11.5 ELIMINATION OF METAPHYSICS

The principal aim of logical positivism was twofold –

1) To provide sciences with a secure foundation.

2) To show the meaninglessness of metaphysics.

For these purposes the logical positivists adopted the method of logical analysis of language. They have shown with the help of this type of analysis that the language of metaphysics does not fulfill the criteria of meaningfulness. Hence, metaphysics is, according to them, nonsense. On the other hand, with their emphasis on the verifiability criterion they wanted to provide sciences with objective foundation.

By applying their criteria of meaning the logical positivists have found only two types of sentences to be meaningful, namely those of logic and mathematics on the one hand, and those concerning empirical states of affair on the other. All other sentences, including those of metaphysics and ethics, are meaningless or nonsense, according to them. But the logical positivists are not as hostile against the ethical sentences as they are against

metaphysical ones. It is because they found the ethical sentences to be practically useful, but they had a faulty conception of metaphysics. By metaphysics the positivists understood a theory of reality. The idealistic concept of reality was that of an ideal lying beyond the world of experience. Those philosophers were of opinion that reality is transcendental; and the empirical world is only an illusion. The positivist philosophers had this type of *search for the reality* in mind when they declared that metaphysics is nonsense. They called the descriptions about the metaphysical entities and the reality as expressed in some "sentences" which did not express any "proposition". A proposition can be verified to be either true or false. Since metaphysical sentences are about some unverifiable super sensuous entities, they are deficient of the capability of being true or false; so, they are meaningless.

The meaninglessness of the metaphysical sentences may be generated, according to Carnap, by two sources: 1) either one or more of the component words of a sentence is/are meaningless, (as for example, 'the dox is higher than the tox' where 'dox' and 'tox' are meaningless) which makes the entire sentence meaningless; 2) the constituent words are each meaningful individually, but their combination in a particular sentence fails to express any meaning (as for example, 'the book runs faster than the chalk pencil'). The metaphysician sometimes speaks the first kind, and sometimes the second kind of nonsense. When, for example, he speaks of the "absolute", he commits the mistake of the first kind as there is no such entity to be found in the empirical world to correspond to the definition of "absolute". He commits the mistake of the second kind when he says that "Reality is identity in difference". Carnap points out that the metaphysician was misled by the conception that for every word or phrase that can be the grammatical subject or predicate of a sentence, there must be a corresponding entity. If those entities are not found in the empirical world, they must be residing in some non-empirical world. Thus, Heidegger imagined that corresponding to the word "nothing" also there must be an entity.

ACTIVITY

- "Metaphysical propositions are non-sense." How can you prove it?

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q 6: What is the principal aim of logical positivism?

.....

Q 7: What are the two types of meaningful sentences given by the logical positivists?

.....

Q 8: State whether the following statements are True or False

a) Metaphysical propositions are not verifiable (True/false).

b) Logical positivism adopts the method of logical analysis of language (True/false).

c) Karl Popper is a critique of logical Positivism (True/false).

11.6 CRITICAL APPRECIATION:

Logical positivism has brought about a twentieth century revolution in philosophy. It started with the empirical outlook, but aimed at overcoming the demerits of traditional empiricism. Combined with the linguistic analyses of Russell, Moore, Wittgenstein and others, the logical positivists aimed at providing philosophy with some scientific foundation. As a reaction against the classical idealistic tradition it was a very bold step. It can be said to be successful to some extent in showing the 'meaninglessness' of scholastic metaphysics. But this enterprise proved to be a kind of over-enthusiasm when it went to deny the very meaningfulness of metaphysics in general. All the difficulties in logical positivism are generated by their theory of meaning.

The verification theory of meaning is the principal thesis of positivism. This theory maintains that the meaning of a proposition is the method of its verification. But interestingly the theorist has no clear account of the principle. It is found that among the positivists there are two versions of verifiability – strong and weak. According to the strong version, a sentence is meaningful if it is actually verified in sense experience. But this strong version cannot render a good variety of propositions as meaningful. Propositions about past events, those about future state of affairs – all become meaningless in this version. But we cannot, for obvious reasons, regard these propositions as meaningless. Again propositions about general truths and those of hitherto unexplored regions are not verified. These too cannot be rendered meaningless simply because they have not been verified. In the face of these difficulties the positivists go to formulate a weaker version of the theory.

In the weak sense, verification does not require that a statement should be actually and conclusively verified. A statement is verifiable in the weak sense if we can think of a probable situation under which it can be verified. That is, a statement in this sense is meaningful if we can show that it is probable, i.e., we can imagine a situation in which it would be true. A. J. Ayer, in this connection, maintains that all empirical or synthetic propositions are verifiable only in this weak sense. Because, even a very simple proposition like "the car is red" is not as simple as it appears. To understand the meaning of this proposition it is necessary that we should classify the particular object as a car and the particular colour as red. Now 'car' and 'red' are general concepts. And the positivist maintains that no general concept can be conclusively verified.

Karl Popper is critical of positivism when it goes to render general statements as an 'important type of nonsense'. He maintains that the positivist discredits not only metaphysics but also natural sciences. **Therefore, he proposes an alternative to verifiability. This alternative is his theory of falsifiability. According to Popper, a statement is significant if we can think of a situation in which it can be false. General propositions of natural sciences cannot be verified by any amount of positive instances, but can be falsified by a single negative instance. Hence, he is of opinion that no statement is scientific which is not capable of being false.**

The positivistic position of denial of metaphysics with reference to their verification theory of meaning suffers from a number of defects. It has been pointed out that the theorist has arbitrarily conjoined meaning with verification. We can understand the meaning of a sentence even if we do not know whether it is verified or not. Again, Ayer has been criticized on the point when he says that empirical propositions are not conclusively verifiable. If we do not take any proposition to be certain, then the process of verification will go on endlessly. Moreover, the verification principle itself does not fall into either of the categories of analytical and empirical propositions; hence it is also meaningless. Further, it is pointed out that the positivist has a wrong conception of metaphysics. Metaphysics does not only mean a discipline that deals with transcendental entities. Metaphysics also represents the study about our actual world, not however from the point of view of a scientist. On this account the positivist may also be said to be doing metaphysics, although of a different kind.

1.8 LET US SUM UP

- Logical Positivism is an early twentieth century philosophical movement. The movement started in Vienna in the year 1922 under the leadership of Moritz Schlick. Logical positivism was also influenced by the logical analysis of Moore, Russell, Wittgenstein, Whitehead, Frege and others.
- The school of logical positivism was started under the leadership of Moritz Schlick. Other prominent members of the circle were Otto Neurath, Rudolf Carnap, Hans Reichenbach, A.J. Ayer, E. Nagel and C.W. Morris.
- According to this theory, the meaning of a proposition is the method of its verification. A sentence is meaningful if, and only if it is either analytic or empirically verifiable.
- Karl Popper speaks of falsifiability as the criterion for distinguishing between scientific and non-scientific propositions. According to him, a proposition is scientific if and only if we can think out the logical possibility of falsifying it.
- The principal aim of logical positivism was twofold –

1) To provide sciences with a secure foundation.

2) To show the meaninglessness of metaphysics.

- There are two versions of verifiability – strong and weak. According to the strong version, a sentence is meaningful if it is actually verified in sense experience. In the weak sense, verification does not require that a statement should be actually and conclusively verified. A statement is verifiable in the weak sense if we can think of a probable situation under which it can be verified.
- Karl Popper proposes an alternative to verifiability. This alternative is his theory of falsifiability. According to Popper, a statement is significant if we can think of a situation in which it can be false. General propositions of natural sciences cannot be verified by any amount of positive instances, but can be falsified by a single negative instance. Hence, he is of opinion that no statement is scientific which is not capable of being false.

11.8 FURTHER READING

a) C.W. Morris: *Logical Positivism, Pragmatism and Scientific Empiricism*, AMS Press, Newyork, 1979

b) R.Carnap: *Philosophy and Logical Syntax,* K.Paul, Trench, Trbner &Co., ltd, London, 1935

c) R.Carnap: *Logical Syntax of Language,* K.Paul, Trench, Trbner &Co., ltd, London, 1935

d) R.Carnap: *Logical Foundation of the Unity of Science,* London: Kegan Paul, 1934

e) A.J.Ayer: *Language, Truth and Logic,* Gollang, London, 1946

f) A.J.Ayer (ed.): *Logical Positivism*, The Free Press, New York, 1959

g) A.J.Ayer (ed.): *The Revolution in Philosophy*, Macmillan,1957

h) K.Popper: *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*, Routledge, London, 2003

i) K.Popper: *Conjectures and Refutations,* London, England: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd. 1972

j) L.Wittgenstein: *Tractatus Logico Philosophicus*, Trans by D.F. Pears and B. McGuinness, London: Routledge, 1961

k) W.P. Alston: *Philosophy of Language,* N.J. Prentice Hall, 1964

ARTICLES:

l) A.J.Ayer: "Demonstration of Impossibility of Metaphysics" *Mind*, July1934

m) W.T.Stace: "Metaphysics and Meaning" *Mind*, Oct. 1935

n) M.Schlick: "Meaning and Verification" in *Theory of meaning* (ed.) A. & K. Lehrer

o) I.Berlin: "Verification" in *The Theory of Meaning* (ed.) G.H.R. Parkinson

p) J.Wisdom: "Metaphysics and Verification" in *Mind*, 1938

11.9 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Answer to Q. No 1: A group of scientists and mathematicians joined in Vienna and the result was the birth of the famous 'Vienna circle'.

Answer to Q. No 2: Otto Neurath, Rudlof Carnap, Hans Reichenbach and A.J. Ayer.

Answer to Q. No 3: This theory says that the meaning of a proposition is the method of its verification. A sentence is meaningful if only if the sentence is analytic and

empirically verifiable. As for instance, propositions of logic and mathematics are verifiable.

Answer to Q. No 4a: The strong version holds that a sentence is meaningful if it is actually verified in sense experience.

Answer to Q. No 4b: The weak version says that a sentence is verifiable if we can think of a probable situation under which it is verified.

Answer to Q. No 4c: It is an early twentieth century philosophical movement. The movement began in Vienna in the year 1922 under the leadership of Moritz Schlick. It is an outcome of the British Empiricist Tradition.

Answer to Q. No 5a: Verification

Answer to Q. No 5b: Twentieth century philosophical movement.

Answer to Q. No 6: The principal aim of logical positivism was two fold:

i) To provide sciences with a secure foundation.

ii) To show the meaninglessness of metaphysics.

Answer to Q. No 7: Ans. Only logical and mathematical sentences are meaningful.

Answer to Q. No 8a: True

Answer to Q. No 8b: True

Answer to Q. No 8c: True

11.10 MODEL QUESTIONS

A. Objective Questions

Q 1: What is logical positivism?

Q 2: What is verification theory of meaning?

Q 3: What is strong verification?

Q 4: What is weak verification?

Q 5: What is meant by elimination of metaphysics?

Q 6: What are two versions of verifiability.

B. Short questions (Answer in about 100-150 words)

Q 1: Write short notes on:

a) Logical positivism

b) Verification theory of meaning

c) Elimination of metaphysics

d) Two versions of verifiability

Q 2: Explain in brief about the falsifiability theory of meaning.

C. Long questions (Answer in about 300-500 words)

Q 1: What do you mean by the movement of logical positivism? Is the movement standing against metaphysics? Write in your own words.

Q 2: What do you mean by elimination of metaphysics? Explain.

Q 3: Are the metaphysical propositions nonsense? Explain.

Q 4: What are the defects of logical positivism? Explain.

UNIT-12 EXISTENTIALISM

UNIT STRUCTURE

12.1 Learning objectives

12.2 Introduction

12.3 Advocates of existentialism

12.4 Salient features of existentialism

12.5 Atheism and theism in existentialism

12.6 Existence precedes essence

12.7 Critical evaluation

12.8 Let us sum up

12.9 Further readings

12.10 Answers to check your progress

12.11 Model questions

12. 1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit you will be able to—

- Discuss about the development of existential movement;
- Discuss about the advocates and thinkers of existentialism
- Discuss about the salient features of existentialism;
- Distinguish between theism and atheism in existentialism; and
- Explain the theme of existentialism that is *existence precedes essence*

12.2 INTRODUCTION:

Existentialism is regarded as the most important philosophical trend in the modern scientific age. It has succeeded in creating a new revolution in contemporary thought. The Existential movement seeks to oppose the traditional ways of thinking in contemporary philosophy. But one important point to be noted here is that existentialism as a way of thought is not confined to philosophy alone. Its divergent interests and points of view can be traced to other fields of study as well. But one fact that is to be understood is that the concern for human life in someway has always been there in philosophy since time immemorial, though it was never studied under the brand name of existentialism. Only with the advent of contemporary philosophy did thinkers start to study and analyze human life in terms of “quality” and authentic existence and they were thereafter referred to as existentialists and their views as existentialism.

Soren Kierkegaard (1983-1855), a Danish thinker is generally regarded as the 'father" of the existentialist movement. He was very much against the abstract conception offered by traditional philosophers regarding life and universe. He tried to show that "truth is factual" – it is a matter to be realized and experienced in our mundane daily life, something to be found in our ethical and spiritual life.

While going through the history of existentialism, we find that soon after the First World War, the views advocated by Kierkegaard on existentialism, spread to Germany and America. The Existentialism movement gathered momentum after the Second World War. The devastating effects of the two world wars that inflicted immense pain and sufferings on human life, forced man to re-think and direct its attention towards self-criticism and self-analysis. At this point, thinkers were alarmed at the prospect of the erosion of human values resulting from the unhindered application of science and technology. Science and technology was then used to maim and destroy the human life. But human life is the most valued treasure of the Universe which is revealed by man's existence in the world. Therefore, they have given utmost importance to human existence.

Unique: being the only one of its kind uniqueness: the quality of unique in a thing or person place or situation.

Existentialism as a philosophy, deals with individual human existence. It is a type of view points that lays utmost importance to distinctive qualities of the individual, his existence, rather than man and nature or the world understood in the abstract or general sense. Existentialism asserts that each human individual is unique, and possesses uniqueness as distinguished from abstract universal human qualities. The true nature of an individual is to be understood as is revealed through his existence.

12.3 ADVOCATES OF EXISTENTIALISM

Some master figures have contributed to the growth of existentialism by their logical, philosophical and literary expressions. They are Soren Kierkegaard, Friedrich Nietzsche, Karl Jaspers, Gabriel Marcel, Martin Heidegger and Jean-Paul Sartre.

Soren Kierkegaard:

(1813- 1855) a Danish writer; who asserted that his "literature" includes philosophy, psychology theology and devotional literature, fiction and literary criticism.

According to Kierkegaard, the main issue in life is to be a Christian or a whole man. His Existentialism deals with the following factors: man's existence, his immortal

soul, his destiny and the reality of God. He identified two great enemies of Christianity. (a) Hegelian Philosophy leading to abstract thinking and (b) the conventional Church goers with their belief in human progress, confidence in reason and faith in the goodness of man. The unbridgeable gulf between God and the world, the creator and the creature leads to anguish in man. At this stage man's desperation makes him abandon reason and embrace faith. He takes a "leap of faith" leading to authentic existence. Kierkegaard says that a true philosopher must regard and understand oneself as the

Creature of God, the absolute sovereign.

Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche: (1844-1900) –a German Philosopher and cultural critic.

Nietzsche: His views on existentialism are often

Intellectual: connected with or using a person's ability to think in a logical way and understand things.

associated with the concepts of "Will to Power", Superman, morality of masters and morality of slaves. His beliefs in Protestant Christianity influenced his views on existentialism. He asks-what purpose is served when a man wants to know? While knowing, man imposes Being on the process of Becoming. But the knowing subject is also a process. This process, for Nietzsche, is an effort. He also refers to it as Will or Power. Knowledge cannot be general or Universal. There is only unique individual relations, interpretations and evaluations. There is no common element or essence, but only individual, private personal and particular existence. Nietzsche opposes the transcendent view of knowledge. What we know, is here before us. There is nothing to know beyond our present existence. Therefore, he accepts the personal reality of the existing individual thinker. Nietzsche's philosophy is characterized by an extensive intellectual and cultural impasse which he described in terms of the "death of God" and the inception of Nihilism.

Karl Jaspers: (1883-1969) German Psychologist and Philosopher, and Chief Exponent of Existentialism.

Karl Jaspers: Jasper's emphasis is on good life and the decision-making self. Philosophy, he says, is a guide to reasonable living, a perpetual quest involving living, feeling, deciding, acting and risking. Matter, life, self and mind are qualitatively different and they cannot be reduced to any common term. Man's personal existence

can be understood by considering (A) man's immediate consciousness of selfhood (B) his relations with his fellow beings in social life, and (C) the various historical structures of community life, like morals, law, the family, the state etc. The self has no reality beyond the world; it is a part of this world. This self is authentic and it gives a true meaning to life. The genuine existence of the self is known through certain conditions of environment, suffering, death and guilt.

Gabriel Marcel (1889-1973): French philosopher and play wright, also one of chief representatives of French existential thought.

Gabriel Marcel: While Marcel is deeply religious with liberal outlook, yet his approach is philosophical. According to him, the main theme of philosophy is the human predicament. He is concerned basically with two questions – Who am I? And what is being? He distinguishes between two elements in thinking. The first type is known as "first reflection" and comprises of experiences of seeing and having. This type is found in thinking of the man in the street", that is, the common man and also in the technical and scientific man. The second type is known as "second reflection". This type is beyond science and technology and objective knowledge. It seeks to reach beyond into the realm of being. There is also the distinction between "me" and something outside or "independent of me". Being involves that which I 'am' and not just that which I 'have'. It goes into the depths of nature and some degrees of participation with transcendence. However, it is undesirable for a living person to abolish all "having" from his life.

Communion with God, Marcel says, can interpret one's existence. No formal proofs or conceptualizing is necessary to describe man's experience with God. Man is free and this freedom can be experienced through hope, fidelity and love.

Martin Heidegger (1889-1976): German Philosopher, contributed to the growth of Existentialism.

Martin Heidegger: His existentialism centers around three issues – (a) Man's life (human being) (b) with his existence in the world of nature (concrete being) and (c) with ultimate reality (Being as such). Marcel says that man must understand that he is a finite. He comes into the world without his consent. He criticizes man who lives a superficial life and who emphasizes things, quality and personal power. Man must abandon his unauthentic existence. In spite of being a part or member of any collective group, he should be above the group- mentality. His mind should never be

engrossed in things and details of everyday life. He may, if he chooses, live a life of pure and genuine existence if, he focuses on the truth. By truth, Marcel means that he must view life from a new perspective, that is, in the light of death. But a man may not be aware of this new perspective. Whatever his final destiny may be, he must rise above the mundane activities of daily life and seek to reach to a better life. This is what is to be regarded as man's heroic existence

Jean Paul Sartre (1905-1980): French Philosopher and writer, chief advocate of existentialism.

Jean-Paul Sartre: His views on existentialism are outlined in his famous lecture, "Existentialism Is a Humanism." In this famous lecture, he comments, "Existentialism in our sense of the word is a doctrine that does render human life possible." He is convinced that there is no "essence" underlying the things we assert. He sets forth the view that human existence is really what we know. He asserts- "Existence precedes essence". Sartre follows Nietzsche when he denies the existence of God. Man makes himself and he chooses the conditions in which he has to live. For him, there are no values external to man. Values are created by man. They have neither permanent nor objective basis. Sartre's philosophy dwells on human experiences of dread, fear and anguish. Man detests loneliness, nothingness and death. Man is immensely free. But human life is marked by obstacles and resistance which man has not created. But human life becomes meaningful through the exercise of free choice in the face of these resistances and obstacles.

Thus, the goal of a human being should be towards a more ideal self. This ideal self is revealed in the heightened consciousness and existence of a free responsible man. But Sartre says that this quest for freedom is endless, quite deceptive and often futile. But even in this futile pursuit for freedom man can demonstrate his integrity.

ACTIVITY

- Do you think existentialist viewpoint is confined to philosophy alone?

.....

- Is existentialist movement a reaction against idealism? What do you think?

.....

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q 1: Name some leading Existentialists.

.....

Q 2: 'God is dead'- Who says?

.....

Q 3: What is philosophy, according to Karl Jaspers?

.....

Q 4: 'Existence precedes essence'- Who writes?

.....

Q 5: Gabriel Marcel is concerned basically with two questions. What are they?

.....

Q 6: Who is generally regarded as the father of existentialist movement?

.....

Q 7: What is the central theme of Sartre's Existentialism?

.....

12.4 SALIENT FEATURES OF EXISTENTIALISM

George Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770-1831): A German objective Idealist.

1. Existentialism is a movement of protest basically against traditional philosophy. It is against Greek rationalism and Hegel's Absolute Idealism. It opposes naturalism that tries to explain life through cause and effect opposing the naturalistic view point.

Science, the existentialist say, has succeeded in destroying and suppressing the creativity of man, human values and personal freedom, human feelings and emotions. Therefore, existentialism criticizes the scientific culture prevailing in modern society. It urges all writers, artistes to be conscious of human freedom and rescue humanity from doom and despair.

2. Unlike the traditional philosophers who assert that man is essentially rational, the existentialists say that man is guided by passion and not by reason. They lay utmost importance on will to power, self consciousness, feelings and emotions, tastes, individual likes and dislikes.

3. Existential thinkers are alarmed by the alienation between man and nature. Modern man has discarded nature and has turned himself into a machine. He has reached such a state that in spite of realizing his helpless state and meaningless existence, he is unable to do anything about it. He is suffering from guilt, dread, anguish and despair. Some existential thinkers say that philosophy aims to realize the true meaning of human life, man's existence in order to free man from all his sufferings. Human life is known only through varied aspects of man's life; they may be, pain, sorrow and suffering or happiness, contentment and well-being. Therefore, existentialism lays importance on the authentic existence of man.

4. Existentialism is an investigation and analysis of the human dilemma or human predicament: - the dilemma with regard to his situation and his prospects in the world. In fact, since the last century, man has expressed concern over his sense of alienation from and meaningless existence in this world. Man feels himself as an outsider in this world, where he must reside. During the 19th Century, some thinkers like Kierkegaard, Nietzsche and Dostoevsky and few others were continuously raising their voice against the lamentable condition of man in this world.

5. Existentialism asserts that "Existence precedes essence." Nothing can be above human existence. Human existence is the sole aim of all thought. It is above all qualities of things. Man's existence alone, as he lives with his physical experience, is what matters. His actual existence cannot be conceptualized. It is a matter of living and experiencing. The existentialists, therefore emphasize the primacy of human existence.

Materialism: the view that nothing is real except matter. Mind and consciousness are merely manifestations of such matter and are reducible to the physical elements.

Idealism: the theory, which asserts that reality, consists of ideas, through mind, or selves, and not of matter.

Angst: Originally, a German word, a feeling of anxiety and worry about a situation, or about life.

6. Existential philosophers have laid importance on human subjectivity. Existentialism rejects materialism and idealism. Truth is subjective and cannot be known apart from the subject's inner feelings. The immediate feeling or apprehension of the individual reveals the truth. It cannot be expressed in proposition. It is a matter of experience.

Leap of Faith: Crossover to a different area of belief, abandoning reason, but yet holding on to strong conviction of leading a qualitatively better enriched and fulfilled life.

7. Existentialism lays emphasis on the freedom of the individual. Man is free but he is dominated by **Will to Power:**

Characteristic of the Superman, leading to creative transformation of human existence that the power leads to "enhancement of life"

sorrow, fear, pain, dread and guilt. These are "Angst of life". Man should find out the cause of these emotions, feelings and sufferings. Nietzsche asserts that "Will to power" and "faith in self" will help us to be free from the "Angst of life". Man has immense choices within his reach. He has to work upon them and also accept responsibility for them. A genuine or authentic self exists, accepts choices, takes decision and accepts responsibility for them. Existentialism, in fact, asserts that man should strive for such an existence that thrives even in the face of frustrations and the impersonality of modern civilization.

Mediocrity: The quality of being average, below standard and not very good.

12.5 ATHEISM AND THEISM IN EXISTENTIALISM

Socialism: a set of political and economic theories based on the belief that everyone has an equal right to a share of a country's wealth and that the government should own and control the main industries.

Christianity: the religion that is based on the teachings of Jesus Christ and the belief that he is the son of God.

Faith: Understood as "Willingness to be oneself; made possible by a transparent, visible trusting relationship to the "power that created the self

Within Existentialism, we find both theistic and atheistic view points. Kierkegaard was a devout Christian and he wanted man to understand the reality of God, the absolute sovereign. He is against all attempts to make Christianity "reasonable" or to defend Christianity through intellectual attempts. He is also against the conventional churchgoer. To know the true and real meaning of his life, he has to undergo pain and despair. This will make him abandon reason and embrace faith. This is what is known "leap of faith" in the life of an authentic individual. Nietzsche is

a renowned atheistic Existentialist. He advocated the concept of "death of God" and **Democracy**: a system of government in which all the people of a country can vote to elect their representative.

also believed that we, humans have killed God. From this we can say that Nietzsche, once upon a time did believe in God. But later on, he turned against God. He talked of the "Higher Man" embodying the higher values of the "Lords (Superman) of the Earth", not the virtues of mediocrity demonstrated by Christianity, Democracy and Socialism. He opposes conventional Christianity which, he believes, makes man impersonal, passive, indifferent and uninvolved.

Heidegger is quite neutral, rather indifferent, to the question of God. The concepts of God in traditional philosophy and religion is not to be treated as the basis of everything, God, for him, is a being like any other being.

Jaspers asserts that we can be guided by faith, love and insight. Though he quotes Nietzsche, often he is closer to Kierkegaard. However, he does not accept either Nietzsche's anti-Christianity or Kierkegaard's "leap of faith".

Authentic: real, true, actual.

Transcendent: Beyond consciousness and cognition (experience).

Marcel says that we can transcend extreme objectivity. We can participate in prayer, meditation or contemplation as we encounter an authentic and transcendent reality. There can be a reciprocal relation between a living personal God and a finite and concrete self or God. Harold H. Titus in "Living Issues in Philosophy" says about Marcel's views – "To refuse God is to refuse to be". Though man cannot adequately conceptualize Being or God, but **Conceptualize:** to form an idea of something in your mind.

if he experiences the presence of God, no formal proof or conceptualizing is necessary.

Reality: things actually as they are, in contrast to mere appearance.

Jean-Paul Sartre's straight-forward and forceful atheism is revealed through his writings like "Being and Nothingness" and his more popular work "Existentialism is a Humanism", to name a few. Sartre's belief in the existence of God is quite different to the views generally accepted. His emphasis is on man's personal freedom. For him, God cannot exist outside a totality or whole. In fact, he says that God as a creator, who is supposed to have created man in their essence and left to act freely, is quite

incompatible with human freedom as conceived by Sartre. God cannot determine, Sartre says, the time when a man is "to die". Man has an intrinsic desire to be God, and God, he says, can ultimately be identified with this desire. Man cannot rely on any external support or God, except his freedom. Man, therefore, must rely on his resources which his freedom offers.

There is no clear-cut distinction between the theists and atheists within existentialism. In fact, both theists and atheists are concerned with human existence along with its associated issues. Few among them are agreeable in accepting God as a transcendental entity. But surely from a neutral stand point, we may say that God can succeed in elevating the status of human existence. If God rescues man from his "predicament" making his life enriched and fulfilled, in this sense God can be accepted as one of the positive factors in Existentialism.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q 8: What is "Leap of Faith"?

.....

Q 9: Name two followers of theistic and atheistic existentialism.

.....

Q 10: What is angst of life?

.....

Q 11: Who says about 'faith in self' and 'Will to Power'?

.....

Q 12: Who wrote 'Being and Nothingness'?

.....

12. 6 EXISTENCE PRECEDES ESSENCE

Existentialism, as the name, suggests deals with human existence. This existence is not an ordinary existence – it is unique, revealing the inner immediate experience of self awareness of the individual. Man's life **Self awareness**: Knowledge and understanding of one's own character as being apart from other things in the Physical world. becomes significant and meaningful, only when he is recognized as an existing individual. An existing individual is aware of his immediate consciousness

and this awareness cannot be expressed through abstractions. Abstract thinking makes man impersonal, taking him away **Abstract thinking**: the properties of thought having no spatio-temporal existence, but supposed to have being, to exist, or to subsist. from the concrete human being and human situation. There is no other reality or being except existence found in the "I" rather than the "it".

Existence: Derived from its German equivalent "Existenz" meaning growing trespassing, self consciousness, simply, it is used to mean spatio-temporal existence, the state or fact of being real or living.

Jean-Paul Sartre and some others assert that the statement "Existence Precedes Essence" is the soul and spirit of the existential movement. They distinguish between "existence" and "essence". "Existence" is something occurring within space and **Abstraction**: the way an idea or plan is formed in the mind, a general idea not based on any particular real person or thing or situation. time, a state of being actual and something which is given here and now. An individual is said to exist in this sense. The existentialists give a more richer, higher and positive status and content to the verb "*to exist"* in comparison to the verb "*to live*". A person is said to have an authentic existence only when he is living a growing, full, vital and self-**Essence**: The primal quality or feature of something that makes it what it is.

conscious life.

On the other hand, "Essence" is that which makes a thing what it is. It is what distinguishes a particular thing from other things. It is that which all things similar and labeled by the same name have in common. In fact often we may talk rightly about essence even though, really, there may not be any factual essence at any particular time. There is a distinction between 'what a thing is' and 'that it is' Essence is 'what a thing is' and 'that it is' is existence of the thing.

Conception: the process of forming an idea or plan; an understanding or a belief of what something is or what something should be.

The classical philosopher relied solely on essence. Plato emphasized upon the concept of man, that is upon man in general and not upon any individual man. For him and others, a person is a person, not by his existence, but as revealed by the ideal, form or essence of man i.e. man-ness.

Supra Temporal: Beyond time; not in time.

Supra Empirical: Beyond experience not in experience.

Existential thinkers reject this very notion of the classical thinkers. They say that the personal act of existing cannot be a matter of conception or abstraction. To actually know about existence one has to experience or actually live through it. It cannot be properly revealed through propositions. For them, the state of existence is primal than the supra-temporal and supra-empirical essence.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q 13: Who first coined the phrase "Existence precedes Essence".

.....

Q 14: What is Existence?

.....

Q 15: What is Essence?

.....

Q 16: Name the classical philosopher who solely relied on Essence?

Karl Marx (1818-1883) German Social Philosopher, economic theorist and revolutionary.

.....

12.7 CRITICAL EVALUATION

Engels: Friedrich Engels (1820-95), a German Socialist and economist who, with Marx, was the founder of what later was called Marxism.

The point where all existentialists meet is their concern for human predicament, man's feelings of estrangement and alienation, his separation from his deeper and inner self, from his fellow-beings from nature and the world. All existentialists want to think and deal with the issue—what is involved in being a human person?

They all oppose traditional philosophy that speculates; deal with systems that have overlooked certain fundamental problems of man's existence. They oppose science and any mass movements, and more recently they have criticized linguistic analysis and logical positivism too. However, they are to be commended for bringing into focus certain contemporary problems of human experience and existence and also for being alert to the inconsistency between thought and action. They have

protested against philosophical solutions offered by Hegel, Marx and Engels, asserting that their solutions are ineffective to meet the demands of modern man. Men have become impersonal and detached due to his feelings of estrangement since the last hundred years. The Industrial Revolution that have produced great cities, the collective and mass movements and the fragmentation and specialization knowledge due to the advancement of science and technology – all these factors are responsible for man's predicament. This predicament is a dilemma faced by man. He is forced to live and make home in the world where he is unhappy and frustrated.

But this rejection of objectivity by the existentialists that deny and suppress distinctive human qualities is not accepted by all, since they have gone a bit too far in rejecting all objectivity. They have denied the importance, and sometimes have raised irrational criticism towards science, nature, the external world, and many valid insights and issues of other kinds of philosophy. The critics ask – if reason cannot solve the problem of human existence, is there any guarantee that passion alone will be able to do so?

Reason should not be discredited or devalued. Man must refer to objective standards of truth and goodness to settle differences of opinion and also major disputes relating to all aspects of the world.

To give importance to a particular mood or a set of feelings as the hint or clue to understand life and the world is utterly objectionable and highly dangerous. In fact, such an emphasis on emotions of anxiety and dread will only create a sense of absurdity and nothingness.

However, we will have to give due credit to existentialism that have directed our attention to serious frustrations, disorders and discrepancies of modern life. In fact, it deserves special merit for alerting us to the precarious condition of not only modern civilization but also of the human existence in its entirety.

12.8 LET US SUM UP

- Existentialism is regarded as the most important philosophical trend in the modern scientific age. It has succeeded in creating a new revolution in contemporary thought.
- Soren Kierkegaard (1983-1855), a Danish thinker is generally regarded as the 'father" of the existentialist movement. He was very much against the abstract

conception offered by traditional philosophers regarding life and universe. He tried to show that "truth is factual" – it is a matter to be realized and experienced in our mundane daily life, something to be found in our ethical and spiritual life.

- Existentialism asserts that each human individual is unique, and possesses uniqueness as distinguished from abstract universal human qualities. The true nature of an individual is to be understood as is revealed through his existence.
- Some master figures have contributed to the growth of existentialism by their logical, philosophical and literary expressions. They are Soren Kierkegaard, Friedrich Nietzsche, Karl Jaspers, Gabriel Marcel, Martin Heidegger and Jean-Paul Sartre.
- Martin Heidegger's existentialism centers around three issues – (a) Man's life (human being) (b) with his existence in the world of nature (concrete being) and (c) with ultimate reality (Being as such).
- Sartre in this famous lecture *Existentialism and Humanism* comments, "Existentialism in our sense of the word is a doctrine that does render human life possible." He is convinced that there is no "essence" underlying the things we assert. He sets forth the view that human existence is really what we know. He asserts- "Existence precedes essence".

12.9 FURTHER READING

1. D.R. Bali: *Introduction to Philosophy,* Sterling Publishers Private Limited.

2. H.J.Blackham: *The Six Existentialist Thinkers*, Routlige & Kegan Paul.

3. Dilip Kumar Chakravorty: *Perspective in Contemporary Philosophy* Ajanta Publications, New Delhi.

4. D.K. Chakravorty: *Fundamental Questions of Epistemology and Mataphysics* Manthan Prakash, Guwahati.

5. Margaret Chatterjee: *The Existentialist outlook* Orient Longman.

6. Dhirendra Mohan Datta: The Chief Currents of Contemporary Philosophy the University of Calcutta, Kolkata.

7. J.N. Sinha: *Introduction to Philosophy* New Central Book Agency, Calcutta.

8. H Harold Titus: *Living Issues In Philosophy*. Eurasia Publishing House, New Delhi.

9. Mary Warnock: *Existentialism* Oxford, University Press.

12.10 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Answer to Q No 1: They are Soren Kierkegaard, Fredrick Nietzsche, Karl Jaspers, Gabriel Marcel, Martin Heidegger and Jean Paul Sartre.

Answer to Q No 2: Nietzsche

Answer to Q No 3: Philosophy is a guide to reasonable living, a perpetual quest involving living, feeling, deciding, acting and risking.

Answer to Q No 4: Jean Paul Sartre

Answer to Q No 5: The two questions are-i) Who am I? And ii) What is being?

Answer to Q No 6: Martin Heidegger

Answer to Q No 7: The central them is 'Existentialism is Humanism'.

Answer to Q No 8: It indicates to embrace faith abandoning reason.

Answer to Q No 9: Kierkegaard and Marcel are two theistic existentialist philosophers. On the other hand Nietzsche and Sartre are two atheistic existentialist philosophers.

Answer to Q No 10: We understand that man is free but he is dominated by sorrow, fear, pain, dread and guilt. They are 'Angst of life'.

Answer to Q No 11: Nietzsche.

Answer to Q No 12: Sartre.

Answer to Q No 13: Jean Paul Sartre.

Answer to Q No 14: Existence is something occurring within Space and Time, a state of being actual and something which is given here and now.

Answer to Q No 15: Essence is that makes a thing what it is.

Answer to Q No 16: Plato.

12.11 MODEL QUESTIONS

A) Very short questions

Q 1: What are the two great enemies of Christianity to Kierkegaard?

Q 2: Gabriel Marcel is concerned basically with two questions. What are they?

Q 3: Mention the concepts associated with Nietzsche's existentialism.

Q 4: What is philosophy, according to Karl Jaspers?

B) Short questions (Answer in about 100-150 words)

Q 1: What is "Freedom" for the existentialist? Explain in brief.

Q 2: Write a note on theism and Atheism in Existentialism?

Q 3: Explain in brief Nietzsche's view on existentialism

Q.4: Explain in brief about Heidegger's concept of existentialism.

Q 5: What are the salient features of existentialism? Explain in brief.

C) Long questions (Answer in about 300-500 words)

Q1: Discuss the salient features of existentialism.

Q2: "Existence precedes essence". Explain with reference to Sartre.

Q3: What are the main issues around which Heidegger's existentialism revolves? Explain.

.....

UNIT: 13 STRAWSON'S CONCEPT OF PERSON

UNIT STRUCTURE

13.1 Learning Objectives
13.2 Introduction
13.3 What is the Concept of Person?
13.4 Strawson on No-ownership theory
13.5 Strawson on Cartesianism
13.6 Strawson's distinction between P- and M –Predicates
13.6.1 Strawson's view on P-predicates
13.6.2 Bernard William's view on Strawson's concept of p-predicates
13.7 Let Us Sum Up
13.8 Further Readings
13. 9 Answers to Check Your Progress
13.10 Model Questions

13.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to-

- explain Strawson's Concept of person
- learn the Cartesian Concept of person
- describe the No-ownership theory
- discuss the incoherence of the No-ownership theory
- explain the concept of P-Predicates
- distinguish between P- and M- predicates

13.2 INTRODUCTION

This unit introduces to you Strawson's concept of person. Strawson's Concept of person is found in the third Chapter of his celebrated work *Individuals* which is subtitled *Essays in Descriptive Metaphysics*. As suggested by the subtitle, Strawson is here engaged in describing the actual structure of our thought about the world and not in presenting a better structure as done by revisionary metaphysics. The basic concepts included in this unit are:

- What is person, according to Strawson?

- Strawson's analysis of Cartesian dualism
- Strawson's distinction between P and M Predicates
- Bernard William's view on Strawson's concept of P- predicates

13.3 WHAT IS THE CONCEPT OF PERSON?

In ordinary usage the word 'person' is taken to be synonymous with the word man. But in Strawson's terminology the word person is used in a special sense although it is not different from the ordinary sense.

Strawson begins his essay by distinguishing persons from non-persons. He uses the expressions 'ourselves and states of ourselves' to represent persons and their states and 'what is not ourselves or states of ourselves' to represent non-persons and their states. While speaking of ourselves ordinarily we ascribe to ourselves many things, such as actions and intentions (I am doing this, I want to do this), sensations (I am in pain), thoughts and feelings (I think, I am angry), perceptions and memories (I see this, remember this), and many other things. Again, we also speak of ourselves not only in terms of such temporary conditions of sensations, perceptions and feelings, but also in terms of relatively permanent characteristics such as height, weight, colouring, shape, size etc. (I am five foot tall, weigh fifty kilo, of fair complexion).

Strawson points out that these two ways of speaking about ourselves are different. While it is obvious that the second way of speaking in terms of height, weight, colouring, shape and size are also the way in which we speak of material bodies (the pillar is five foot tall, weighs fifty kilo, of brown colour), the former way of speaking in terms of actions and intentions, sensations, thoughts and feelings etc. is not applicable to material bodies. These states of consciousness are peculiar to ourselves alone. What Strawson goes to emphasize at this point is that while speaking of ourselves as five foot tall and as being happy or angry, we ascribe both – physical characteristics and states of consciousness – to the very same thing. That is, I admit of both, physical states and states of consciousness, at the same time in the same sense. In other words, it may be said that Strawson does not recognize the dichotomy between mind and body insofar as a person, the same person, can be spoken of in either of the ways – in terms of his thoughts and feelings, or in terms of his height and weight.

At this point Strawson goes to consider two possible reactions to his thesis

that both physical characteristics and states of consciousness are ascribed at the same time to one and the same thing, viz. persons. These reactions are to the effect that it is a linguistic illusion that we ascribe both these states to one and the same thing.

The *first reaction* Strawson considers is from the camp of the Cartesians, that is, from the followers of Descartes. According to them, what we call a person is actually a combination of two distinct substances belonging to two different types, each of which has its own characteristic states and properties. None of the states or properties belonging to one substance can ever be possessed by the other. Hence, the Cartesians challenge the claim of Strawson that both states of consciousness and physical characteristics are ascribed to one and the same thing. Rather, they opine that states of consciousness are ascribed to one substance while the physical states are ascribed to the other.

13.4 STRAWSON'S VIEW ON NO-OWNERSHIP THEORY

The second reaction, Strawson thinks, comes from Wittgenstein and Schlick. It maintains a view that our states of consciousness are not ascribed to anything. This view is called by Strawson 'no-ownership' or 'no-subject' doctrine of the self. In order to illustrate this 'no-ownership' doctrine Strawson takes the help of an example given by Wittgenstein of the two uses of 'I' in the two sentences 'I have a toothache' and 'I have a bad tooth'. These two sentences, although grammatically similar, are completely different in nature.

The sentence 'I have a bad tooth' says that there is a bad tooth in my mouth. This bad tooth is in my possession in the same sense that a match box is in my possession when I say 'I have a match box'. This 'I' as appeared in this sentence is logically equivalent with 'Skinner' (a different person) because there is nothing peculiar about my having the match box than Skinner's having the match box. Both I and Skinner are of the same status. One important point is to be taken note of is that when we put 'I' and 'Skinner' on a same level, then we put emphasis on the physical aspects alone. That is in this sentence both I and Skinner are understood only as physical bodies. This use of the word 'I' is the possessor sense. But this possessor sense of 'I' is different from the non-possessor sense as represented by the sentence 'I have a toothache'. A toothache is an experience, a state of consciousness which,

according to Wittgenstein, cannot be possessed by anyone. Hence, there is no place for an ego to own the experience.

Strawson here distinguishes, within the Wittgensteinian scheme, between two senses of the verb 'to have': *having1* and *having 2*. The first kind 'having' is characterized by the logical transferability of ownership as in the case of a match box or a car. But experiences (e.g. a toothache) are not owned in this sense as its ownership cannot be so transferred. This kind of having is *'having 2'* and cannot be called a having at all. So, experiences are not owned by anything except in the dubious sense of being causally dependent upon the state of a particular body. But in the Cartesian scheme an Ego is feigned in order to provide an owner, in a logically non-transferable sense, to experiences. But the No Ownership theorist maintains that since a non-transferable ownership is not possible, there is no need to imagine an Ego for the purpose , and Ego should be eliminated from the picture altogether. Belief in Ego is because of confusion.

Strawson, however, does not think that the theory is coherent. In his analysis, the theory believes only in that kind of 'having' where the ownership is logically transferable so that a statement that 'I have X (a match box)' becomes a contingent statement, because the 'X' which I have now could be had by someone else also. Now that they also believe that experiences can be had by someone in the sense that they are causally dependent on the state of a particular body, the owning of these experiences must be in the transferable sense. This implies that the statement that 'I have a toothache' is also a contingent statement. The statement takes the form in the hands of the theorist like "All my toothaches are had by (uniquely dependent upon the states of) body B". What Strawson points out here is that the theorist cannot drop the possessive word 'my' without contradicting his own position. For one thing, the word 'my' cannot be simply dropped, in which case the sentence would be "All toothaches are causally dependent upon the states of body B" because it is an obviously false statement. If on the other hand, he goes to replace the word 'my' with the expression 'person P's' then also he cannot get rid of a possessive word. But if he goes to reduce the word to 'body B's' then the sentence would be 'All body B's toothaches are causally dependent upon the states of body B'. Obviously the sentence then becomes a tautology or a necessary truth. But the theorist maintains that all sentences asserting possession are contingent sentences, because he does not believe in any

kind of possession where ownership is not transferable. Thus, the theorist has to find himself in a dilemma: he cannot either drop the possessive word 'my' or if he drops it then he cannot maintain his own position that ownership is always transferable, and that since the experiences are said to be owned by the ego in a non-transferable sense, they are not owned by anything. This inability to drop the word 'my' or any other possessive word like yours, his, theirs or that person's, while referring to experiences is because of the fact that experiences, e.g., a toothache, a headache, pleasure or pain, are particulars of a sort such that they cannot be understood without reference to a person. "States, or experiences, one might say, owe their identity as particulars to the identity of the person whose states or experiences they are" (Strawson Individuals, P.97).

Pointing to this internal incoherence of the No ownership theory Strawson goes to establish that the states of consciousness and experiences are necessarily possessed by a particular person in the logically non-transferable way. For it is not possible that a particular state or an experience that actually belongs to one should have been possessed by someone else.

At this point, Strawson also goes to state that a particular state of consciousness or an experience has got *two* aspects of ascribability: *one* with respect to oneself, and the other with respect to others. That is, the experience of toothache can be ascribed to myself, as in the sentence "I have a toothache" and to another as in the sentence "Mr. X has a toothache". The important point here is that in both the ascriptions the state refers to the same state; 'toothache' has the same meaning in both the cases. The dictionary does not have two sets of meanings – one for first person use and another for second and third person use of a particular state.

We can observe here that with this thesis of two-way ascribability of states and experiences Strawson tries to avoid the problems given rise to by the theses of no-ownership theory and the Cartesianism. Also, it is supposed to have solved the problem of other minds.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q 1: State whether the following statements are True or False.

a) Strawson's concept of person is found in his book 'Individuals'. (True False)

b) Strawson emphasizes that we ascribe both-physical

characteristics and states of consciousness to the very same thing. (True/False)

c) According to the Cartesians, a person is not a combination of two distinct substances. (True/False)

d) According to the second reaction, our states of consciousness are not ascribed to anything. (True/False)

e) Strawson says that the No-ownership theory is coherent. (True/False)

Q 2: What do you mean by the concept of person, according to Strawson?
(Answer in about 50 words)

.....

Q 3: What is meant by Cartesian concept of person?
(Answer in about 50 words)

.....

Q 4: What is 'No-ownership theory'?
(Answer in about 50 words)

.....

ACTIVITY

Do you find any difficulties of 'No-ownership theory' advanced by Strawson? Discuss

Ans:..... .....

13.5 STRAWSON ON CARTESIANISM

Descartes advocated of two substances – mind (ego) and body. Each of the two is diametrically opposed in character to the other; mind is non-physical and body is physical. Hence for him, mind cannot possess any of the physical characteristics such as length, breadth, height, weight etc. Similarly body also cannot have any of the states of consciousness such as thought, feeling, willing etc. Therefore, it is not possible, according to him, to ascribe both types of characteristics to one and the same thing. In other words, all states of consciousness and experiences are ascribed to the ego. This ego is the owner of our experiences.

But Strawson points out a serious difficulty with the Cartesian thesis of an ego owning our experiences. The difficulty lies in the fact that in order to ascribe a state or an experience to something, that 'something' should be identifiable and individualizable. But the problem is that in the absence of any physical characteristics

an ego remains unidentifiable and unindividualizable; that is, we cannot point to anything and say that it is an ego, because anything without shape, size, colour or other physical attributes cannot be pointed at as 'it'. 'It' means a thing that is distinguished from other things, and the basis of this distinction is physical characteristics such as colour, shape and the like. It is distinguished means it is individuated and identified. But ego cannot be so identified in absence of the physical attributes. Hence, the question of ascribing states and experiences to it does not arise.

Strawson here considers a defence of Cartesianism: the ego or the subject of consciousness can be thought to be identified indirectly with reference to the particular body to which the subject stands in a special relation. But such a solution is of no use, because in that case there would be no point in ascribing experiences to an ego rather than to the body. Moreover, there is the logical possibility that there may be more than one subject attached to one and the same body. "The uniqueness of the body does not guarantee uniqueness of the Cartesian soul" (Individuals, P. 101).

What Strawson thinks is the way to come out of this difficulty is to acknowledge the primitiveness of the concept of person. "What I mean by the concept of a person is the concept of a type of entity such that both predicates ascribing states of consciousness and predicates ascribing corporeal characteristics, a physical situation &c. are equally applicable to a single individual of that single type" (Individuals, pp.101-102).

What Strawson means by calling the concept of person a primitive concept can be explained in his own words in the following way: "We are tempted to think of a person as a sort of compound of two kinds of subjects: a subject of experiences (a pure consciousness, an ego) on the one hand, and a subject of corporeal attributes on the other." But Strawson points out a lot of difficulties in maintaining this duality. After considering all these difficulties he, therefore, concludes that the concept of person is logically prior to that of an individual consciousness. "The concept of a person is not to be analysed as that of an animated body or of an embodied anima" (p. 103). However, he does not rule out the possibility of an ego existing as a secondary entity. "A person is not an embodied ego, but an ego might be a disembodied person, retaining the logical benefit of individuality from having been a person" (p. 103).

13.6 STRAWSON'S DISTINCTION BETWEEN P AND M PREDICATES

Strawson makes it a point to be noted that one can ascribe states of consciousness to oneself only when one ascribes or is prepared to ascribe them to others. These 'others', including oneself, are of a type of entity that can be individuated, that is, they must admit of both the states of consciousness and the corporeal characteristics at the same time. Here Strawson makes a distinction between two kinds of predicates that are applied to persons. The first kind of predicates are those that are also applied to material bodies to which states of consciousness are never applied. He calls this first kind **M-predicates** which include predicates like "weighs 10 stone", "is in the drawing room" etc. The second kind of predicates consists of "all other predicates we apply to persons" like "is smiling", "is going for a walk" as well as "is in pain", "is thinking hard" etc.

Strawson insists that both these two types of predicates are ascribed to one and the same thing, viz. persons. The concept of a person is a primitive concept in the sense that it is not analyzable into a particular consciousness (mind) and a body, because a person is not a combination of a mind and a body. He also says that there is no 'type ambiguity' between 'I' and 'Smith'; that means, 'I' and 'Smith' are not individuals of two different types. Type ambiguities are found only in case of predicates like 'is in the drawing room', and 'is hit by a stone'; because they have completely different meanings when applied to a person and when applied to a material body.

13.6.1 Strawson on P- Predicates

Of the two kinds of predicates, P and M, the latter is not at all problematic – they are but predicate ascribing material properties. But what Strawson means by 'P-predicates' requires special care to be understood. This is because under the heading P-predicate, he includes all those which "we would not dream of applying to material bodies." In other words, P-predicates are ascribed to persons only. All P-predicates are however, not consciousness predicates like 'is intelligent' or 'is in a pensive mood', but still "they imply the possession of consciousness on the part of that to which they are ascribed" (p.105). Thus, 'is going for a walk' is not a consciousness predicate since it has nothing directly to do with consciousness, but still it is a P-

predicate because it is exclusively applied to a person and not to anything else.
A P-predicate is ascribed to others on the strength of observation of their behaviour. But this behaviour on the part of others is not just a sign from which the presence of a state of consciousness is to be inferred. Rather, Strawson emphatically states that behaviour is the logically adequate criteria for ascribing P-predicates to others. The argument from analogy of one's own case for applying states of consciousness to another does not arise at all, because Strawson maintains that a state of consciousness can be ascribed to something only when that 'something' can be identified; and this identifiability depends upon its having a physical body. So the skeptical doubt about the presence of a state of consciousness in another does not arise. One's behaviour logically justifies ascription of a state of consciousness to one. But one does not rely upon this behaviour criterion to apply some of the P-predicates to oneself, as for example, 'am angry', 'am sad', 'am happy' etc. But in case of some other class of P-predicates that concerns assessment of character ('am honest') or capability ('can lift 50 Kg weight'), one has to rely on the same behaviour criteria even in order to apply them to oneself. Strawson here considers a possible difficulty – the difficulty of resolving the question: which of the ascriptions of P-predicates- first person ascription or third person ascription- is primary? There seems to be two contrary approaches. Suppose we write Px as the general form of expression for ascription of P-predicates. Now, according to one version, x is to be replaced by 'I' in the primary sense, and its replacing with any other second or third person pronoun or noun is secondary and derivative. On the other hand, according to the other version, x is to be replaced by 'he', 'that person' and other third person pronoun or noun in the primary sense. In that case the use of 'I' in place of x would be secondary and not proper. But, Strawson maintains, "it is essential to the character of these predicates that they have both first- and third-person ascriptive uses, that they are both self ascribable….and other-ascribable…" (p.108). To learn their use is to learn both aspects of their use. That is, to ascribe these P-predicates to oneself one has to know how to ascribe them to others. One also has to admit that others can also ascribe them to themselves as well as to those who are different from themselves. And in both the ascriptions it means the same thing. Strawson here gives the example of the mental state of depression. When Mr. X says, "I am depressed" it is a feeling on X's part, but it is a particular set of X's observable behaviour for others. But it is

the same thing in both the cases. "X's depression is something, one and the same thing, which is felt, but not observed, by X, and observed, but not felt, by others than X" (109). This line of thinking can rid us of the dichotomy between philosophical skepticism and philosophical behaviourism.

Throughout the essay (Essays in Descriptive Metaphysics) Strawson takes great care to establish that the states of consciousness are ascribed to one and the same thing, to which also are ascribed physical situations etc. And that these ascriptions of consciousness predicates have two aspects – self ascriptive and other ascriptive. Both being the aspects of the same status, neither is primary to the other. He further maintains that this line of thinking is possible only when the primitiveness of the concept of person is acknowledged.

LET US KNOW

Skepticism: It is the denial that knowledge or even rational belief is possible either about some specific subject matter or in any area.

Behaviourism: It holds that mental states are logical constructions out of dispositions to behaviour. In other words, it describes the mental aspects of a person, so it is a shorthand for describing the various dispositions to behavior that the person possesses.

13.6.2 Bernard Williams View on Strawson's Concept of P-Predicates

Bernard Williams in his book *Problems of the Self* (Ch. 7) points out certain difficulties in the concept of P-predicates as stated by Strawson. Certain P-predicates have nothing peculiarly to do with consciousness; as for example, in case of 'is playing ball', 'is coiling a rope' or 'is in drawing room'. "For once we see that many P-predicates are highly corporeal, we may begin to wonder which corporeal predicates really are M-predicates" (B. William: Problem of the Self, p.123). These predicates are mostly dominated by physical movements on the part of the person concerned. Hence they are not characteristically different from M-predicates. Again, the predicate *is running down hill* can be meaningfully applied to a person, a dog, and also to a stream. Now, in the Strawsonian scheme it would be a P-predicate in case of person while it would be an M-predicate in the other two cases.

It may be mentioned here that when applied to a stream, 'is running down hill' is

a figurative use of the predicate borrowed from its original and appropriate use in case of a person. However, it may be said to be a lapse in Strawson not to speak anything about lower animals. A dog runs in the same sense in which a man runs. But whether we can call a predicate applied to a lower animal a P-predicate, Strawson is silent on this point.

Again, although Strawson is against any analysis of the concept of person into a body and an ego, he still maintains that ego can have a logically secondary type of existence. "A person is not an embodied ego, but an ego might be a disembodied person, retaining the logical benefit of individuality from having been a person" (*Individuals*, p.103). But this assertion of existence of a disembodied ego is not in conformity with his concepts of individuation and identification. For a disembodied ego, by definition, does not possess any of the physical characteristics and, hence, cannot be either individuated or identified. Again, following his definition of a person as a type of entity to which both physical as well as conscious states are ascribed at the same time, we probably cannot call a disembodied ego, even if there is one, a (former) person as this ego does not admit of any physical states.

Despite these loopholes, Strawson's concept of person occupies a very unique position in modern analytic philosophy.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q 5: State whether the following statements are True or False:

a) According to Descartes, we cannot ascribe both physical characteristics and states of consciousness to one and the same thing. (True/False)

b) Strawson says that the concept of person is a primitive concept. (True/False)

c) According to Strawson, the concept of person is analyzable into a mind and a body. (True/False)

d) Strawson says that P-predicates are ascribed to persons only. (True/False)

e) Bernard Williams is not a critic of Strawson's concept of person. (True/False)

Q 6: How does Strawson criticize the Cartesian concept of ego? (Answer in about 104 words)

Ans: .....

.....

Q7: Distinguish between M-predicates and Ppredicates.(Answer in about 110 words)

Ans:.....

Q 8: What do you mean by Strawson's concept of P-predicates? (Answer in about 88 words)

Ans:.....

.....

ACTIVITY

Is Strawson's view on the concept of Person satisfactory?

Ans: .....

Do you support Bernard Williams's criticism on Strawson's concept of P-predicates? Discuss

Ans:.....

.....

13.7 LET US SUM UP

- Strawson holds that both physical characteristics and states of consciousness are ascribed at the same time to one and the same thing, viz. Persons.
- Strawson's concept of person is a primitive concept in the sense that it is not analyzable into a particular consciousness (mind) and a body, because a person is not a combination of a mind and a body. He also says that there is no 'type ambiguity' between 'I' and 'Smith'; that means, 'I' and 'Smith' are not individuals of two different types.
- According to the Cartesians, a person is actually a combination of two distinct substances – mind and body, each of which has its own characteristics.
- According to the 'No-ownership theory', our states of consciousness cannot be ascribed to anything.
- Strawson goes to establish that the states of consciousness and experiences are necessarily possessed by a particular person in the logically non-

transferable way.

- Strawson points out that a particular state of consciousness or an experience has got two aspects of ascribability: one, with respect to oneself, and the other, with respect to others.
- According to Strawson, the concept of a person is the concept of a type of entity such that both predicates of consciousness and predicates of corporeal characteristics are equally applicable to single individual.
- Strawson makes a distinction between M-predicates and P-predicates. M-predicates can also be applied to material bodies to which states of consciousness are never applied. P-predicates consist of all other predicates such as smiling, walking, thinking etc. which we apply to persons.
- Strawson insists that both M-and P-predicates are ascribed to one and the same thing, viz. Persons.
- Strawson's concept of person is also not free from difficulties, yet it occupies a very unique position in modern analytic philosophy.

13.8 FURTHER READING

1 Sen, P.K.&Verma, R.R.(1995) (ed) *The Philosophy Of P.F. Strawson. New Delhi:* I.C.P.R.

2 Strawson, P.F.(1974). *Freedom and Resenement and Other Essays.* London. Metheun &Co. Ltd.,

3. Shaffer, J. A. : (1988) *Philosophy of Mind*. New Delhi. Prentice Hall of India Pvt. Ltd.

4. Ghose, R. : (1990) *The Idea Of a Person.* Calcutta: Punthi Pustak

13.9 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Ans to Q No 1: a) True b) True c) False
d) True e) False

Ans to Q No 2: According to Strawson, the concept of person is a primitive concept, because it is not analyzable into a particular mind and a body. He says that both M-predicates and P-predicates are ascribed to one and the same thing, viz. persons. A person is not a combination of a mind and a body. The concept of person is

logically prior to that of an individual consciousness. It is not to be analysed as that of an animated body or of an embodied anima.

Ans to Q No 3: According to the Cartesians, a person is actually a combination of two distinct substances belonging to two different types. These two distinct substances are mind and body. Each of them has its own characteristic states and properties. They say that states of consciousness are ascribed to one substance while the physical states are ascribed to the other.

Ans to Q No 4: Wittgenstein and Schlick maintain a view that our states of consciousness are not ascribed to anything and this view is called by Strawson 'No-ownership theory' of the self. We may illustrate the 'No- ownership theory' with the help of an example of the two uses of 'I' in the two sentences: 'I have a toothache' and 'I have a bad tooth'. Although these two sentences are grammatically similar, they are completely different in nature. In the sentence ' I have a bad tooth', we put emphasis on the physical aspect alone. But Wittgenstein says that a toothache is an experience, a state of consciousness which cannot be possessed by anyone.

Ans to Q No 5: a) True b) True c) False d) True e) False

Ans to Q No 6: According to the Cartesians, all states of consciousness and experiences are ascribed to the ego. But Strawson in this regard points out a serious difficulty that in order to ascribe a state or an experience to something, that something should be identifiable and individualizable. But the problem is that in the absence of any physical characteristics an ego remains unidentifiable and unindividualizable. Because, anything without shape, size, colour or other physical attributes cannot be pointed at as 'it'. So, an ego cannot be identified in the absence of the physical attributes. Hence, the question of ascribing states and experiences to it does not arise.

Ans to Q No 7: Strawson makes a distinction between M-predicates and P-predicates. M-predicates are predicates of ascribing material properties. M-predicates can also be applied to material bodies to which states of consciousness can never be applied. But P-predicates are predicates of ascribing properties to persons only. P-predicates consist of all other predicates which we apply to persons. M-predicates include predicates like 'weighs 10 stone', 'is in the drawing room' etc. P-predicates include predicates

like 'is smiling', 'is going for a walk', 'is in pain', 'is thinking hard' etc. Thus, it becomes clear that P-predicates can be ascribed only to persons; on the other hand, M-predicates can be ascribed to both persons and material bodies.

Ans to Q No 8: According to Strawson, P-predicates are predicates of ascribing properties to persons only. P-predicates include all other predicates which we apply to persons only. They can never be applied to material bodies. However, all P-predicates are not consciousness predicates like 'is intelligent' or 'is in a pensive mood'. He says that 'is going for a walk' is not a consciousness predicate since it has nothing directly to do with consciousness, but still it is a P-predicate because, it is exclusively applied to a person and not to anything else.

13.10 MODEL QUESTIONS

A. Very Short Questions

Q 1: What are the two distinct substances, according to Descartes?

Q 2: Give examples of P-predicate

Q 3: Give an example of M-predicate.

Q 4: What are the two substances advocated by Descartes?

Q 5: Who advocates the no-ownership theory?

B. Short Questions(Answer each question in about 150 words)

Q 1: What are the reactions considered by Strawson?

Q 2: What is Person for Strawson?

Q 3: What is 'M-predicates'?

Q 4: What is 'P-predicates'?

Q 5: What are the two aspects of the ascriptions of consciousness predicates?

Q 6: What is 'No-ownership theory?

Q 7: Briefly comment on the view that the concept of person is a primitive concept.

C. Distinguish between (Answer each question in about 150 words)

Q 1: First reaction and Second reaction on persons.

Q 2: M- predicates and P-predicates.

Q 3: Cartesianism and No-ownership theory.

D. Long Questions (Answer each question in about 300-500 words)

Q 1: Critically discuss the No-ownership theory.

Q 2: Discuss Cartesianism in the light of Strawson.

Q 3: Critically discuss Strawson's concept of P-predicates.

Q 4: How would you resolve the conflict between First and Second reactions on persons?

Q 5: Do you think that Strawson's concept of person is satisfactory? Give reasons for your answer.

*** **** ***

UNIT 14 THEORIES OF PUNISHMENT

UNIT STRUCTURE

14.1 Learning Objectives
14.2 Introduction
14.3 Notion of Crime and Punishment
14.4 Theories of Punishment
14.5 Deterrent theory
15.6 Reformative theory
14.7 Retributive theory
14.8 Capital Punishment
14.9 Let Us Sum Up
14.10 Further Readings
14.11 Answers to Check Your Progress
14.12 Model Questions

14.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit you will be able to:

- Describe the concept of crime and punishment
- Elaborate the Deterrent theory of punishment
- Discuss the Reformative theory of punishment
- Explain the Retributive theory of punishment
- Differentiate between different theories of punishment
- Attempt a comparative assessment of different theories of punishment.

14.2 INTRODUCTION

The theories of punishment presuppose that punishment is an evil. Punishment is imposed because sometimes some people do wrong. Punishment may be either legal or divine. In the legal context this is called crime or offence. It denotes only those offences against society which are recognized by natural law. And these offences are liable for punishment. The issue of punishment deals with the legal process whereby the acts of violation of criminal law are punished according to the

provisions of law. In the theological (divine) context this is called sin or evil. A man is rewarded for his good deed. On the other hand, a man is punished for his evil deeds. If a man voluntarily violates a moral law (which is recognized by society), the authority of the moral law demands that he ought to be punished. This is the ethical justification of punishment. Justification of punishment can be derived from two approaches. The first one is **teleological approach** and the second one is **deontological approach**. Teleological approach holds that any act or policy is judged by its consequences in terms of good produced by it. While, deontological approach holds that an act is good or right irrespective of its consequences. From deontological approach we can discuss the retributive theory. Again from the teleological approach we can describe the **Deterrent** and **Reformative** theory.

LET US KNOW

- `Deontological approach identifies an ultimate principle which is treated to be right. It is absolutely necessary to follow it irrespective of it consequences.
- Teleological approach, on the other hand, identifies a worldly purpose which is treated to be good. Any act or policy is judged by its consequences in terms of the good produced by it.

14.3 NOTION OF CRIME & PUNISHMENT

The term 'crime' is commonly used as an offence against society which is recognized by the natural law. It is not the case that all moral offences would be considered as crimes. As for instance, ingratitude is not a crime. Rather, it is considered as a sin. Because it cannot be punished by the natural law. On the other hand, stealing is a crime, because it is punishable by the natural law. Therefore, it can be said that the term crime is used in a narrower sense.

'Punishment' may imply a deliberate fault, disobedience of command, violation of law or norm, or any act universally regarded as wrong. An evil doer is punished so that he/she can feel remorse or repentance for his action. On the other hand, Penalties are not considered as punishments. As for instance, traffic fine and late fine of examination deposited by a student are not considered punishments. Reward and punishment are broadly used as a device or procedure in all societal functions for encouraging desirable behaviour and discouraging undesirable behaviour. These are the marks of social approval or disapproval.

A crime ought to be punished. A man should be rewarded according to his deeds. Similarly, a man should be punished for his evil deeds. If a man voluntarily violates a moral law, the authority of the moral law demands that he ought to be punished. This is the ethical justification of punishment. But the point that is we always see rules in case of inflicting punishment on a criminal. This leads to the different theories of punishment. We can discuss the theories of punishment under **two** general philosophies: **utilitarian** and **retributive**. The utilitarian theory of punishment seeks to punish offenders to discourage, or deter future wrong doing. On the other hand, the retributive theory punishes the offenders because they deserve to be punished.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q No 1. State whether the following statements are true or false:

a) In the legal context punishment is called crime.(True/False)
b) Punishment is called sin or evil in the theological context.(True/False)
c) Justification of punishment can be derived from teleological and deontological approach. (True/False)
d) De-ontological approach holds that an act is good or right. (True/False)

Q No 2: Fill in the blanks
a). ————holds that an act is good or right irrespective of its consequences.
b). ……..holds that an act or policy is judged by its consequences in terms of good produced by it.
c)The term crime is used in a narrower sense than—————

Q No 3: What is crime?
.....

Q No 4: What are the theories of punishment?
.....

ACTIVITY : 14.1

- Do you find any difference between crime and sin? Explain.

Ans:……

- The term crime is used in a narrower sense than sin. What do you think?

Ans:……

14.4 THEORIES OF PUNISHMENT

Three main theories have been put forward to justify punishment. These are generally known as:

- The **Preventive theory**. This theory holds that the aim of punishment is to hinder others from committing similar offences.
- The **Educative theory**. This theory holds that the aim of punishment is to educate or reform the offender himself.
- The **Retributive theory**. This theory holds that the aim of punishment is to vindicate the authority of the moral law.

14.5 THE PREVENTIVE THEORY or THE DETERRENT THEORY

This theory indicates that the aim of punishment is to hinder others from committing similar offences. It is expressed in the dictum of the judgment-"You are not punished for stealing sheep, but in order that sheep may not be stolen." The deterrent theory or the preventive theory works in two directions: (a) individual deterrence or specific; and (b) General deterrence. In case of individual deterrence an offender is punished for his crime in order to show that he commits a mistake. Again, individual deterrence or specific deterrence works in two ways. First, an offender may be kept in jail or prison to physically prevent her from committing another crime for a specified period. Second, this incapacitation will discourage the offender from repeating his/her criminal behaviour. On the other hand, in case of general deterrence an offender is punished not for his reformation but for the benefit of others. Here, punishment is not an end; rather it is imposed on a criminal as a means for the benefit of others. So, general deterrence shows that punishment imposed on a criminal as an example so that others learn that committing crimes are always dangerous.

This theory supports capital punishment or death penalty for the most dreaded criminals so that they cannot repeat the same type of crime. As for instance, if someone kills a man then he should also be killed to stop killing. In this context, this theory shows that criminals have no right to take away a life. That is why he should be sentenced to death to protect the public from murdering anyone else. Punishment should be an example so that others do not commit the same mistake. Here criminals are used as a means in order to prevent others from committing similar mistakes. But this theory cannot be accepted. We cannot use a criminal as a means in order to prevent others from committing the same crime. Because criminals are not things or objects that we can use for the benefit of others. Hence, punishment should be an

end not a means. This theory raises a serious question i.e., is their any scope of reformation of a criminal in preventive theory? In answer, it can be said that there would not be any scope of reformation of a criminal if we accept the death penalty. In this context, the preventive theory is not satisfactory. Sociologists and Criminologists want to show that most of the crimes are impulsive. A crime may stem from irrational thoughts and feelings. So, exemplary punishment is not conducive to discourage people from indulging in crime.

In short, it can be opined that Preventive theory or Deterrent theory does not encourage for reformation of a criminal. So, the very purpose of punishment imposed on a criminal is not entertained. Therefore, this theory is not applicable in a modern society as a satisfactory theory of punishment.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q 5: Whether the following Statements are True or False:

a) The Deterrent theory works in two directions:

b) The Deterrent theory supports capital punishment.

ACTIVITY

- Do you support preventive theory?
  Answer……
  .....
- Is capital punishment inevitable in preventive theory?
  Answer……
  .....

14.6 REFORMATIVE THEORY OF PUNISHMENT

According to the supporters of the Reformative theory, the aim of the punishment is to reform the criminal himself. In this theory, punishment is not imposed as a means for the benefit of others. Rather, punishment is given to educate or reform the offender himself. Here, the crime committed by the criminal is an end, not a means as in the Deterrent theory. This view is commonly accepted in the present time. This theory favours the humanitarian sentiments of the age. Therefore, punishment is imposed for the welfare of the criminal himself. Unlike the Deterrent theory, the Reformative theory does not treat the criminal or the offender as a thing or means for the benefit of others. Hence, punishment is inflicted on a criminal for his reformation.

This theory does not justify capital punishment. Because punishment is inflicted only to educate or reform the criminal himself. Punishment does not always make reform in a criminal. On the other hand, kind treatment sometimes produces a better result than punishment. It may be more favourable to the reformation of the criminal. Forgiveness can change the nature of the criminal and give the scope of repentance and reformation to the criminal. It is clear that the reformative theory does not justify capital punishment. It supports reformation of the criminal.

The Reformative theory is supported by physiologists, sociologists and psychologists.

Kleptomania: It is a mental illness in which a man has a strong desire to steal.

(A) **Physiologists** hold that crimes are due to physiological defect. Therefore, the criminals should not be punished. Rather, they should be treated in hospitals by psychologists or psycho-analysts. That is why, according to this theory, crime is not a deliberate act of violation on part of the criminal. It is only due to his mental instability. As for instance, we can mention Kleptomania. In Kleptomania, a criminal is compelled to steal. Therefore, criminal anthropologists hold that criminals should not be punished. Rather, they ought to be treated in hospitals or reformatories. But the problem is that all crimes are not due to insanity or physiological defects. There are some crimes which are deliberate violations of the moral law and should be punished. Because such crimes are not due to physiological defects. As for instance, we can think about corruptions. It is evident that some businessmen indulge in adulteration of food, black-marketing etc. They deliberately violate certain moral laws. So, they ought to be punished.

(B) Again there are some crimes which are due to social inequalities. For instance, theft is a crime. The authority of the moral law demands that the person who is involved in theft should be punished. But if we investigate the case properly we understand that the cause of theft is poverty. Therefore, criminal sociologists view that we cannot think of prevention of crime without improving the social and economic conditions of the common people. Crimes can be prevented only if the society is reconstructed on the basis of justice and equity. The advocates of this view are called criminal sociologists.

(C) This theory is supported by psychologists. They hold that crimes are not due to willful violation of the moral law. Rather, crimes are due to mental disorder or insanity.

That is why criminals should not be punished. They should be treated in hospitals or reformatories for reformation. Freud, a famous psychologist views that crimes are due to sex wishes or spite wishes. Therefore, the treatment of the criminal should be educational or medical rather than punishment. But there are some crimes which are deliberate violation of the moral law committed by some people. Therefore, they should be punished. So, punishment prevents others from committing similar crimes. It also can refine the criminal's mind not to take to the wrong path.

It is true that the Reformative theory can work fruitfully in case of reformation of non-habitual offenders. But in some cases it does not work smoothly, because a hard core criminal cannot be reformed. If we accept it then criminals will repeat the same type of offence. That is why, in stead of trying for the reformation of his criminal mind he should be punished. Thus, it can be said that the Reformative theory will be more effective if it is intended to supplement normal punishment, rather than replace it altogether.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS : 3

Q 6: Fill in the blanks:

a) ……..holds that the aim of the punishment is to reform the criminal himself.

b) The reformative theory does not justify……..

c) ……holds that crimes are due to mental disorder or insanity.

ACTIVITY-14.3

- Does reformative theory justify capital punishment? Discuss.

  Ans:…….....

- Is reformative theory satisfactory? Discuss.

  Ans:……

14.7 THE RETRIBUTIIVE THEORY

This theory holds that the evil consequences of a man's deed are not merely evil to others, but the evils in which he is himself involved. It implies that punishment is an end in itself not a means to any end beyond itself. If a man commits a crime, the

authority of the law demands that he ought to be punished. The main aim of the punishment is to safeguard the authority of the moral law. If a man commits a crime deliberately, the authority of the law demands that the man should be punished. Through the punishment of a criminal the authority or the supremacy of the moral law is established. If the criminal is not punished by the authority of the moral laws than it loses its dignity, majesty and supremacy. Therefore, if a man consciously violates a moral law he ought to be punished to vindicate the authority of the moral law. Again, this theory views that if a man takes the life of a man, justice demands that the criminal has no right to live. So, he should be sentenced to death. But it can be viewed that this theory justifies capital punishment under exceptional circumstances.

Kant: (1724-1804) Immanuel, German philosopher.

Hegel: (1770-1831) George Wilhelm Friedrich, German idealist

Bradley: (1846-1924) Francis Herbert, Idealist philosopher

The supporters of this theory are Aristotle, **Kant**, **Hegel**, **Bradley**. Aristotle holds that if a man commits a crime he gets negative reward in return. He deserves to get negative reward because he has committed a crime or violates a moral law. Immanuel Kant points out that if a man voluntarily commits a crime he should be punished. He should not be considered a means for the welfare of others. Rather he should be considered an end unto himself. Therefore, Kant says that moral law is categorical imperative in the sense that moral laws are unconditional. In his *Metaphysics of Morals* (1797), Kant observed: "Judicial punishment…can never be inflicted simply and solely as a means to forward a good, other than itself, whether …of the criminal, or of civil society; but it must at all times be inflicted on him, for no other reason than because he has acted criminally." Kant argued that a human being should always be treated as an end in itself, and not a means to another's end. This is the supreme principle of morality or the 'categorical imperative'. If an individual commits a crime, he violates the moral law. So, it shows that the crime commited by a criminal implies that he is responsible for that. None is responsible for his account. Therefore, Kant holds that moral law is imperative or unconditional because it comes from within to restore justice. That is why he beautifully writes that 'If justice perishes then it is no more worth while that man should live upon the earth.'

Hegel also like Aristotle holds that if a man commits a crime, he gains a reward in return for breaking a moral law. Bradley holds that punishment is imposed for the

sake of punishment. Punishment is demanded by justice in order to safeguard the authority of the moral law.

Emile Durkheim (1858-1917) a French Sociologist formulated social solidarity of punishment which is similar to the Retributive theory of punishment. His view is that crime is a violation of collective conscience, which consists of social values. He viewed that punishment is essentially a ceremonial reaffirmation of social values that are violated and challenged by the crime. In Durkheim's view, punishment of criminals is something like the sacrifice of individuals for the common good. So, Durkheim treats punishment as an end in itself like the Retributive theory.

The Retributive theory has **two** forms. The first one is **rigorist** and the second one is mollified form of punishment. The rigorist theory holds that if the offence is severe, the punishment should be severe. On the other hand, if the offence is light, the punishment should be light. If a person commits a murder, justice demands that the person should be sentenced to death. This form of punishment was found in the **Old Testament** of the **Judeo-Christian Bible**: "When a man causes a disfigurement in his neighbour……..it shall be done to him, fracture for fracture, eye for eye, tooth for tooth….." But the mollified form of the Retributive theory holds that punishment should be inflicted under some circumstances. The circumstances are the age of the criminal, his intention, provoking circumstances etc. There are taken into account when punishment is inflicted to a criminal. That is why this theory will say that if a person commits a murder, he should not be hanged without going through the circumstances under which he has commited the crime. According to some advocates of the retributive theory, men have free will and are capable of making rational decisions. An offender who is insane or otherwise incompetent should not be punished. In contrast to this, a person who deliberately upsets the balance of society should be punished.

Hence, it can be said that the mollified form of the retributive theory seems to be more satisfactory than the other theories of punishment.

The merit of the retributive theory is that it lays emphasis on the termination of social discrimination. None can get rid of punishment if he/she violates the authority of the moral law. Social status is not the determining factor to inflict punishment on a criminal. But Manu, an ancient law giver, prescribed the different levels of punishment for different castes. Aristotle also suggested the level of punishment. According to

him, a slave possesses harsher punishment than a free man on the ground that the 'slave was less sensitive'.

The retributive theory seems to be more satisfactory than the other theories of punishment. John Mackenzie writes that neither reformative theory (for the criminal himself) nor preventive theory (for the welfare of others) can function unless and until it is supposed that punishment is the vindication of the authority of the moral law. It shows that both the theories take the motto of the retributive theory i.e., punishment is given in order to safe guard the authority of the moral law.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q 7: State whether the following statements are true or false

a) The retributive theory justifies capital punishment. (True/False)

b) According to the retributive theory, the aim of punishment is to safeguard the authority of the moral law. (True/False)

c) Aristotle, Kant, Hegel and Bradley advocate the retributive theory of punishment. (True/ False)

Q 8: What are the two forms of retributive theory?

……

Q 9: What is mollified form of the retributive theory?

……..

Q 10: What is the motto of the retributive theory?

……..

ACTIVITY : 14.4

- Do you support the Retributive theory of punishment? Discuss.

Ans:…….....

- Is capital punishment endorsed in the retributive theory? Discuss.

Ans:…….....

14.8 DEBATE ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

Capital Punishment indicates death penalty under a judicial verdict in accordance with the provisions of law as a punishment for crime. In the recent years most of the countries cast for vote for the abolition of capital punishment. However, it still continues as a part of the Indian penal system even though death is awarded in

the rarest of the rare cases it is converted into life imprisonement. Death penalty seems to be rare in the Indian penal system because most of the crimes are converted into life imprisonment. Therefore, the question remains whether the issue of capital punishment should be retained in the statue of books or it should be abolished altogether. An argument against the capital punishment is that as such-crimes as befit death punishment are not inborn criminality on the point of the offender. That is why any crime against the violation of law is subject to scrutinize. It means, we have to see why he has chosen this criminal path. There may be some reasons, like lake of education, proper guidance and wholesome environment etc. On the very occasions factors like these lead to crimes.

From the debate on Capital punishment we can put forward the view that both the reformative theory and mollified form of the Retributive theory go against the capital punishment. Because the Reformative theory lays emphasis on the reformation of the criminal mind without imposing punishment. It undoubtedly helps to rectify a criminal's mind. That is why it is advocated in modern times. But in all cases we cannot accept it wholeheartedly. Now a days, we encounter the problem of terrorism. Terrorists are not the ordinary illiterate or underprivileged people who commit crime under the stern of circumstances. They are rather a motivated group intent on killing people. In dealing with such criminals we cannot offer. Therefore, Capital punishment must be retained in our statute books in order to fight terrorism and other heinous crimes.

14.9 LET US SUM UP

- Justification of punishment can be derived from two approaches. The first one is **teleological approach** and the second one is **deontological approach**.
- Teleological approach holds that any act or policy is judged by its consequences in terms of good produced by it. While, deontological approach holds that an act is good or right irrespective of its consequences. From deontological approach we can discuss the retributive theory. Again from the teleological approach we can describe the **Deterrent** and **Reformative** theory.
- We can discuss the theories of punishment under **two** general philosophies: **utilitarian** and **retributive**. The utilitarian theory of punishment seeks to punish

offenders to discourage, or deter future wrong doing. On the other hand, the retributive theory punishes the offenders because they deserve to be punished.

- This theory indicates that the aim of punishment is to hinder others from committing similar offences. It is expressed in the dictum of the judgment- "You are not punished for stealing sheep, but in order that sheep may not be stolen."
- According to the supporters of the Reformative theory, the aim of the punishment is to reform the criminal himself. In this theory, punishment is not imposed as a means for the benefit of others. Rather, punishment is given to educate or reform the offender himself.
- This theory does not justify capital punishment. Because punishment is inflicted only to educate or reform the criminal himself. Punishment does not always make reform in a criminal. On the other hand, kind treatment sometimes produces a better result than punishment.
- This theory holds that the evil consequences of a man's deed are not merely evil to others, but the evils in which he is himself involved. It implies that punishment is an end in itself not a means to any end beyond itself. If a man commits a crime, the authority of the law demands that he ought to be punished. The main aim of the punishment is to safeguard the authority of the moral law.
- The Retributive theory has **two** forms. The first one is **rigorist** and the second one is mollified form of punishment. The rigorist theory holds that if the offence is severe, the punishment should be severe. On the other hand, if the offence is light, the punishment should be light. If a person commits a murder, justice demands that the person should be sentenced to death. But the mollified form of the Retributive theory holds that punishment should be inflicted under some circumstances. The circumstances are the age of the criminal, his intention, provoking circumstances etc.
- The retributive theory seems to be more satisfactory than the other theories of punishment. John Mackenzie writes that neither reformative theory (for the criminal himself) nor preventive theory (for the welfare of others) can function unless and until it is supposed that punishment is the vindication of the authority of the moral law. It shows that both the theories take the motto of the retributive theory i.e., punishment is given in order to safeguard the authority of the moral law.

14.10 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Answer to Q No 1 : a) True b) True c) True d) True

Answer to Q No 2: a) De-ontological approach b) Teleological approach

Answer to Q No 3: The term 'crime' is generally used as an offence against society which is recognized by the natural law.

Answer to Q No 4: There are three theories of punishment. They are respectively:

i) Deterrent theory of punishment

ii) Reformative theory of punishment

iii) Retributive theory of punishment

Answer to Q No 5: a) True b) True

Answer to Q No 6: a) The reformative theory of punishment.

b) Capital Punishment

c) Psychologists

Answer to Q No 7: a) True b) True c) True

Answer to Q No 8: Mollified and Rigorous form of Punishment

Answer to Q No 9: The mollified form of the retributive theory holds that punishment should be inflicted under same circumstances.

Answer to Q No 10: The motto of the retributive theory is; punishment is given in order to safeguard the authority of the moral law.

14.11 FURTHER READING

- John. M. Mackenzie: A Manual of Ethics, Surjeet Publications, Delhi, 04
- J.N. Sinha: A Manual of Ethics, New Central Agency, Calcutta, 1986
- R.N. Sharma: Introduction to Ethics, Surjeet Publications Delhi, 04

14.12 MODEL QUESTIONS

A) Objective questions (Answer in about 50 words)

Q 1: What is teleological ethics?

Q 2: What are three main theories of punishment?

Q 3: What is retributive theory of punishment?

Q 4: What is the main motto of retributive theory?

Q 5: What is mollified form of retributive theory?

Q 6: What are the two forms of retributive theory?

B) Short questions (Answer in about 150- 300 words)

Q 1: Write short notes-

a) Capital Punishment

b) Preventive theory of punishment

c) Reformative theory of punishment

d) Retributive theory of punishment

e) Crime and punishment

f) Mollified form of retributive theory

g) Regoristic form of retributive theory

Q 2: Write briefly about the deterrent theory of punishment.

Q 3: What is reformative theory of punishment? Explain in brief.

Q 4: What is retributive theory of punishment? Explain in brief.

Q 5: What are the two forms of retributive theory of punishment? Which one is satisfactory, explain in brief.

C) Long questions (Answer in about 300-500 words)

Q 1: Define Crime? Do you find any distinction between Crime and Sin? Explain.

Q 2: What are the theories of Punishment? Explain the Preventive theory of Punishment? Is it satisfactory?

Q 3: Explain the Reformative theory of Punishment? Is it satisfactory?

Q 4: Explain the Retributive theory of Punishment? Is it satisfactory?

Q 5: What is Capital Punishment? Is Capital Punishment tenable?

Q 6: What are the two forms of the Retributive theory? Discuss

Q 7: Do you accept the mollified form of punishment? If so, give reasons in support of your answer.

Q 8: Do you find any distinction between Reformative theory and Retributive theory? Discuss.

9. Write short notes on:

a) Capital Punishment

b) Preventive theory of Punishment

c) Reformative theory

d) Retributive theory

e) Crime and Punishment

f) Mollified form of retributive theory

g) Rigorous form of retributive theory

UNIT: 15 INDIVIDUAL AND SOCIETY

UNIT STRUCTURE

15.1 Learning Objectives
15.2 Introduction
15.3 Social Contract theory of Society
15.3.1 Criticism of the Social Contact theory
15.4 Organic theory of Society
15.4.1 Criticism of the organic theory
15.5 Theory of Group of Mind
15.6 Modern Debate on Individual and Society
15.7 Let us sum up
15.8 Further Reading
15.9 Answers to check your progress
15.10 Model Questions

15.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit you will be able to:

- discuss the relation of the individual and Society
- explain the social contract theory
- describe the organic theory of society
- elaborate on the theory of Group of mind
- evaluate the modern debate on individual and Society

15.2 INTRODUCTION

Different thinkers have put forward their opinion on the relation between individual and society. Although we find different views on the relation between the society and the individual living in it, yet the common viewpoint is that the relation between the two is inescapable. The interesting point that arises here is about how society originated and which comes first–society or the individual. This issue has become an interesting point of discussion not only among the social philosophers but also among the sociologists. Therefore, we get different theories regarding the relation of the two. In this unit we will discuss the different theories adding different

philosophers' viewpoints regarding the relation between the individual and the society. The three important theories in this regard are as follows:

- The social contract theory: According to this theory, society is an artificial structure to meet up peoples demand. The supporters of this theory are Hobbes, Rousseau and Locke. This theory is also known as structuralism in modern sense.
- The organic theory: According to this theory, society is an organism. Just as an organism is an organic unity of interdependent organs, so also society is an organism of interdependent individuals. Both cannot exist apart from each other.
- The group mind theory: According to this theory, man is a social being. The social self or ideal self can be realized through society. So, man is inconceivable apart from society. Idealist philosophers advocate this theory.

Besides elaborating on these three theories we will discuss contemporary debate on the contentious issue of the relationship between the society and the individual and their relative importance.

15.3 SOCIAL CONTRACT THEORY

One of the most important theories of the relation between individual and society is the social contract theory. This theory holds that the society is an artificial phenomenon. People lived independently of one another without any reciprocal relation. At that time they thought that they are self sufficient to run their life. But in course of time they come into contract with one another to form a society for their personal advantage. So, the emergence of society is a mechanical process of individuals coming together. The advocates of the social contract theory are: Thomas Hobbes, Rousseau and John Locke. We will now discuss the respective viewpoints one by one.

Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679) : Hobbes in his book *Leviathan* writes that man is selfish, quarrelsome, and aggressive. He is egoistic in nature. As a result, he thinks to be perfect in whatever he does. So, his selfish nature is the root cause of the conflict among men. Hobbes writes that- the life of man is solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short. It indicates that nature is a state of war. Because people want to run their life independently without coming into contract with other fellows. That is why, in order to safeguard their life, they come into a contract with one another. As a result the concept of society comes into light.

John Locke (1632-1704) : John Locke holds that the state of nature is against the state of war which is upheld by Hobbes. Rather, it is a state of peace and good will. It is not held that man is independent of nature. The state of nature is governed by the law of nature, which is not challenged by man. So, people are subordinate to the law of nature. That is why, it is not the like Hobbes' view of contract. Like Locke, Hobhouse (1588-1679) also states that everyone is free and born equal in society. So, people came into contract to form a society which removes the crude state of nature, and formed a civil society. After the formation of the civil society people entered into another contract and formed a government to make and enforce laws for the welfare of all.

J.J. ROUSSEAU (1712-1778) : Rousseau holds that the state of nature was based on mutual good-will and happiness. But in due course the growth of population and the desire to acquire property on the part of the people became the principal cause of conflict and collision among people. Therefore, in order to free themselves from such conflict and collision people came into contract to defend their property and security. The contract was made not just to protect property and security only. The contract was also formed for co-operation, co-ordination and mutual harmony among the people so that people could come into contract easily. So, the main purpose of the contract was to generate a general will so that mutual harmony or social unity would emerge. In this way the concept of society came into existence.

Adam Smith, a famous economist, holds the view that people came into contract in order to regulate the mutual economy. So, in his view society is an artificial procedure made by man.

15.3.1 Criticism of the Social Contract theory

Although the advocates of the theory give different views to explain the origin of society, still it can be asserted that this theory is not satisfactory. This theory is based neither on historical fact nor on logical truth. The view that man can live apart from society (man precedes society) cannot be accepted, because man is a social being. Again the thought of the state of nature prior to the socialization process in the context of society cannot be easily accepted. We cannot by evidence show that society came into existence in order to protect property and to defend their security.

Secondly, the presupposition that the state of nature was selfish and brutal before the contract came into existence cannot be accepted without reservation. Because man is neither absolutely selfish nor absolutely unselfish. We cannot ignore the fact that man has both egoistic and altruistic nature.

Thirdly, this theory is not based on logical truth. Because the social contract presupposes the political consciousness. But we cannot imagine the political consciousness in the state of nature. Therefore, the concept of contract cannot be presupposed before society came into existence. That is why the social contract theory is not satisfactory.

Lastly, the social contract theory is nothing but an attempt of the thinkers to justify the relation between individual and society. Although the reasons of contract presupposed by this theory cannot be accepted, yet the supposition of contract for the emergence of society provides clues to the social thinkers to critically discuss this theory.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q1: Fill in the blanks:

A. ..... holds that society is an artificial phenomenon.

B. John Locke is an advocate of.....

C. According to Hobbes, man is ..... by nature.

D. Rousseau holds that the state of nature was ..... and.....

Q2: State whether the following statements are true or False.

A. Rousseau /Locke/ Hobbes wrote the book Leviathan

B. The life of man is solitary poor, nasty, brutish and short- said by Locke/ Rousseau/Hobbes

ACTIVITY : 15.1

- Do you think that the social contract theory is not a satisfactory reply to the relation of individual and society? Discuss.

Ans: .....

.....

15.4 ORGANIC THEORY OF SOCIETY

This theory compares society to an living organism. Just as a human body cannot exist apart from its parts or organs, so also the society cannot exist apart from the individuals. Again just as a society cannot exist without individuals, so also individuals cannot be complete without a society. Individuals are part and parcel of society. Just as we cannot think of a human being without bodily parts so also the concept of society without individuals will be meaningless. Individuals cannot be independent of society. **Herbert Spencer**, one of the advocates of this theory says: "Social structure can be compared to an animal body whose system of nutrition has its counter parts in society, in the industrial and agricultural systems, the circulatory system with the heart, arteries and veins, corresponds to the communication and transport systems of a nation, the nervous system to the government, and so on."

The organic theory indicates the social nature of man. Man is a social animal. So, a man wants to be in company with others. The sharing nature of man overcomes the presupposition of the brutish or selfish nature of man which is thought to be the reason behind the contract. Therefore, the social contract theory alone cannot give us a proper reply to the question of the relation between the individual and the society.

The organic theory, therefore, is a developed form of the theories about the relation between individual and society, because this theory holds that individuals are interdependent on one other. As a result, people want to live in mutual contract and intercourse with one another. So, apart from society, men are mere abstractions. Thinking, feeling and willing, which are the essential conditions of a man, are activated only in a society. Therefore, a question naturally comes to our mind as to if we can think of a man without a society? The organic theory answers that question by holding that the focus of a man is reflected in society. We cannot think of a society without individuals. So, an individual cannot exist without a society, both are interdependent. Society consists of individuals. And Individuals are essential parts of society. According to this theory, both are inseparable from one another. That is why, this theory does not recommend the mechanical view of society. Rather it advocates a natural view of society through organic relation.

LET US KNOW

Functionalism is the oldest and most dominant theoretical perspective in sociology. This perspective lays emphasis on two aspects: i) Application of the scientific method to an objective study of the social world. ii) Use of an analogy between the individual organism and society. Emile Durkheim and recent Talcott Persons(1902-1979, Americian sociologist) are the two advocates of functionalism. They hold that the social world is objectively real. Functionalists compare society to a living organism. They hold that the different parts of society e.g. the family, education, religion, law and media etc. contribute to the smooth functioning of society.

15.4.1 Criticism of the organic theory

Although this theory is a developed form of the mechanical view of society, still this theory is not free from criticism.

Firstly, this theory tries to explain the relationship of individual and society through organic relation. The problem is that we can metaphorically explain the relationship in terms of the organic form, but in reality the picture is different. Because society and individual cannot be like a structured human body. Although mechanically it is possible for us to explain the different functions of a human body, but we cannot explain the relationship of individual and society like an organism.

Secondly, the organic theory is not satisfactory. Organs of a human body cease to exist when a man dies. But the society does not cease to exist. It continues its functions. Therefore, on this ground critics are not ready to accept the organic theory of society.

However the significance of this theory is that it removes the primitive concept of individual and society. This theory shows us the inseparable relation of individual and society. Over and above, it emphatically asserts that individual cannot live without society, and society also cannot exist without individual. So, both are inseparable.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q3: What is organic theory?

.....

.....

Q 4: Can we think of society without individual?

.....

.....

Q 5: Who are the advocates of the organic theory?

.....

.....

Q6: State whether the following statements are true or False.

A. The organic theory holds that individual and society are interdependent. (True/false)

B. The organic theory is satisfactory. (True/False)

C. The social contract theory advocates the mechanical view of society. (True/False).

ACTIVITY : 15.2

- Why is the relation of individual and society not mechanical according to the organic theory? Discuss.

Ans: .....

.....

- Do you think that the organic theory is a satisfactory account of relation between individual and society?

Ans: .....

.....

15.5 THEORY OF GROUP OF MIND

According to this theory, man is a social being. His rational self or ideal self is nothing but the social self which can be realized in society. Every individual human being who has a rational self belongs to society. So, they are members of society. Morality and spirituality are also realized in society. So, according to this theory, the realization of social self is the main goal, of an individual which is realized only in society. Therefore, the society is the medium of realizing the highest nature of self, which is indeed the social self. It is hidden in the nature of self. But every individual can realize unseen self in society. It also can be said that the potential self can be actualized in society. Therefore, every individual has an aim to realize the higher self.

But this realization is fulfilled only when the individual self tries to achieve it in society or in the social universe. That is why, eminent social thinker Durkheim rightly pointed out that "Social mind is an existence distinct (not apart) from the mind of the individuals, and is superior to them. This mind or collective consciousness is the higher form of psychic life. It tends to absorb the individual mind from which it differs not only in the richness of content but also in kind."

This saying of Durkheim beautifully points out that ever individual self is different from the higher social self. So, the commonality or the objectivity of self is realized only through the social self. It is considered as the essence of every ideal self or individual self.

Individuals are interdependent members of society. He cannot realize the universal, moral and spiritual self apart from other individual selves or fellow men. The social self is the higher self, and individual self tries to actualize the common nature of self in society. Therefore, it can be said that society is the unity of the individual self. And every individual self leans towards the same goal i.e., common good. It is also regarded as the ideal of every individual self.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q7: What is the main goal of the theory of Group of Mind?

.....

.....

Q8: According to the Group of Mind theory, what is 'social self'?

.....

.....

Q9: State whether the following statements are True or False:

a) According to the 'theory of Group of Mind', Man is a social being. (True/false)

b) Durkheim asserts the individual self is different from the higher social self. (True/ false).

c) The Group of Mind theory holds that the higher self can be realized without society. (True/ False)

ACTIVITY : 15.3

- Is the Group of Mind theory satisfactory? Give reasons.

Ans: .....

.....

- Do you find any difference between individual self and social self? Discuss.

Ans: .....

.....

15.6 MODERN DEBATE ON INDIVIDUAL AND SOCIETY

The relationship between individual and society can be classified under four categories in contemporary sociological theory. They are respectively:

- Nominalism
- Interactionism
- Neo-nominalism
- Realism

Nominalism: According to this theory, individual is the only reality. The general concepts such as society, group, culture and values are not regarded as useful in order to study human behaviour. The only thing which can be explained and which is very much useful is the behaviour of individual. This is also so called individual psychology. It helps to predict others' human behaviour, knowing one's behaviour from different angles. That is why, the group context is not a real entity. It is nothing but an assaemblage of different individuals.

This concept has a resemblance to the social contract theory. This theory also holds that society is an artificial phenomenon. Society is not a natural phenomenon, because people felt a necessity of coming into contract in order to get rid of fear from natural calamities like earthquakes, flood, different diseases etc. So, this theory gives us the hint that individual has a dominant role in the social contract theory. Apart from individuals, society has no existence independently. Like the concept of nominalism, the social contract theory holds that the individual precedes the society.

Interactionism: This concept holds that neither society nor individual can be discussed independently. Individual and society both interact with each other, and only then a meaningfull relationship between individual and society develops. Just

as society is incomplete without individual, so is individual without society. Hence both are inseparable. Interactionism is concerned with the socio-psychological frame of reference which ignores what is common to all men as well as what is unique to particular individuals. Rather, it deals with what is common to classes of individuals in a particular culture or a particular social context.

This concept has a similarity to the organic theory of society. The organic theory also indicates the important relationship of individual and society. This theory holds that individual and society are interconnected; one cannot be discussed without the other. This theory compares the society to an organic human body. Just as an organic body is interconnected to other parts of a body, so also individual and society are indispensably related.

Neo-nominalism: This concept accepts the existence of group as an objective reality as well as the idea that individual is the fundamental unit. This concept indicates that society is made up of persons and of processes which have their locus and immediate origin in the person. Social phenomena can be explained in terms of individual phenomenon. This concept amends the other concept that society is an artificial emergence of individual. Rather, it goes ahead and views that society is made up of persons, who cannot be an artificial appearance. Allport and Homans are the two advocates of neo-nominalism. The neo-nominalists, reductionists or advocates of psychological sociology view social structure as 'a kind of convenient fiction or a shorthand designation for summarizing individual behaviour in aggregative terms.'

This concept has a similarity to the Group mind theory, criticizing individual centric posture over social structure. This concept gives us the hint that social self is also equally important like the individual self. Social self can give us the important point that social self is an aggregate of individual self. That is why this concept puts importance on social behaviour in order to describe the relationship between individual and society.

Realism: This doctrine holds that both group and individual are real. They are not concrete, but are abstract entities. It also holds that group is understandable and explicable in terms of social processes and factors, but not explicable or understandable by reference to individual behaviour.

Durkheim holds that social processes are independent of human will. That is why, social phenomena cannot be reduced to individual phenomena. A whole is not

identical with the parts. So, society is not a mere sum of individuals. It is said that the first origins of social phenomena are psychological because the only elements which make up society are individuals. Individuals represent a specific characteristic, because nothing collective can be produced if individual consciousness is not taken into account. But individual consciousness itself cannot be a characteristic. When individual consciousnesses are combined in a certain way then social life emerges.

The tendency to explain the social life through psychological factors is not a correct explanation. Although it is thought that certain qualities like religious sentiments, parental love, sexual jealousy are innate in man, still these qualities are the results of collective socialization process. Therefore, collective life is not derived from individual life.

The latter, i.e., the individual cannot explain the former i.e., the collective but it can atleast help an explanation. A sociologist explains the social facts. But, later he can take benefit from his psychological lesson, yet he must concentrate on the realm of social facts. This was Davidson's view.

In sharp contrast to Durkheim's view, George Homans, an advocate of neo-nominalism in contemporary sociology holds that sociology can be derived from psychology. According to him, social processes can be reduced to the laws of behavioural psychology.

These sociologists lay emphasis exclusively on psychological and socio-psychological phenomena. It undoubtedly leads to one sided research in sociology. Turner says that Homans reduces sociological questions into psychological questions. But, according to William Issac individual behaviour and social institutions are to be explained in terms of culture. Everything that people think, feel and do is culturally determined.

There is still another group of thinkers such as Charles Horton Cooley, Znaniecki, who hold individual and society are two aspects of the same reality. According to Thomas and Znaniecki, the individual is neither the product of his milieu, nor does he produce his milieu, rather we can say both. Another scholar, White has claimed that culture, not the individual, is the only genuine reality.

The question-whether sociological phenomena can and must be reduced to psychological phenomena, has been a critical issue in contemporary sociology. In this respect reductionism can never give us an adequate answer regarding the

relationship between individual and society. Rather, it deviates its track from the original issue of the relationship between individual and society. Man is more than a psycholological animal because he is also the product of culture. However, society is not mere collection of individuals. Rather, it is an entity involving a qualitative jump from individual to society. That is why, it is not a satisfactory strategy to reduce the social phenomena to psychological phenomena or to reduce psychological phenomena to social phenomena in the context of individual and society.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q10: What is nominalism?

.....

.....

Q11: What is interactionism?

.....

.....

Q12: Who are the advocates of neo-nominalism?

.....

.....

Q13: What is realism?

.....

.....

Q14: Fill in the blanks:

a) ..... individual is the only reality.

b) ..... holds that both group and individual are real.

c) Reductionism leads to ..... research in sociology.

ACTIVITY : 15.4

- Can we think of the traditional type of society through the sociological concept of nominalism? What do you think?

Ans: .....

.....

.....

.....

- Is the concept of realism a satisfactory answer to individual and society?

Ans: .....

.....

.....

.....

Anthony Giddens view on structuralism:

In the above discussion we have seen that in the context of the individual and the society both individual consciousness (Psychology) and social phenomena (Facts) are mutually complimentary. But what role does the social structure play in determining the activities of the individual? In this context we can mention Anthony Giddens, well known British sociologist who refers to the classical theorists holding the view that social structure decides the action of the individual. We can call it dualism. Let us see how Peter J. Kivisto, an American sociologist defines structuration: "The theory of structuration is an attempt to overcome the dualism that he sees as plaguing other theories –a dualism that gives priority either to actors or to social structures……...structures are created by humans, but they in turn constrain and enable human action." You may wonder what this dualism means. According to this definition the dualism lies in the relation between the individual (actors) and the social structures. Just as the structures are created by human beings, they are also controlled by social structure.

Giddens asks the question: Is society made up of the sum of individual's actions? Or, is society more than the sum of these actions and is there a social structure that is independent of each individual's actions? Giddens points out some salient features of structure. They are:

- Structures exist only in human memory
- Structures exist only in practice. They are produced by agents, i.e., actors(individuals).
- Structures enable us to do actions. They also exercise control on the actor.
- Structures consist of rules and resources which agents or actors draw upon in the production and reproduction of social life.

He views that the relationship between social structure and individual or actor or agent is never taken as dualism. Nether the agent can be explained in terms of social structure nor the social structure can be explained in terms of the agent. He

holds the view that structure inherently involves structuration. The actor always does some activity and doing some activities he actually does structuration. Structuration implies reproducing structure. So, reproduction of structure is structuration.

15.7 LET US SUM UP

- In this unit we come across different theories regarding the relation between individual and society from the traditional to modern. In the tradional stage we have found the theories like **the social contract theory**, **organic theory** and **theory of group of mind**. These theories undoubtedly attempt to explain the relationship between individual and society, but their viewpoint in case of discussing the relationship between the two can be pinpointed as follows.
- The social contract theory holds that society is not a natural phenomenon. People felt a necessity of coming into contract to get rid of troubles.
- The organic theory holds that individual and society are interdependent like bodily parts of a human body. Just as in a human body, bodily parts are interconnected to each other, so also the relationship of individual and society are inter-related.
- The group of mind theory holds that individuals are members of society. Apart from society men are mere abstractions. This theory also points out a goal of human life, i.e., to realize the social self in society. So, this theory also indicates that individual and society are related.
- All these theories attempt to discuss the relationship of individual and society, but none can claim to be satisfactory in this context. It is undoubtedly true that these theories start an important discussion to provide us many important clues in case of the origin of society.
- In sociology too, we come across different theories regarding the relation of individual and society. Nominalism holds that individual is the only reality. There are not any general concepts like society, culture, value etc. According to this concept, knowing one's behaviour we can predict others behaviours also. This concept undoubtedly has a similar viewpoint to the social contract theory for the presupposition of independent reality of individual.
- **Interactionism** like the organic theory discusses the interrelation of individual and society.

- **Neo-nominalism** is a developed form of nominalism, which holds the view that both individual and group mind are fundamental units. This theory points out the social behaviour of man, which is very much important in order to explain the inter-relationships of individual and society.
- **Realism** holds that social life is not explicable in terms of individual behaviour, although individual behaviour or consciousness can take a role.

15.8 FURTHER READING

1) Doshi, S L. (2006). *Modernity, Postmodernity and Neo-Sociological Theories*. Rawat Publications
2) M. Francis Abraham. (1982). *Modern Sociological Theory*. Oxford University Press,
3) Mackenzie, John S. (2004). *A Manual of Ethics*, Surjeet Publications
4) Sinha, J.N. (1984)**.** *A Manual of Ethics*. New Central Book Agency,
5) Sharma, R.N.(2006*). Introduction to Ethics*. Surjeet Publications
6) Rawat, H.K. (2007). *Sociology*. Rawat Publications

15.9 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Ans to Q No 1: a) The social contract theory b) Social contract theory
c) Egoists d) Mutual good-will

Ans to Q No 2: a) Hobbes b) Hobbes

Ans to Q No 3: It is a theory which holds that society can be compared to an organism. Just as a human body is interconnected with other parts, so also society and individual are interdependent. One cannot be discussed apart from the other. So, both are interconnected.

Ans to Q No 4: According to organic theory, we cannot think of a society without individual. From the sociological perspective too, as for instance, interactionism also makes it clear that both are interconnected.

Ans to Q No 5: Herbert Spencer, Emile Durkheim are the advocates of the organic theory.

Ans to Q No 6: a) True b) False c) False

Ans to Q No 7: The main goal of the theory of Group of Mind is to realize the social self, which is realized within society.

Ans to Q No 8: Social self is nothing but the highest nature of self, which is hidden in every individual self.

Ans to Q No 9: a) True b) True c) True

Ans to Q No 10: Nominalism is a concept in sociology, which holds that individual is the only reality.

Ans to Q No 11: Interactionism is a concept in sociology, which holds that both individual and society interact upon each other to discuss meaningfully the concept of individual and society.

Ans to Q No 12: Allport and Homanas are the two advocates of neo-nominalism.

Ans to Q No 13: Realism is a concept in philosophy which upholds the view that both group and individual are real.

Ans to Q No 14: a) Nominalism b) Living organism c) Realism d) One sided research

15.10 MODEL QUESTIONS

A) Very short questions

Q1: Define the organic theory

Q2: What is social contract theory?

Q3: What do you mean by interactionism?

Q4: Who are the advocates of the social contract theory?

Q5: What is neo-nominalism?

Q6: What is realism?

B) Short questions (Answer in about 150 words)

Q1: Briefly explain the social contract theory.

Q2: What is organic theory of society? Briefly explain

Q3: Write a brief note on interactionism.

Q4: Write a short note on neo-nominalism.

Q5: What do you mean by theory of group of mind? Explain

Q6: Explain in brief the concept of realism.

C) Long questions (Answer in about 300-500 words)

Q1: What are the theories of individual and society? Which one is more satisfactory, according to you? Explain

Q2: What is social contract theory? Discuss.

Q3: What is organic theory of society? Explain.

Q4: What is the theory of Group of Mind? Is it satisfactory? Discuss.

Q5: What are the concepts in sociology regarding the relation between individual and society? Are they satisfactory?

Q6: What is nominalism? Do you find any similar viewpoints between nominalism and the social contract theory? Discuss.

Q7: What is interactionism in sociology? Is this concept similar to the organic theory of society? Discuss.

Q8: What is neo-nominalism? Do you find any similarity between neo-nominalism and the group mind theory? Discuss.

Q9: What is realism? Is it a satisfactory account of the relation between individual and society? Discuss.

Q10: What is reductionism? Is it a satisfactory concept in society? Discuss.

*** ***** ***