UNIT 9: MIND-BODY RELATION

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

9.6 Strawson's view on Mind and Body Relation

9.7 Let Us Sum Up

9.8 Further Readings

9.9 Answers to Check Your Progress

9.10 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
- analyze 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 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 Berkeley. 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. 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.

Descartes, in this context, introduces the concept of Interactionism where he speaks 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 interact with 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 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. It is observed that like the metaphorical relation of the rider and the horse, the relation of mind and matter also 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. The 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 affect 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

Q 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 viz. God. 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 the effects of the same cause which is the 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 the question by saying that both Substance and Mind 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 relation between the mind and the body 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: On what Ground 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

Q 1: Do you support parallelism? If yes, give 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 nothing can 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 spirit 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 windowlessness monad it can be seen 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 in 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 coincides 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 windowless monads that 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 creator 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 cannot 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.

Q10: Who propounds the concept of monads?

.....

.....

Q11: What is pre-established harmony? (Answer in about 69 words)

.....

.....

Q12: Briefly explain the nature of Queen Monad? (Answer in about 74 words)

.....

.....



ACTIVITY 9.3

Q 2: 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 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 also says that Leibnitz 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.

5.6 STRAWSON'S VIEW ON MIND AND BODY RELATION

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 and corporeal and mental predicates can be applied.



ACTIVITY 9.4

Q 3: Is Russell's view satisfactory in case of Leibnitz's concept of mind-body relation? What do you think? Discuss

Ans: .....

.....

.....

Q 4: Do you support Strawson's view in case of mind-body relation? Discuss

.....

.....

.....



CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

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

.....

.....

Q14: 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)

Q15: Strawson's concept of person is a critique of two theories? What are they?

.....

.....



5.7 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.



5.8 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(1998). A History of Western Philosophy.
4) Shaffer A. Jerome(1968). Philosophy of Mind. U.S.A:Prentice-Hall, Inc., Eaglewood Cliffs, N.J.



5.9 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Ans to Q 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 the body is 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



5.10 MODEL QUESTIONS

A. Very short Questions

Q1: Who propounds the theory of Interactionism?

Q2: What is Interactionism?

Q3: Define Parallelism

Q4: What is Pre-established harmony?

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

Q1: Briefly explain the theory of Interactionism?

Q2: Briefly comment on Spinoza's theory Parallelism.

Q3: What is psycho-physical realism? Discuss briefly.

Q4: What do you mean by Strawson's concept of person? Explain briefly.

Q5: What is pre-established harmony? Briefly explain

Q6: What do you mean by Queen Monad? Discuss briefly

C. Write short note on (Write in about 150 words)

Q1: Occasionalism

Q2: Interactionism

Q3: Parallelism

Q4: Theory of monads

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

Q1: What is interactionism? Explain

Q2: Discuss Spinoza's theory of parallelism.

Q3: What is Pre-established harmony? Is it a satisfactory theory in case of the relation of mind - body problem?

Q4: Is Russell a critic of the theory of monads? Discuss it with reference to Leibnitz's theory of pre-established harmony.

Q5: What according to you are the limitations of Interactionism? Discuss

Q6: Which one of the three theories like Parallelism, Interactionism, and Pre established harmony would you prefer most in case of the mind-body relation? Explain

Q7: Do you find any distinction between Interactionism and Parallelism? Discuss

*** ***** ***