

Contemporary Issues in Philosophy of Mind and Cognition

Prof. Ranjan K. Panda

Prof. Rajakishore Nath

Department of Humanities and Social Science

Indian Institute of Technology, Bombay

Lecture No. # 08

Dualism- 2

See in the last class, we discussed about the nature of mind in the philosophy of Decart. Decarts you all know, so is deriving a kind of a thesis, which is called substance dualism. As you know for Decart mind is an independent substance and the body is another substance, which is independent of the mind.

So, body and mind are two independent substances and their existence does not need the help of the other, meaning there by the existence of mind does not require the existence of the body and the existence of body does not require that the existence of mind. With this now we had formulated Decart's philosophy of mind as a substance dualistic theory of mind.

Today, we will discuss little further, how do we comprehend the nature of mind in Decart theoretical frame work, is it simple that Decart **it** is deducing from **on** this hypothesis. That I think, therefore I exist and therefore I am; is it a simple **exubutic** claim Decart is making or a something else? What is the epistemological clue Decart provides us to understand the nature of the mind or the nature of the self? Is there a Meta physical necessity to talk about the nature of self?

What is the epistemic access to this notion of the self that is what we would like to discuss. And at the latter half of this talk I will be also talking about critics of Decart, particularly **((C))** Tried and John Searle. I have accepted them as critics because as you know they were able to write famous essay Decart's meath is a very important contribution to the contemporary debate on philosophy of mind. It is also, it is true in the case of John Searle who is talking about how mind body problem is no more a mind body problem.

Whether what is mind body problem today is something like this, that there is some mind brain problem. So, will come back to this debate about the meth's in addition philosophy in a philosophy of Decart and (()) john searle does not find that mind body dualism is not a problematic one. So, I will come back to these two questions little later.

Now, let us look at Decart's axioms, that I think therefore I am, FL. Now, when Decart believes that I think is an indubitable proposition, Decart is certainly aware of this fact that this indubitability is something very intuitive, something very private. Now, that is what is Decart is claiming, why because, I am a thinking thing, is not accessible to the other, I am not an object, rather I am the subject, which is thinking all the time and hence from this notion of thinking I can very well derive that I exist.

So, I existence, the existence of the subject as a thinking thing is something very important, important from two points of you, one is that it is a epistemic subject who is all the time knowing, imagining, dreaming, experiencing, feeling, etcetera, etcetera and it is also an a meta physical subject. The meta physics of the subject talks about the fact that mind is really there. It does not say that mind is something like that epistemical entity, which is a free phenomenon now. So, that kind of claim Decart does not want to make and mind is represented is a kind of a unitary principle, when I say I am acting, I am giving this lecture, so this I represents the entire activities of mind. So, the representation of mind as a self is something very significant in the cartesian theory of of mind where Decart makes an ontological claim. So, substance dualism talks about the ontology of mind, mind that is really there. And when Decart talks about mind that is really there it is there independent of the objects that are there in the world.

So, the ontology of the object or the ontology of the world is also not questioned by Decart, because Decart knows, I mean in the sense that Decart quite convinced with this mechanistic world view, which was proposed by galileo and many others. And that the object or things in the world have an ontological status and their ontology is something which is clear and objectrable, I mean which also talks about a self-evident truth.

So, the ontology of the world is self-evident, because it is observable, it is publicly accessible, etcetera, etcetera. Similarly the ontology of the mind is also real and its exist and it is accessible from a private sense, it is directly accessible, meaning there by I can directly access my mind, you do not have a direct access to my mind.

Whether I have a direct access to mind, so everyone who thinks have a direct access to their respective minds, I can immediately know that what I am thinking, I am aware of what I am thinking right now. So, that state of my mind is immediately accessible, whereas it is not immediately given to your observation, so what you observe is probably my actions, my behaviors, etcetera, etcetera.

But my behaviors, actions are part of the body, it is the body which is performing my behaviors, it is the body which is know making (()), it is the body which now makes this expressions possible. But what is important for Decart here is this, that it is not the body alone is real, it is something which is presupposed here is to be looked very carefully that there is a mind, which causes certain voluntary actions and I am giving this lecture to you all talks it about my voluntary actions.

So, when you observe my behaviors you are listening to my lectures, now these lectures are already made public. So, there is nothing private about it, but in Cartesian frame work there is some sub privacy still prevails. In the sense that how would does one know about the mind, how does one have the access to his or her mind?

So, in that sense when we look at this question will find that there is some element of privacy is still left to Decart and Decart has been criticized for this notion of privacy. That mind is immediately accessible to an individual who is a thinking thing and as a thinking subject he alone is aware of what he is thinking.

So, there is a kind of an inner mind, mind is not a public phenomenon, mind is not an outer phenomenon. So, this inner outer distinction is very clear in the cartesian philosophy of mind, what the Decart philosophy of mind. Now, how does one resolve that kind of a dualism, how does one connect to this two pools, the inner pool on the one hand and the outer pool on the other hand.

Now, Decart's believed that it is because of the god, it is because of the existence of god, power of (()) importance, this kind of interaction is possible between these two pools, the mind and the body. When we say that the body is, I am doing this, I am doing that, I am giving you lecture, I am listening to music, I am observing all of you on the class, I am invigilating your examinations etcetera, etcetera, I am performing voluntary actions. And we all perform voluntary actions in our everyday life, when we talk about voluntary actions human action particular, we do not really bother about the mind body interaction,

rather this is a very theoretical questions and indeed a very philosophical questions, it is not a general questions in that sense.

So, when really Alenen points out very recently on this text Decart's concept of mind, he says the mind body interaction is not questioned at all when we talk about our everyday life phenomena. So, it is question only when we talk about when mind is not interacting with the body, if that interaction is possible at all and what is Decart response to this? Decart said this interaction is possible, because there is an (()) got.

So, Decart gives a kind of a religious answer to thesis, I mean beyond this two substances mind and body Decart's in fact know many of the historians of philosophy of mind, have potted that Decart is presupposing another kind of a substance, the substance is probably, primary substance of god.

That comes at the end of such meditations, let us do not talk about the concept of god, I will come back to this idea when we will talk about Ryle. But, let us see if mind and body are interacting then what this mechanism of interaction is. Say for example, when I came to your class I thought about what I am going to say today.

Now, this thinking or deciding to talk, something relevant is a kind of a decision that I am making, is a kind of a judgment I am making. So, I am already in conversation with my own self that I will be doing this. Now, when I am say I am already in conversation with myself and presupposing that there is a there is a self or I am rather talking to me.

Now, Decart says that this kind of intervention and the intervention that happens from language makes a kind of a confused relations. I mean, in the sense that it gives a confused idea about my own being, my own self. Why this confusion? What kind of confusion it is? Now, Decart as I mentioned earlier, in the previous class, that Decart is in fact interested in a kind of knowledge claim, which is clear, distinct and self-evident.

You know knowledge must guarantee clarity, knowledge must guarantee that know it is distinct and clear, knowledge must guarantee some kind of certainty to all of us, hence it should be self-evidently true. So, the intervention of language does not make things clear according to Decart, but still Decart is a kind of, you know arguing a kind of a presentational thesis, where the existence of mind is presupposed.

But mind, my knowledge about my mind is such an immediate knowledge, where I do not really require the help of language to know it. Now, look at this idea of **a this** making a decision or a judgment or say something to you presupposes a thought or **or** thinking mind. For Decart this thinking mind is a kind of an ontological reality and this ontological reality controls all our voluntary actions.

It executes these ideas, this decisions and that is how we are able to perform voluntary actions. Now, where does Decart locate the mind? As I have mentioned earlier I would like to repeat it here that Decart locates the mind at the center of the pineal gland and this gland is somewhere at the middle of the brain, now if the pineal gland is **the** immediately is placed where the soul or the mind is located.

In Decart's meditation you will find there is no mention of mind rather Decart is again mentioning the concept of soul. I am using concept of mind and the soul interchangeably, so here it is the soul which has power of intervening to the domain of mind. And the body has the power as the ability to sense things and pass this information to the mind.

The mechanism through which this information is passed through a something is very significant, Decart says there are animal spirits and there are animal spirits stored in the cavities and these animal spirits are transformed into some kind of sensations and further by actions. So, there is a kind of a **you know** elaborate discussion on this biological function of the body, how the animal spirit is transformed into some kind of a behavior.

How this animal spirit controls our notions, now how this animal spirit cause **you know** voluntary actions, bodily movements. So, that is what is explained in Cartesian biological or philological frame work, so there is a complete explanation of that, now let us go deep into that kind of questions. Let us accept in brief that the body is an organic system and this organic systems **are** controlled certain mechanical function of the organisms, therefore we can explain the behaviors of the body by using the mechanical laws. So, human body is like any other material body, so let any other matter, so that is why this mind and matter dichotomy in Decart's.

Because my access to my body is like my access to the objects out there, so as I said the body exists out there, I am not having a kind of an immediate access to this particular

entity as I am having in the case of the mind. So, that is what something very significant in Decart is.

Now, other two things, which I would like to mention this context is this. One is do animals think? And the other is what the status of animal is? One of the brief answers to this question would be, now in Decart, animals do not think, now who I am posing these questions in between? I am posing it, because are this animals treated like any other objects in the world, the answer is yes, in **in** Decart philosophical frame work will find that animal do not think, they are like know the material bodies, they are like trees, plants and any other objects, like stones, etcetera, etcetera.

Now, what is the capacity of **of** human thinking? Now, according to Decart human beings are having higher order consciousness and the two important features of this higher order consciousness is one is imagination and another is reasoning. So, imagination and reasoning are two important features of human consciousness, human beings can imagine what would happen in future. With the help of imagination we can grasp things, ok.

Now, you might have learned something about this Decart, example of the wax. Now, when Decart's **talks about**, the objects talks about things of the matter, material bodies, what does he says? He says the material body are **are** having certain fundamental or essential properties and like thinking is an essential property of consciousness or the mind or the soul, similarly the matter has an essential property and that essential property is a extension. So, extension is an essential feature, what is essentiality here? And Decart gives an example of wax. When he says let us call go and collect wax from the honey comb and bring that wax and when you bring that wax to **(())** and you will find the wax has particular fragrance and it has particular color, particular shape, etcetera, etcetera.

But if you light the flame and bring that wax near to the flame and burn it you will find colors are changing and shape is also changing. Now, what remains with the object? And Decart says it is extension, extension is something that who tells us that something which occupies space, the body is an extended entity must occupy a space.

So, that which occupies space is the extension of the body, so Decart saying that there is a kind of a requisitions and reextension, requisitions is about the existence of the mind and the mental events, mental states and processes, whatever is there in the domain of the

mental life. Resection talks about whatever exist in the domain of the material world, so this kind of dichotomy is very much there. And the very fact that I am able to grasp, which is the same wax, Decart says it is my imagination which helps me to comprehend that it is the same wax. So, with the help of imagination and reasoning I can talk about the existence of the wax or identity of the wax.

So, the identity of the being is captured by imagination and rationality. Now, similarly **when** how do I say that two plus two is equal to four and this two plus two is equal to three plus one, this kind of identity is comprehended through my reasoning and through my imagination. So, human beings have a kind of a higher order consciousness and this higher order consciousness is different from mere sensibility. Animals having this power of sensing things, they show us some reflexive behaviors, look at the pet, pet's are very sensible animals. I should say that pet's are very sensible beings and what is it to you that when they roll tears if you beat them, if you being very harsh to them, what is that, are they not thinking?

Now, for Decart they are not thinking, they are not thinking precisely because they are not aware of what they are doing. Now, this awareness for Decart is a kind of a self-awareness, the awareness of one's individuality, the awareness of one's being, a something very **but** important and it is that awareness which confirms that we are a metaphysical subject, we are a subject which exist to perform certain moral actions.

So, all our voluntary actions are to be morally evaluated, they are evaluated either good or bad precisely because we are responsible for our actions. Now, this kind of a responsibility is attributed to human beings, human actions, particularly because human actions flows from a conscious mind, human beings know what they are doing. We do not hold responsible to the animals, when we say that they are performing voluntary actions. Of course, they have some beliefs or of course they have on the sense of fear, doubts, etcetera, quite possible to me personally they do we have certain believe states.

But what is not immediately given or what is not given at all to them is this idea of self-consciousness, their existing the consciousness about their own individuality, a something very significant.

Now, Decart is trying to talk about the existence of one being with reference to introspection. He says how do I understand my own individuality, how do I understand

that I am the same person, because my physical body has changed and is changing or in future we all will grow up.

Now, but still I consider myself is the same individual, so Decart says interspection is something of his talks about how do I reflect on my own being and this reflection is reflection of my consciousness, that is what gives me a clear and distinct ideas about my own self. This is where Decart is claiming that we can interspect, analyze the phenomenal mind, we can very well study the phenomenal mind, reflect own our thoughts and see how distinctly they are appearing to all of us.

So, the existence of mind is not questioned in the Cartesian theoretical frame work, neither Decart questions the existence of the body, the body has essential property ((C)) and extension of the mind has an essential property called thinking thought. Now, with this two essential qualities or attributes, I mean Decart never called with properties mind, is not a property for Decart. I am saying it probably I still believe that mind is the you know caused by certain brain processes, which is the claim of john Searle.

Let us conclude about Decart theoretical positions. Now, Decart for me is a dualist who accepts that mind and body are independently conceivable. Their existence can be independently conceivable; mind is a thinking substance where the body is an extended substance. So, they belong to two different categories, now this word category is something significant; will come to see what kind of significance it has when will go to the critics of Decart.

Let us go back to the critics of Decart. Leebert Ryle one of the twentieth century philosopher raising an important point with regard to Decart substance dualism. According to Ryle Decart's theory is an official theory, it is official because it is widely accepted, people accepted and though they find that there is some problem about the interaction between mind and body I mean religious thinkers, the scientist and many others, they often find that it is not a problematic one, but with some modification this position can be held.

Now, Ryle calls us as one of the official theory, it is one of the established theory, but Ryle does not accept Decart's theoretical positions. I would come to some of the questions which Ryle is raising in this context.

(Refer Slide Time: 29:14)

Contemporary Issues in Philosophy of Mind & Cognition

Questions

- How can the mental events will be part of physical events?
- How does body influence the mind and vice-versa?
- How can we be entirely blind and deaf about the working of others' mind?
- Is there something hidden?
- How does one talk about authenticity?



Prof. Ranjan K Panda, Department of Humanities & Social Science, IIT Bombay

Now, let us look at these questions from this slide. How can the mental events will be part of the physical events? Because, as you know for Ryle mental events are different from physical events, mental events are private, they are accessible directly to all of us. And **for his** physical events are the events which are there in the world, they observable and therefore mental events are not part of the physical events. Now, the question is how can the mental events will be part of the physical events?

Second question talks about how does body influence the mind and vice-versa? Is there any interaction between mind and body? Because we are an embodied being with him, Decart is posing this question and as I mention philosopher (()), in her book Decart's concept of mind published in 2003, by harvard university phrase, says that Decart is talking about an embodied being and this embodied being is being where the embodiment of mind is not questioned at all in our everyday life.

So, then how does Decart explain to us the mind body interaction is a logical interaction? I think Ryle is raising the question because the some amount of misery laps there. The third question talks about how we can be entirely blind and deaf about the working of other mind. Where he says that my mind is available to me as a persons and it is private, I can take only the cognitions of its activities.

So, what I am thinking right now, but how can you be not aware of all these when I am living this world. How can we be entirely blind and deaf about the workings of other

minds? Is there something hidden then? Ryle is certainly referring to flight who says there is something called an unconscious mind and that unconscious mind is something very much hidden to the conscious mind. So, Ryle brings flight, (()) one of the twentieth century famous psychoanalyst (()).

Now, how does the last question talks about? How does one talk about authenticity? Now, when we talk about the objectivity of mind it is very important that how do I may confirm this objectivity? How do I confirm that this is something very significant, this is something really there and because of that next my claim is very circular, in the sense that I know that I am and I know that I am thinking being. So, my thinking defines or explains my existence to me and I will not have any kind of a clue, on the basis of which I can confirm that others are thinking.

So, in that sense this question is something very interesting. Now, Decart says that mind and body are two independent substances, mind is an inner phenomenon and it is real, it does not exist in space, whereas body is something which exists in space. Now, the existence of mind in the body taken in the case of an embodied mind, mind that is there in the body now performing voluntary actions or experiencing, performing things. So, that mind Ryle says I mean is this a mind like a ghost ghost in the (()), you know a something Ryle's one of the favorite concept.

According to Ryle mind exists in the body like the ghost exist in the brain on the machine. So, the human body is like a machine and it is functioning, following the natural laws, the law of casualties, so the mechanical laws can explain how does the body function. But mechanical law would not explain how my body acts according to my will, my intention to act. So, the mechanical act does not explain the mind because mind is something outside there.

(Refer Slide Time: 34:22)

Contemporary Issues in Philosophy of Mind & Cognition

The Dogma of Ghost in the Machine

- The substance dualism is
- Category Mistake
- Eg. *A foreigner visiting University*
- “It has then to be explained to him that the University is not another collateral institution, some ulterior counterpart to the colleges, laboratories and offices which he has seen. The university is just the way in which all that he has already seen is organized.” (P.18)

 NPTEL

Prof. Ranjan K Panda, Department of Humanities & Social Science, IIT Bombay

Look at Ryle's favorite example of a ghost in the machine, where he says how we can locate a university. Now, a foreigner visiting a university, I will just read out this quotation, it has then to be explained to him that the university is not another collateral institution, some ulterior counterpart to the colleges, laboratories and offices, which he has seen the university is just the way in which all that he has already seen is organized.

Now, this is very important in the sense that he says when we talk about mind, mind is nothing but a kind of collateral **you know** organic bodies which are there. So, **mind exist** mind cannot exist independent of the body. Like when a foreigner visits to a university he would find that there are departments, there are schools, there are laboratories, libraries, there are gymnasiums, now he would see all these.

Now, where does the university exist? When we say that there it exist when we put all these thing together is a kind of a collateral institutions, where the ulterior counterpart with the university. So, when you say that mind and body are two different things then you are really making a category mistake. So, according to Ryle they are not too categorically independent substances, they are one and that can be **you know** analyzed.

Ryle gives various examples; one is how we can talk about a system and how we can look at. Now, there are different divisions within the systems, I mean there is a system and there are subsystems and how the subsystems are functioning. So, that is important

and once you know the function of these subsystems you will understand how the entire system is functioning.

So, that is one kind of an example when he try to give how pointing out to the (()) of the military. And he also talks about team spirit, what is this concept called team spirit? Pointing out to a cricket match, in a cricket match the bowlers are bowling to the batsman, batsmen do face the balls. They beat, well go for six, four's, singles, etcetera, there is a case of a run out, there is a case of bowled; now all these are the concepts when we talk about a cricket match happening out there.

But where do we locate this concept of team spirit when the entire team is very enthusiastically playing the cricket, trying to defeat the other. So, team spirit is part of everybody, it is not with the bowlers, it not with the fielders, it is not with the captain, it is exhibited now quote and quote Ryle's talk, it is exhibited in the performance of everyone's actions.

So, it is not something hidden, so mind is similarly is exhibited when we perform voluntary actions, mind is not something hidden. So, there is nothing called private about this concept of mind, there is another thing which Ryle's makes it very clear to all of us. Now, what are the reasons why Decart concludes the substance dualism? What are the reasons behind it?

(Refer Slide Time: 38:44)

Contemporary Issues in Philosophy of Mind & Cognition

Origin of Category Mistake - 1

- Descartes discomfort with Galileo's mechanical theory of the universe .
- Descartes showed that there is something beyond the mechanical function of the universe.
 - For Ryle, **Descartes** was religious and moral person and **Hobbes** was not committed to any religious understanding of the world.



NPTEL

Prof. Ranjan K Panda, Department of Humanities & Social Science, IIT Bombay

Now, look at this, the origin of this category mistake. In Decart was very much you know an aware of Galileo's mechanical theory of the universe. Now, the mechanical theory of universe talks about there is a mechanical law that is a causal law which forwards everything and that can explain the nature of things that are existing in the world or the existing in the universe.

But, Decart was bit uncomfortable when it comes to the explanation of the mind. Decart showed that there is something beyond the mechanical function of the universe, now Ryle is also referring to Hobbes, Hobbes did not much bother about the existence of mind, whether he was could comfortable with Galileo's mechanical theory.

Now, mechanical theory is explained by Galileo with an example of a clock, how the machineries in the clock function? When you locate the wheels of the clock they are all connected with each other's like now as I mentioned earlier. That there are subsystems, subsystems are having a kind of a coordinated function and that exhibits that a system is function.

So, in a mechanistic world, if you will find that mind is part of the world and Hobbes accepts this world, Hobbes is committed to this world, but Decart is not, Decart had this religious and moral feeling which was the reason probably for not feeling comfortable, which this mechanistic world view. Decart know that mind is something which cannot be explained with the mechanical laws, the law of the universe.

(Refer Slide Time: 40:41)

Contemporary Issues in Philosophy of Mind & Cognition

Origin of the Category Mistake - 2

- **The mind must be governed by non-mechanical laws**
- **How to reconcile the freedom of will with the deterministic world view of mechanics?**



NPTEL

Prof. Ranjan K Panda, Department of Humanities & Social Science, IIT Bombay

And these are **the** I think mind is not governed by a non-mechanical laws. Now, the question is whether mind is governed by a non-mechanical laws at all, the later Cartesians had this view that my mind is governed by a kind of a non-mechanical laws, like you have a kind of a **(())** idea of universal law of reasons, where **you know** principles which governs our actions, which are different from the causal laws.

One can look at life is world and look at, see whether things are there. The other problem which you find is this, the reason for a category mistake is that how do we relate freedom of **will with** deterministic world. Because the universe which is governed by the mechanistic principles or the principles of law of causality, **is** gives a kind of a closer in the sensor, put a kind of a closer to the entire system and is a kind of a **you know** determination which Decart is contemplating and how does one explain freedom which relation to the determination.

So, these are the questions which will come back to in our next classes, may be in future will have a special topic on the freedom of will and there while be discussing the relationship between free will and the world or when we will talk about cells, will try to see how cell tries to define this relationship, those are the questions.

So, to conclude this Decart is a substance dualist and mind is a substance can be immediately known, one can have a privileged excess to the mind through interspection. And similarly, on the other hand will find that the body is an extended entity; extension is the essential feature of the body and that exist. And the function to the body can be explain through a mechanical principles of the universe and Ryle is being a very much critic to this **you know** idea of a dualism. And according to Ryle is a category mistake so mind is not an a entity which exist independent of the body, mind is you say that then it is like a ghost existing. So, the **the** presence of mind **is** is a epic phenomenon for Ryle, but probably Ryle **is** will not say that, Ryle accepts that there is mind, but in Ryle's philosophical analysis will find Ryle accepts that the mind is rather exhibited in the behaviors **in** in our voluntary actions.

So, Ryle does not really eliminate the notion of mind when he identifies mind with the behaviors or voluntary actions. So, with this I will end this lecture and we will come back to Searle criticism in the next lecture and see how the Searle do justice to Decart's substance dualism; thank you.