

**Anekant Journal of Humanities
and Social Sciences**

A Half Yearly and Peer Reviewed Open Access Print and Online Journal
<http://www.humanitics.org/>

RESEARCH ARTICLE**Vol. IV, Issue I, August 2021****Title: -AN OVERVIEW OF THE DIFFERENT TYPES OF DUALISM**

Abida Sultana

Research Scholar in Visva- Bharati University,
Department of Philosophy & Comparative Religion,
Bolpur, Shantiniketan
and

Assistant professor in Philosophy,
Dum Dum Motijheel College,
Under West Bengal State University Avenue 1,
Dum Dum, North 24 Parganas, Kolkata.
Email id: shilpimallick000@gmail.com

Abstract:

Philosophy is a logical and rational reflection on life. In a wider perspective philosophy means the critical analysis of the issue. Nothing is beyond in the scope of philosophy. Whenever someone is trying to explain something in a rational, critical, systematical, logical, and unique manner then we can say this that the person philosophizes. The humanistic aspect of philosophy is emphasized in recent years. Now philosophy is regarded more as an interpretation of human life, its source, value, meaning and destiny. It's focus about the enquiry into the nature of the world, soul and God. It tries to understand the relation between the universe and man. When we talk about the human life then one of the necessary questions is that what components make a human being as a human being. An ordinary aspect about this matter is that human being is the combination of mind or conscious experience or soul and body. This paper tries to uphold nature of these conscious experiences and relation between these with the human body from the perspective of different Dualism theory. Dualists state their views about mind, body, and the relation of mind-body. The paper discusses these theories in brief and the differences and similarities among them.

Keywords: dualism, humanism, soul, relation of mind and body etc.

Philosophy is the rational attempt to have a world view. It is not contented with a partial view of the whole reality it tries to have a compact view of the whole reality. If we see the definition of philosophy in a wider perspective, then philosophy is the systematic and critical study of fundamental questions those arise in our everyday life and through the practice of other disciplines. The humanistic aspect of philosophy is emphasized in recent years. A human being philosophizes when he consciously reflects upon his life and experiences and make an intellectual effort to harmonize the various aspects of his experiences and they also tried to find out the nature of these conscious experiences and the manner of the existence of these. If we see in the case of the human life and try to know the composition of a human being means with what, a human being created? Then There is a view which is a dualistic approach in western philosophy. They state that human being is the combination of mind and body. We can give examples of dualists like Plato, Descartes, and others. Here is an important thing need to mention that Mind is also said as soul or mental events or conscious experiences. Now the question is that what are the nature of mind? What is the role of the human body in the existence of mind or mental states or conscious experiences? Is mind or conscious experiences being material thing, which publicly observable like other material things like body or is it an immaterial one? These questions are the part of the branch of philosophy that is called Philosophy of Mind.

Philosophy of mind is a study of philosophical inquiry into the nature of mind and its properties. This inquiry tries to find out whether mind is a separate entity as body, or it is a part of it like brain. There is another query that whether mind has the properties, which are unique, such as consciousness. If it is agreed that mind has the quality like consciousness, then such a claim assumes something which is philosophically controversial. If it is said that minds are objects of certain kind, somehow related, maybe casually, maybe via identity to other objects such as bodies or brains. Then this type of explanation involves indirect and complex notion of mind then it literally treating mind as a ‘thing’.

In our day today life we are very much familiar with the term “Mind” and from the ordinary perspective there is no issues on the existence of mind and commonly we believe that whatever thinking, concept, or ideas we have that only inhere in mind. Now this an unavoidable matter that how human being exist with a grate correlation of the two extremely opposite entities? One is mind or consciousness and another one is physical body. Because by nature this two are very much opposite according to dualism and non-dualism theories also. Mind have no extension it is not able to observe by the public and body have the extension it can be located in space. The mind-body problem is a core problem of philosophy of mind. In monism mind and body are ontologically same. The monistic model rejects the notion of human being as divided into mind and body. It rather emphasizes the basic unity of human being. These theories also believe that ‘mental’ events do not exit separately, as they correlate with physiological events, or rather a “mental” event is also a “physiological” event. It may be absurd for the ordinary people that human being possesses no mind, but the monism theory also has their own reason to believe that. But Dualistic theories claim that everything can be described properly with the help of both mental and physical conceptual framework. Dualism is the worldview which reasons that physical states or events are the properties of a physical object, while the mental states or events are the properties of mind. This interpretation suggests that the essential nature of conscious intelligence resides in something non-physical, in something which remains beyond the scope of the science like physics, neurophysiology and computer science. Nowadays this interpretation is the most widely accepted by the scientists. Besides it is deeply embedded in the most of world’s popular religions, has been dominating in the tradition of western philosophy as well.

This paper mainly focuses on the views of dualists. How the Dualists state their views about mind, body, and the relation of mind-body. But there is a fact that dualists also disagreed about the existence of

mind as a separate entity. This paper discusses in brief some important theories of dualism. First, the discussion begins with history of Dualism. The classical origination of Dualism theory in Plato's Phaedo. Plato was the believer of dualism theory. Plato believed that things are the copies of the absolute form, and the true substances are not physical bodies, the physical bodies are also the copies of eternal forms. He stated that forms are the grounds of intelligence. So these forms not only make the world possible, they also make it intelligible, because they perform the role of universal, it is their connection with intelligibility that is relevant to the philosophy of mind. Plato has Presented varieties of arguments in support or to substantiate the immortality of soul. Plato stated that intellect is immaterial, and this aspect is relevant for this paper. Plato has separated the identity of soul and body and expressed the idea of dualism similarly Aristotle has also considered soul and body separately. Both the great Philosophers views were different still they had never tried to show mind and body as the same. Aristotle has described soul and body in the light of actuality and potentiality respectively.

As a dualism theory which is most famous in modern period of philosophy that is **Substance Dualism**. Substance dualism has discussed widely this aspect of mind and body relation. It argues that there is essential difference between mind and body. Likewise, it recognized mind and body as two completely autonomous entities that possess separated set of properties. This division is a fundamental concept of theory of substance dualism which is often referred as **Cartesian Dualism**, as it was Descartes who contributed the most to this problem. According to his Cartesian Dualism theory, mind and body are two different essences whose qualities and modes are not only separate from each other, but also whose existence is independent from one another. He tried to set foundation for division between these two, but at the same time he also explained what the nature of mind-body relation is and how they do interact with each other. In favor of his theory, he constructed a complex set of argumentations.

First, we need to have an insight into the substance dualism theory as presented by Descartes. Descartes had more than one argument for the substance dualism and one of those is '**Separability Argument**' from his sixth meditation: "First, I know that everything which I clearly and distinctly understand is capable of being created by God to correspond exactly with my understanding of it. Hence the fact that I can clearly and distinctly understand one thing apart from another is enough to make me certain that the two things are distinct, since they are capable of being separated, at least by God. The question of what kind of power is require bringing about such a separation does not affect the judgment that the two things are distinct. Thus, simply by knowing that I exist and seeing while absolutely nothing else belongs to my nature or essence except that I am a thinking thing, I can infer correctly that my essence consists solely in the fact that I am a thinking thing. It is true that I may have (or, to anticipate, that I certainly have) a body that is very closely joined to me. But nevertheless, on the one hand I have a clear and distinct idea of myself, in so far as I am simply a thinking, non-extended thing; and on the other hand, I have a distinct idea of body, in so far as this is simply an extended, non-thinking thing and accordingly, it is certain that I am really distinct from my body and can exist without it."

Afore said that it is not that every dualist agreed the separate existence of mind and property dualism is one of those which didn't accept mind as an independent entity, yet they are dualist because they agreed the existence of mental events and agreed that these are beyond the explanation of the science, like physics. **Property Dualism** theory is one of them. According to this theory, we do not possess any physical substance except brain which has a special set of properties. Followers of property dualism argue that all properties of physical brain are non-physical in nature. Even such sensations like pain, fear, or ability to see colors have been explained classified as non-physical, since it is not possible to explain/ to reduce them

into terms of physical sciences. The main difference between substance dualism and property dualism theory is that the followers of substance dualism claim that mental properties are non-physical in nature and reside in the abode of mind, which is projected as a non-physical entity, independent from the body, while, according to the latter point of view, the source of conscious intelligence and all mental sensations is a physical substance called brain.

Another theory of Dualism is **Epiphenomenalism**. According to Paul Churchland's book "Matter and Consciousness" Epiphenomenalism is the oldest version of Property Dualism. This term is rather a mouthful, but its meaning is simple. The Greek prefix "epi"- means "above", and the position at issue holds that mental phenomena are not a part of the physical phenomena in the brain that ultimately determine our action and behavior, but rather ride 'above the fray'. Mental phenomena are thus epiphenomena. They are held to just appear or emerge when the growing brain processes a certain level of complexity. But there is more. The Epiphenomenalist holds that while mental phenomena are caused to occur by the various activities of the brain, they do not have any causal effect in turn. They are entirely impotent with respect to causal effects on the physical world. They are mere epiphenomena. This means that the universal conviction that one's actions are determined by one's desires, decisions, and volitions is false! One's actions are exhaustively determined by physical events in the brain, which events also cause the epiphenomena we call desires, decisions, and volitions. There is therefore a constant conjunction between volition and actions. But according to the Epiphenomenalist, it is mere illusion that the former causes the latter. The Epiphenomenalist's 'demotion' of mental properties- to causally impotent by-products of brain activity- has seemed too extreme for most property dualists, and a theory closer to the convictions of common sense has enjoyed somewhat greater popularity. Here I tried to draw an attention that William R. Uttal in his "Dualism- The Original Sin of Cognitivism" discussed Epiphenomenalism theory under the Material Monism theory to show a brief taxonomy of Monism. But I discussed that aspect where Epiphenomenalism discussed as a dualistic theory for the purpose of my paper.

Interactionism is one of the types among substance dualism theory which we get from William R. Uttal's book "*Dualism- The original sin of cognitivism*". We got interactionism theory as a mind-body relation theory in Descartes's Cartesian dualism theory. Here I discuss interactionism as a type of substance dualism theory. According to this theory reality divided into two types one is mind another one is matter. In human being Mind refers to verities of mental process or thinking and matter refers to human body main brain. According to this theory mind and brain interact with each other. Mind and brain can affect each other equally. This view differs from the previous view in only one essential respect: the interactionist asserts that mental properties do indeed have causal effect on the brain, and thereby, on behavior. The mental properties of the brain are an integrated part of the general causal fray, in systematic interaction with the brain's physical properties. One's actions, therefore, are held to be caused by one's desires and volitions after all. Epiphenomenalists didn't believe the causal power of mental states or events.

Other important dualistic theories are **Reductionism**, **Creationism** and **Emergentism**. According to William Haskar's "The Case for Emergent Dualism". According to William Haskar discuss Reductionism as a dualistic theory where David Lund in his "*Materialism Dualism, and the Conscious Self*" discussed Reductionism as a reductive materialism theory which never accepts mental processes as mind's function. William R. Uttal's book "*Dualism- The original sin of cognitivism*" Reductionism theory discussed as Monistic theory. Believer of the Reductionism theory wanted to prove that somehow these mental processes are related to the bodily behaviour or brain processes. Now we see why William Haskar discussed this theory as a dualistic theory. According to his discussion the main concept of Reductionism

is- according to certain laws and principles simpler entities create a complex entity by the help of the correct arrangement of its entities. Reductionists presented their views on mind depending on this concept. According to them human mind or soul nothing but the complex function of the neurons by which the human brain has formed and operate according to the standard law of Physics and Chemistry. They agreed the feelings of something are beyond the explanation of Physical law or we can say not a material one. As simpler entities create complex one by the correct arrangement of its entities with certain law and principle, similarly complex function of neurons create feelings or conscious experiences. Reductionists agreed that feelings of something is not equivalent with the neurons which are physical or material nor nothing more than neurons, yet they said consciousness is the creation of the neurons and it is not obvious that a created one is always equivalent with its elements by which it produces. So may be based on this concept author discussed this theory as a Dualism theory not as a Monism theory.

According to the author **Creationism** is the theory which modelled as Descartes's Cartesian Dualism theory. But obviously there has some differences between them. According to this theory soul or mind created directly and individually by the God. Common version of this theory is mind and body are two different substances. Body is totally physical, and its properties are also physical which we have known from the Physical Science. Physical properties never possess any mental properties like thought, not even sensation. Mind is a "Thinking Thing" and the necessary characteristic of this is consciousness. However, body has no mental characteristic as well as mind has no physical properties like no electric charge, no mass not even a location in space. From this discussion we can connect that how Creationism related to the Cartesian theory of Descartes. Now there is another similarity where both the theories believe that, yet mind-body are two completely different in nature, yet they can interact with each other. Creationism theory explain the interaction in this manner: mind receive the information from the body or brain instead of that brain carry out the decision which made by the mind. Here the difference lies between Descartes's theory and Creationism. We know Descartes unable to define the process of the interaction between mind and body. He tried to answer where this interaction happened but couldn't answer how these two different entities interact. Another variance of Descartes's theory and Creationism is that according to Creationism mind infuse by the god earlier stage in the development of the organism and mind united with the body throughout the life of a person but mind never dependence on the body for its existence. Mind or soul created by the God and then infuse in the body. Descartes also state that mind and boy created by God but the infusion of the mind in the body was not claimed by Descartes.

Lastly, **Emergentism** is a dualistic theory. Emergence means certain elements united in a certain manner and emerges a new element which is very surprising, and which is totally different from the previous elements from which it emerges. According to this theory mind or in fine conscious experiences are the result of the structure or function of brain and nervous system and this result appears naturally Emergentists doesn't claim the infusion of the mind in the body from the outside, like Creationism. There are three kinds of Emergentists position based on the emergence of mind.

- The first one state that only mental properties or events or conscious experiences emerge. It is not that we always perceive these as an emergent property, but these experiences should be irreducible to the physical one.
- The second Emergentist position state that not only the mental states or events or conscious experiences emerge but also the causal power is emerged. For an example 'Anger' is a mental state but the effect of the physical world is also on this. From loud emphatic protests to acts of violence. But it is the fact that neither only conscious experiences nor only causal power emerges.

Here I want to mention one thing that Philosopher who are the followers of Physicalism theory they need not to agree the emergence of the mental experiences. According to them 'Anger' is only the result of the brain state and mental events are the subsequent of physical events.

- "What Emerges?"- third types of answer to this question is that, not only mental properties or conscious experiences and not only the causal power emerges but a new individual a subject emerge, which have those conscious experiences and that subject also practices the causal power. This individual is not formed with the elementary components of the physics it is an emergent immaterial entity, an "Emergent Self", which is an undividable whole and go through the various conscious experiences. It gains the knowledge of itself, the world where it exists and accomplish verities of activity, which serves its ends and desires, and its unbreakable existence has maintained by the body or brain. Emergentist also said that this "Emergent Self" can be in space. The location of this "Emergent Self" is the location of that nervous system and brain by which it was created.

To conclude this paper with reference to a recent theoretical research and experimental evidence as argument form for dualism theory where the existence of mind agreed either as an entity or as mental events or conscious experiences, which are beyond material or material properties. From here also we can understand the composition of human life (here the term composition is used in a literal sense) with help of the following Arguments. Earlier it is discussed that Substance dualism is agreed that there are two independent entities. One is matter and another is mind. Human being is the combination of material body and immaterial mind. We also see that our mental events are the cause of our bodily events, and our bodily events effect our mental events. Now the question is how anything in the body cause anything in the mind? And how anything in the mind cause anything in the body? Because they are totally different. One is completely material, and another is completely immaterial. What is the relation between mind and body? This is the most famous problem and it's usually called mind-body problem. Substance dualist Descartes said that there is a causal relation between mind and body. But how is this utterly insubstantial 'thinking substance' to have any influence on ponderous matter? How can two such different things be in any short of causal contact? - These questions raised against Dualism.

A defense is that entirely nonspatial mental events could not possibly cause physical motion in the way that billiard balls cause physical motion. William G. Lycan said that when a mental event is the cause of a physical event that time the nature of that cause is not like the way as billiard balls do. So he said that then why we try to find out a causal explanation like physical science have? It is true that the lack of a good model is a trenchant objection and not just a prejudice. We have no good theory of causality itself which have been called theories 'of causality'. Though there is yet no model for Cartesian interaction, microphysics gets more and more bizarre, and indeed itself resorts (on some interpretations of quantum mechanics) to quasi-mental vocabulary. But from here we cannot possibly be sure that no model for Cartesian interaction will emerge.

The big problem for interaction is the utter non-spatiality of Cartesian egos. William G. Lycan suggested that dualist should give up non-spatiality. Descartes had his own 17th-century metaphysical reasons for believing the nature, like non-spatiality, of mind but now we need not to accept that minds are entirely non-spatial. Lycan gave us a way of thinking that it can be possible to assume that minds are located where it feels as if they are located, may be in the head behind the eyes also. If it will be protested that our heads are already entirely full of physical stuff and that two things cannot occupy the same region

of space at the same time, then it will also be said that Immaterial minds are not physical. And it is only true for the case about the two physical entities, two physical things cannot occupy the same region of space at the same time. But for that matter Lycan also proposed in his thesis that, our heads are not entirely full of physical stuff. Physically, they are mostly empty space, with minuscule particles zipping through them at very high speeds.

Dr. Wilder Penfield was known for his ground-breaking work with epilepsy. His work involved stimulating brain tissue in conscious patients to find the causes of epilepsy. During these sessions Penfield found that the prodding of certain areas of the brain triggered vivid memories of past events. The patients reported clearly remembering such things as the taste of coffee. One patient, while on an operating table in Montreal, Canada, remembered laughing with cousins on a farm in South Africa. Penfield was amazed that his patients were not under anesthesia and simultaneously able to be re-experienced memories and of being prodded by an electrode in an operating room. Penfield called this a “double consciousness” wherein a memory was stimulated physically but was attended to and recognized as a memory by a conscious patient. Penfield likened this to the patient watching a television program while remaining aware that it wasn’t now happening. Penfield repeated these results on hundreds of epileptic patients and concluded that a separable mind was able to track what the brain was doing because of the artificial stimulation. Penfield noted that “The mind of the patient was as independent of the reflex action as was the mind of the surgeon who listened and strove to understand. Thus, my argument favors independence of mind-action.” Penfield also stated that if we liken the brain to a computer, it is not that we are a computer, but that we have a computer. Penfield, who began his research as a materialist, switched to dualism after extensive research with epileptic patients. He said, “Something else finds its dwelling place between the sensory complex and the motor mechanism. . . . There is a switchboard operator as well as a switch board.”

REFERENCES

- 1) Armstrong, D.M 1968. *A Materialist Theory of Mind*, New York: Humanities Press.
- 2) Armstrong, D.M 1999. *The Mind-Body Problem- An Opinionated Introduction*, West View Press.
- 3) Bayne, Tim 2010. *The Unity of Consciousness*, Oxford University Press.
- 4) Churchland, Paul 1984. *Matter and consciousness*, Cambridge: MIT press.
- 5) Cockburn, David 2001. *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Mind*, palgrave Macmillan.
- 6) Damasio, Antonio R 1999. How the Brain Creates the Mind, Vol. 281, No.6, Scientific American.
- 7) Descartes, R. (1641 / 1996): ‘Meditation VI’, in *Meditations on the First Philosophy*, J. Cottingham (trans.), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 8) Eccles, J. (1980): *The Human Psyche*, Springer, New York.
- 9) Groothuis, Douglas 11.7.2011. *Some argument for substance dualism, and one objection*, WINTERY KNIGHT.
- 10) Hasker, William 2004. “Emergent Dualism: A Challenge to a Materialist Consensus”- In *What About the Soul? Neuroscience and Christian Anthropology*, edited by Joel B. Green 101-115. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press.
- 11) Hasker, William 2012a. “Is Materialism Equivalent to Dualism?” In *After Physicalism*, edited by, Benedikt Paul Gocke, 180-199. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- 12) Hill, Christopher S 1991. *Sensation- A Defense of Type Materialism*, Cambridge University Press.
- 13) Heil, Jhon 1998. *Philosophy of Mind- A Contemporary Introduction to the Philosophy*, Routledge.

- 14) Jaworski, William 2011. *Philosophy of Mind- A Comprehensive Introduction*, Uk: Wiley Blackwell Publisher.
- 15) Lowe, E.J. 2000. *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Mind*: Cambridge University Press.
- 16) Lund, David 2013. "Materialism Dualism, and the Conscious Self: Routledge.
- 17) Lycan, William G 11.9.2009. "Giving dualism its due", *Australasian journal of philosophy*, volume 87, issue 4, 2009.
- 18) Plato, *Phaedo* in J. Cooper (ed.) *Plato: Complete Works*, pp. 49–100, Indianapolis: Hackett
- 19) Rodriguez-Pereyra, Gonzalo 2008. *Descartes's substance dualism and his independence conception of substance*, *Journal of history of philosophy*, volume 46, number 1.
- 20) Searle, John R 2004. *Mind-A brief introduction*, Oxford UK: Oxford university press.
- 21) Stich, Stephen and Warfield, Ted, A. P (ed.) 2003. *The Blackwell Guide to the Philosophy of Mind*. Blackwell Publisher.
- 22) Uttal, R. 2004. *Dualism –The Original Sin of Cognitivism*, Routledge.
- 23) *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.
- 24) <https://www.britannica.com>