Substance Dualism and Substance Monism, Meaning and Essence

Descartes is a Substance Dualist. Spinoza is a Substance Monist.

Spinoza: His philosophy discusses the relations of the intellect to the world as one substance called God which contains things that have attributes and modes. An attribute is the essence of a substance. (Definition 4, Corollary 2, 46). Like Descartes, Spinoza thought that extension is the attribute of a thing. There are modes which are the affections of a substance. Modes are the different parts of objects which exist as sense data and in actions. The color yellow exists in a yellow cloth. Running exists in the runner. The intellect is the thinking substance that is distinct from other faculties in the mind such as the wit and imagination. The wit creates concepts about objects which we can sense. It abstracts ideas of the objects and is related to the imagination which represents things that are not immediately present to us in the world. God, according to Spinoza has to do with physical attributes whose essence involves existence. Extension is one of God’s infinite attributes and God is unlike other things in the world because God is not caused. God is the free cause of substance. Substance exists in the world independent from objects and is prior to all things. (Definition 3, Corollary 2, 46). The idea that the mind is a substance that is in all things is why Spinoza’s philosophy is different from Descartes. Descartes thought that the mind is located in the brain as a locus not found in matter. I think both would say that attributes exist because of extension.

Substance: The word “substance” shows us that we can imagine why we see reality in the ways that we do according to the presentation of physical objects. Humans view the world differently but something in the world stays the same, one big picture that is observable according to the order and arrangement of objects. Perhaps this is the Buddhist notion that there is an Ultimate Reality that can be experienced through the alteration of mental states.

Essence: Like our brains, objects are made of chemicals that are affected by Earth's atmosphere. Unlike our minds, objects are inanimate and lifeless and don’t evolve. We have evolved over thousands of years to live in nature. Thus, there is a question concerning our nature in relation with objects and other living things. We are different from other living things because we are thinking things whose perceptions conceive objects and explain them relatively to the mind. If we want to order principles so that they are true, we must show why our thoughts function in terms of other things in the world. This is why Spinoza’s ideas about substance are significant. His ideas show us that we are intimately connected with our surroundings.

Understanding Deduction and Induction

How we reason and make Inferences

Why Descartes is Wrong

An example of deduction is knowing why the mathematical proposition two and two is four is true. Deduction has to do with particular examples and understanding that their converses are false. For instance, 2 + 2 isn't 5. It is a contradiction to say 2 and 2 is 5 is true.

In induction, we make more general inferences. From the proposition, all men are mortal we infer Socrates was a man. It is the same as saying that because Socrates is a man we infer all men are mortal. But the cases are different and we can believe that the first proposition (all men are mortal) is true from the basis of evidence. That is to say, we have no evidence of a man living beyond the age of 145, thus we know that Socrates must have been a mortal man.

The human mind is the only thing in the universe that has the capacity to reason by induction. It seems possible there are other species of animals that can make deductions and we see this in their behaviors

such as when they go to the same hunting, nesting, and reproducing grounds. They know where to go

from instincts which are habits but they might not

have minds like us that know what they are doing.

Thus, it is possible that God created us and gave us the powers of the mind that Descartes wrote about in The Meditations to prove there were a priori mathematical truths that could be known through mental processes like affirming, denying, willing, believing, and also by reflecting.

Thinking is a byproduct of the interaction between our minds and nature. The mind reasons to explain why things are true and false. This is a fact of psychology.

Locke's idea that the mind is a Blank Slate that creates ideas of things from its perceptions is the basis for the philosophy of idealism.

Idealists believe that we understand reality based on our ideas about so-called qualities. A category is a human made

Both he and Descartes think that the problems of philosophy entertain the reader by showing us that there are other ideas which we should consider when asking ourselves how and why things are true.

For example, Descartes recognizes that there are eight actions of the mind that prove it is a cogitating thing. Locke says that the existence of primary qualities and secondary qualities can be understood according to both simple and complex ideas from experience and the principles we use in science.

Then Kant came along and explained there was a datum responsible for hosting the faculties in the mind. The datum seems to be like cogito. It was a way for Kant to distinguish the soul from the body. Kant also had proposed the idea that there were three faculties in us, the third being unique. These faculties are the Sensibility and Understanding and Reason. The Sensibility is the body. The Understanding is the mind. And Reason is the force uniting the former two. Is the mind located in a particular place at the center of the brain in the pineal gland, a locus like Descartes thought? Is it more spread out and also located in the peripheral brain?

In logic, Barbara is the most common form of syllogism. One way it is stated is S is M, M is P, Hence, S is P. This is called a syllogism because there is a major premise, minor premise, and conclusion. There is a connection between the letters S, M, and P which are signs that denote the truth of the conclusion from the premisses. In the proposition such as "All men are mortal." we can't infer a particular instance of a man being mortal such as Socrates but we can infer Socrates is mortal from the proposition that "We have no evidence of a man having lived past a certain age."

This is why we want to use induction to know truths about experience whereas we use the principle of deduction to know truths about mathematics and logic. Are we using inductive or deductive reasoning to infer the truth of the conclusion in Barbara? CS Peirce says that deduction is nothing but the application of a rule. The major premise lays down this rule; as, for example, all men are mortal. Enoch was a man. Enoch is mortal. The other or minor premise states a case under the rule; as, Enoch was a man.

Demonstrative/Deductive argument begins with Pythagoras. The conclusion applies the rule to the case and states the result: Enoch is mortal. All deduction is of this character; it is merely the application of general rules to particular cases. Sometimes this is not very evident, as in the following; All quadrangles are figures, But no triangle is a quadrangle; Therefore, some figures are not triangle. But here the reasoning is really this: Rule. -Every quadrangle is other than a triangle. Case. -Some figures are quadrangles. Result. -Some figures are not triangles. Inductive or synthetic reasoning, being something more than the mere application of a general rule to a particular case, can never be reduced to this form. (Chance and Logic, 132).

There is A thing called S that is M. For instance, in the case Shakespeare said Hamlet was Principle of Denmark. Here, Hamlet and Shakespeare are real names. Are they are the names of imagined individuals? Hamlet more so than Shakespeare because we have proof of Shakespeare writing poems but as in relation to Hamlet we see that Hamlet is a character that we imagine.

Dylan Smith thinks that deduction is taking general things and making them specific. An example of deduction is "All birds are must be red. You see a red bird a deduction is that it must be red. Induction is taking a specific example and making it a general. You see a red cardinal and from this observation you infer at least that some cardinals are red. Propositions are a sequence of words that create a web of coherent meaning.

Russell writes, "Heraclitus said everything changes. Parmenides thought that nothing changes. In 450 BC Socrates had an interview with Parmenides and an old man and learned much from them. Plato himself was introduced by the doctrines of Parmenides. The South Italian and Sicilian philosophers were mystics and religious. The Ionia philosophers were scientific and skeptical. Mathematics under the influence of Pythagoras flourished more in Magnagrecia than in Ionia. Mathematics of that time was entangled with mysticism. Parmenides was influenced by Pythagoras who was a mystic. He invented a system of logic that in one form or another was carried down by subsequent metaphysicians down to and including Hegel. He was often said to have invented logic but what he really invented was metaphysics based on logic. The Doctrine of Parmenides was set forth in a poem On Nature.

He considered the senses deceptive and condemned the multitude of things as mere illusion, the only true being is the one which is infinite and indivisible. It is not in Heraclitus a union of opposites since there are no opposites. He apparently thought that cold means not hot and dark means only not light the one is not conceived by Parmenides as we conceive God it seems to think of it as material and extended he speaks of it as a sphere but it cannot be divided because the whole of it is present everywhere. Parmenides divides his teaching into two parts called respectively the way of truth and the way of opinion. In the way of truth, he says 'thou canst not know what is not that is impossible nor utter it for it is the same thing that can be thought and can be how then can what is be in the future or how could it come into being? If it came into being it is nor is it if it is going to be in the future thus is becoming extinguished passing away not to be heard of.' The thing that can be thought and that for the sake for which the thought exists is the same for you cannot find thought without something that is as to which it is uttered. (Bertrand Russell, The History of Western Philosophy, Chapter 5, Parmenides).”