

MIND AND MATTER RELATIONS: A CRITICAL EVALUATION OF THE ANALYTIC PERSPECTIVE

BY

ALIKE, MIRIAN NGOZI

&

MBAH, ANIKPE ANTHONY

Keywords: Mind, Matter, Relations, Analytic, Perspective.

I

INTRODUCTION

The mind-matter problem has been a major concern of metaphysics. Most attempts made by philosophers to settle the problem, rather culminated into further difficulties. Thus, each scholar was left with his own opinion and suggestions about mind and matter.

Basically, the problem involves answering the question, "what is the fundamental nature of mind and matter" and "how mind and matter are related". However, an elementary consideration of what we know about mental and physical events might well lead us to suspect that the most general characteristics of each, are different from each other, and yet that they seem to bear some relations to each other or have some influences upon each other.

To discuss on all views that have been presented on this topic may not be possible let alone realistic. On this note, we will limit ourselves to the works of some analytic philosophers like John Searle, Carl Hempel, Gilbert Ryle and Ludwig Wittgenstein. The focus of this work is to examine the views of by some major analytic philosophers. At the end of this work, it will be an epitome of an analytic perspective of mind and matter relations.

Moreover, our scientific knowledge would suggest that the physical world is inanimate, purposeless, yet determined or fixed in the order of events within it. The mental world, on the other hand; involves planning, willing; desiring etc. Though these words may be difficult in many respects, our experience appears to indicate that they are interrelated or interconnected; Let us look at what we mean by mind and matter.

II

THE CONCEPTS OF MIND AND MATTER

THE MIND AS A CONCEPT

The Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary defines the mind as a part of a person that makes him able to be aware of things, to think and feel.¹ The mind here becomes the faculty, more precisely the cognitive faculty, the power to think and to know. The mind is power to think has a mind. Therefore, the best evidence of the presence or existence of a mind is

the evidence of thinking. The mind is immaterial, though the materialists identify the mind with the brain. When a human being is dissected, what we see is only the brain and not the mind, because the mind is immaterial.

In this part, it will be interesting to explain in details what surrounds the concept of the mind. When we talk about the concept of the mind, what should actually come to mind is its nature and most likely its functions. So in this part of the work we will explain more on the nature and functions of the mind.

NATURE OF THE MIND:

It has been observed that most of the explanations on the nature of the mind have not been able to satisfy those seeking answers to the problem. Thus the efforts at getting right at the real nature of the mind have proved abortive.

A basic question about the nature of the mind is whether the mind is a material substance or a spiritual substance. If one upholds the view that man is made up of body and soul, definitely the mind should be located within the realm of the soul. Obviously, the mind cannot be found in bodies that have no soul. This is because the soul is present in all that have life. But does it mean that the mind is common to all that have soul? It should however be noted that the nature of the mind has been explained differently by different scholars and philosophers.

The idealists like Plato, Descartes, Hegel and others, stressed that the mind is spiritual in nature. They generally deny the existence of matter as an autonomous entity or substance, existing on its own, independently of any mind or entity. In the *Phaedo*, Plato, was of the view that the mind (soul) consist of the intellect (reason) and the emotions and the will, and it is also incorporeal. He opines further that the soul is immortal.²

The materialists like Democritus, Epicurus, John Locke and David Hume, will rather stress on the primacy of matter in their view of reality. Some even go as far as denying the existence of any immaterial spiritual element and maintain that only matters exist. According to Democritus, "whatever exists is composed of atoms and whatever happens is atoms in motion".³ He held further that anything is material because everything is composed of atoms. Others like U.T. Place; a contemporary British Philosopher sees the mind processes as identical with the brain processes, while others see the mind activities as the brain's product.

However, the neutral monistic theory of Bertrand Russell sees the mind as merely series of events. "Mind and Mental, are merely approximate concepts, giving a convenient shorthand for certain appropriate laws"⁴.

The logical behaviourist theory conceives the mind in terms of behaviour. A mental state is a behavioral state; According to them, the mental states can only be verified through behaviour. The integrated approach held the view that though the mind needs the brain to function, it does not mean that both the mind and brain are identical. They are only closely related or connected such that any harm on the brain affects the mind. Spinoza and Descartes agreed that the mind is a thinking thing. Spinoza sees the mind as a part of the infinite intellect of God.⁵ which is similar to Hegel's view, which sees the human mind as a phase or dialectical movement of the absolute mind or spirit.⁶

In the words of Bergson "there is no state of mind, however simple, which does not every moment"⁷. Hence the mind is an Omnibus concept.

Thus in the presence of many divergent views and opinions on the nature of the mind, and the absence of a, single agreed explanation of the mind's nature, it seems satisfactory to seek the mind's nature through its functions.

FUNCTIONS OF THE MIND

1. Memory

This is the ability to retain information, either from outside or from inside. Beyond this ability to retain information, the mind equally has the corollary ability to recall or retrieve the information whenever they are needed. This function is so great in importance such that where it is wanting or lacking, all the rest 'of our faculties are in great measure useless. For example thoughts, reasoning and knowledge would not be able to proceed beyond the present objects of our perception. It should be noted that memory is associated with the past, present or even future actions.

According to the empiricist epistemology of Aristotle, Aquinas, Locke and Hume, when we perceive anything, an image of that thing is stored in our minds. The image is later stored up in the memory, from where it could be recalled when needed. Sometimes, when they are recalled or presented they no longer maintain the vividness or sharpness as at when they were being fenced. Thus without memory, we would not be able to identify our individual selves as the same persons.

2. Volition (Will)

This is the ability of the mind to make decisions and choices, and as well execute actions. The will is guided by the intellect's illumination and as long as the will follows the illumination and guidance of the intellect, the will shall always choose rightly. But unfortunately the will does not always obey the intellect's direction. Often the will is blinded by passions, which make it to go contrary to the directives of the intellect. Consequently the mind becomes disturbed and knows no peace because of guilty conscience.

3. Imagination

This is the mind's ability to form or construct an image as to present it in a picture like form what the mind is thinking about. Man is capable of forming images of both what exist in reality and what does not exist. According to Jean Paul Sartre, man's power of imagination is linked with the power of freedom. Freedom is able to negate any given situation and envisage different situation.⁸ To this end he answered the question; how is the mind able to imagine what does not exist? In other words, imagination is man's (minds) capacity to withdraw from being into non-being. Hence, man's power of imagination implies the limitless height of his freedom.

4. Consciousness

Chambers 21st century Dictionary defines consciousness as the state of being conscious, awareness. The physical and the mental state of being awake and fully aware of man's

environments, thoughts and feelings.⁹ According to John Mill, "consciousness is a condition of our feelings and mental operation; more correctly it is the operations themselves, the consciousness is not the condition of the feeling, but the feeling itself,"

5. Perception

John Locke is of the opinion that perception is the first and simplest idea we have from the mind and it is what some called thinking in general. Perception is the ability of the mind to see, hear, smell, feel, taste and understand things. Though the senses perceive, the actual perception lies with the mind, Thus whatever maybe the alterations made in the body, if they don't, reach the mind, there is no perception and hence no knowledge.

6. Thinking/Thought

The mind according to Descartes is a thinking thing. The mind is always in the activity of thinking whether we are conscious of it or not. It has the actual perception of ideas in itself constantly as long as it exists; actual thinking is as inseparable from the mind as actual extension is from the body. The mind do think of things other than itself, and when the mind thinks about itself, it is called reflexivity of the mind. .

7. Simple Apprehension:

This is the act of the mind through which it perceives or grasps an object intellectually and without affirming or denying anything about it. It is the basic interrelationship between the intellect and an object. By it the mind or intellect grasps what the thing is, its essence, whatness or quality. In apprehending this essential quality of the thing the mind forms within itself the formal concept or idea, of the thing.

8. Judgment

Here, the mind makes either an affirmative or a negative response to the ideas, when the mind takes a stand in doing this, it is composing or dividing, combining or separating, associating or disassociating ideas or concepts in order to achieve a new result.

By judgment, the mind affirms or denies something about any given thing. For example one may say "this house is not beautiful", this means that the person has denied the house the quality of beauty. The mind can as well make more complex judgments, such as in analytic and synthetic judgments.

THE CONCEPT OF MATTER

Matter is that which occupies space, possessing size -md shape, mass, movability and solidity (which may be the same as impenetrability) its nature was historically one of the great subjects of philosophy.¹⁰

Matter, unlike mind is purely physical whereas the mind is spiritual in nature. Whatsoever is physical can be regarded as matter especially when it has to do with the human nature. Thus the body of human being and all that can be seen of the human being is called matter. Matter is recognized as a physical entity. The world of matter is the material world. Plotinus sees matter at the lowest level in the hierarchy of being. He compared matter to the dimmest, the

most extreme limit of light, which is darkness itself. He said further that matter is the opposite of the spirit.¹¹ There are different views about the nature of matter but in a more general sense, matter is a physical entity.

THE NATURE OF MATTER

Aristotle argued that "matter is what things are made of, and exist in some primary and unformed state until it is made into a thing." He went further by saying that we shall not find anywhere such a thing as 'primary matter' that is matter without form. Form and matter as he said, never exist separately.¹² Plotinus argued that matter is the principle of evil in the sense that matter is at the fringe of emanation, where the absence of rationality results in formlessness and the least degree of perfection. For Bergson, the emergence of intellect and matter occurred together, and were intended to work together. This means that the intellect is intended to secure the perfect fitting of our body to its environment, to represent the relation of external things among themselves. But according to him, matter does not represent ultimate reality. Lucretius is of the view that nothing can act or suffer without matter. He also said that the first beginnings were matter and this matter is immortal and everlasting, that if matter had been everlasting, all things would have wholly passed away to nothing, all that we see had been born again for nothing.¹³

Anaxagoras made major development when he interpreted the processes by which matter takes on the form of particular things. He is of the opinion that the nature of reality is best understood as consisting of mind and matter.¹⁴ Matter exists as various kinds of material substances, all uncreated and imperishable. For him, the process by which matter is formed into things is through "separation". This separation is originally achieved through the power of the mind.

Descartes, was of the view that the essential property of matter is that which is extended. All of the forms that body or matter occur in, involve only various extensional features, never mental ones. The realm of thought and extension are completely different. He asked that, if this is accepted, how can mental events have anything to do with physical ones and vice versa? He claimed further that physical actions occur by impact of one extended object upon another. Since mental events are not extended, how can there be any impact or contact between that whose nature is it to occur in space, and that which does not occur in space? How can an idea move a hammer, or a hammer strike upon an idea?¹⁵

MATERIALISM

This theory claims that both mental and physical events could be accounted for in terms of purely physical concepts and laws. They also hold that all what we call mental events are really like physical events, only in various combinations of matter in motion. They argued further that the physical movements that occur in the brain are what we call thought, and these are produced by other events in the material world, either outside our bodies, or inside, and in turn, can produce further motions in ourselves or outside ourselves.

In another sense, they affirm that the idea of pain, of perception, of memory, and so on, is nothing but a set of physical occurrences in our nervous system and brain. When we say that we have a sensation of yellow, for example, this is explained as the result of certain light waves stimulating the optic nerve which in turn causes a certain pattern of motion in the brain.

III

ANALYTIC PERSPECTIVE

The term "analytic" means using logical methods in order to give- an opinion. "Perspective" on the other hand means one's view or opinion. Thus analytic perspective means opinions from scholars who employ the analytic method,

In philosophy, there are some group of philosophers; who are called analytic philosophers. They believe in the analysis of concepts for clarification and for better understanding. According to them,

Analysis consists in rewriting sentences of natural languages in such a way that these sentences will exhibit their logical form. When they are put into their logical form, their meaning will become clear, and philosophical perplexity will be eliminated.¹⁶

SOME ANALYTIC THEORIES OF MATTER AND MIND RELATIONS JOHN SEARLE ON BIOLOGICAL NATURALISM

John Searle argued that some philosophical problems can receive a scientific solution and one of these problems is that of consciousness. Consciousness as we have discussed earlier is a function of the mind. Thus the problem of consciousness and that of the mind are the same. According to him, the problem can be stated as follows: "How exactly is a conscious state caused by brain processes and how exactly is it realized in the brain?"

He went further to say that:

Consciousness 'consists of those subjective states of feeling or awareness that begin when we wake from a dreamless sleep and continue on throughout the day until we become unconscious again.

The features of consciousness are four namely;

1. Every conscious state is subjective in the sense that it only exists as experienced by a human or animal subject.
2. Every conscious state is qualitative.
3. Conscious state typically comes to us as part of unified conscious field. For example I don't just experience the feeling of the shirt around my neck, the sound of my voice, the sight of people around me, but I experienced all of those conscious states as part of one large conscious state, my whole conscious field at the moment
4. Consciousness is intentional in the sense that typical conscious state are about something or refer to something. If I see or think about an object, then my conscious experience is directed at or about the object; it has the object as its intentional object.

Most conscious states are intentional, and these forms of consciousness are most interesting, because they mediate our relation with the rest of the world through perception, memory, intention, belief, desire, emotions, and all the rest of our waking live.

HOW CONSCIOUSNESS FITS INTO THE WORLD

1. Consciousness is Real:

Consciousness is a real phenomenon in the real world. We cannot show that consciousness is an illusion like sun set, or rainbows because, where the very existence of consciousness is concerned, we cannot make the distinction between reality and illusion. If I consciously have the illusion that I am conscious, then I am already conscious. Traditional eliminative reductions rest on a distinction between reality and illusion, but where the existence of consciousness is concerned, the conscious illusion is itself the reality of consciousness. According to Searle "we cannot do a non- eliminative reduction of consciousness of some third ~ person phenomena, because if we do, we would leave out the essential first - person qualitative character of conscious experiences."

2. Consciousness caused by Brain Processes:

All conscious state, without exception, is caused by neurobiological process in the brain. If the brain processes are functioning right, the subject will be conscious. This means that everything in consciousness, from the taste of the beer, to the sound of the music, is caused by lower level neurobiological process in the brain. There is nothing to the causal power of consciousness, which cannot be explained, by causal power of the neuronal base.

3. Consciousness is realized in the Brain:

This means that all conscious states exist in the brain as higher level features of the neuronal system. The main point is that consciousness exists as a feature of the brain without being a feature of any individual neuron or synapses by itself.

4. Consciousness as a Causal Function:

Consciousness functions causally in producing bodily movement and other physical effect in the world. This means that when I decide to raise my arm, the arm goes up. Thus, my arm goes up when I want to go up, when I decide to raise it. To put it more technically, my conscious intention -in- action causes the bodily movement of my arm raising.

Searle held the view that the conjunction of the above four claims constitute an approach to the mind which he called "biological naturalism". His view is biological because it says the right level for a scientific account of consciousness is the biological level and it is naturalistic because it says that consciousness is an ordinary part of nature along with life, digestion, photosynthesis and all the rest of it.¹⁸

GILBERT RYLE ON MIND

Ryle's concept of the mind is an opposition to the notion that the mind is distinct from the body, and is also a rejection of the philosophical theory that mental states are distinct from physical states.

According to him, "the assumption that there is a basic distinction between mind and matter is a basic category - mistake. "This is because it attempts to analyze the relationship between mind and body as if they were terms of the same logical category. He said further that traditional idealism made a basic "category mistake", by trying to reduce physical reality to the same status as mental reality and that materialism made a basic category mistake by trying to reduce mental reality to the same status as physical reality.¹⁹

Ryle stipulated that mental processes are nothing but intelligent acts. There are no mental processes, which are distinct from intelligent acts. The operations of the mind are not merely represented by intelligent acts but are the same as intelligent acts.

Ryle, enunciated thus:

An act of remembering, dreaming, knowing or willing is not merely a clue to some hidden mental process or intelligent operation; it is how that mental process or intellectual operation is defined.²⁰

He rejected the doctrine that the will is a faculty within the mind and the doctrine that volitions are mental process, which the human body transforms into physical acts. Thus, the doctrine of separation between mind and body is referred to by Ryle as "the dogma of the Ghost in the Machine".²¹

He argues further that there is no ghostly, invisible entity called "the mind" inside a mechanical apparatus called "the body".

Thus, the workings of the mind are not an independent mechanism, which governs the workings of the body. The workings of the mind are not distinct from the actions of the body, but are conceptualized as a way of explaining the action of the body.

Ryle also argued that there is no contradiction between saying that physical laws govern an action and saying that the same action is governed by principles of reasoning. The motives of observable actions are not hidden mental process, but are propensities or dispositions, which explains why observable actions occur.

He went further to say that knowledge, memory, imagination, and other ability or disposition do not reside inside the mind, in the sense that the mind is a place where these dispositions are located. Dispositions, he said are neither visible nor hidden because they are not in the same logical category as behavioral actions. Dispositions are not mental process or intellectual acts, but are propensities, which explain various modes of behaviour. Thus Ryle admits that his approach to the mind is behaviouristic in that it is opposed to the notion that there are hidden mental processes, which are distinct from observable behavioural responses.

LUDWIG WITTGENSTEIN

Wittgenstein basically was out to discuss on the possibility of private language. That is, is it possible for a person to devise a language in which he would communicate to himself alone, his inner experience, his feelings and other mental activities? In his **Philosophical**

Investigation, Wittgenstein argues against the possibility of such a language. According to him.

Language is public and there is nothing as private experience or private sensation, or private mental state. Experience expresses itself externally without language. Psychological concepts, ideas, expressions etc couldn't be learnt only from one's own experience but from public language, which expresses experiences. There is no such thing as private languages expressing private mental states.²²

This idea of the argument on private language by Wittgenstein which can be related to the issue of mind is something invisible and private, whereas, matter is more public, following the argument of the denial of private language. Therefore, it can be inferred that issues that concern the mind which cannot be verified are not meaningful. If any real thing can be discussed, it should be issues that are physical and which concerns matter. On this note, the issue of mind and matter relation may not even arise since all that there is, is matter and not mind, that is public and not private.

CARL HAMPEL

He is a philosopher of science, whose logical positivist stand influence most of his theories. He adopted the scientific method, the method of verification as the only way of knowing whether a proposition is true or false. He further postulated that any proposition that cannot be verified empirically is meaningless. He ruled out metaphysics and theology as genuine disciplines and branded their propositions as nonsensical because they cannot be empirically verified.

Carl made it clear that "any claim about mental states which is not verified in behaviour is meaningless. He also maintained that behaviour must be able to prove true or false any proposition about mental state, otherwise such proposition is meaningless."²² In this case, behaviour is the test which must be used to show that a claim is true or false. Carl Hempel maintains that mental states cannot be used in separation from human behaviours. To do that would be to involve oneself in conceptual confusion. He opined that:

The mind and matter interaction problem is therefore a pseudo - problem arising from this confusion. Mental states are not separable from behavior. If they are they become meaningless.²⁴

A summary of Hempel's position on mind and matter relation is that, the separation of mind and matter is already a problem for the mind and matter are basically one. Thus any effort to separate the mind and matter becomes meaningless. Hence the issue of interaction or relation should not even arise since mind and matter are one in the human behaviour.

IV

MIND-MATTER RELATIONS

Mind and matter relation, is thus a study of the human mind and its relationship with the body. It is thus a study of the nature of the human person. It asks the following question is there a spiritual element in man? Is the human mind spiritual? What is the relationship between the mind and the brain? Is the mind another word for the brain or is it something different from the brain?

We know that if the brain is seriously damaged, the mind ceases to function properly. Does that mean that the mind is nothing other than the brain or that it depends on the brain? Is it tile product of the brain, or is it the function of the brain?

On the other hand we know that what takes place in the mind finds expression in the body, that what happens in the mind affects the body. Thoughts move the body into action. Again if a man is angry, his face turns red and his mental acts affect his physical body.

However, we will like to state (hat there are many approaches to the solution of the mind and matter problem. A single solution may be too bias, but for the sake of clarification and analysis we will expose the analytic view which is represented by the logical behaviourist approach.

LOGICAL BEHAVIOURIST APPROACH

This theory conceives the mind in terms of behaviour. A mental slate is a behavioural state. According to them, "the transmission from mind to behaviour is by means of language and mental state which can only be verified through behaviour." If for example a man claims to be in pain (a mental state), you look at his behaviour, the expression of his face e.t.c., and again you see him smiling, obviously you can't take his claim to be in pain seriously because his behaviours does not confirm it. Thus they hold that all language about mental states is in the final analysis behavioural language, which is only meaningful in terms of behaviours.

More of logical behaviourist's position on mind and matter can be seen in the postulations of Carl Hempel and Gilbert Ryle. Hampel was of the opinion that "mental states cannot be looked at in separation from human behaviour.' Thus the mind and body interaction problem is therefore a pseudo-problem arising from this confusion. Thus mental states are not separation from behaviours, if they are, they become meaningless.

Ryle on his part argued that: the view of mind and body is entirely false, and it is the root - cause of the pseudo - problem of mind - body interaction. Ryle sees this category mistake as due to the misuse of ordinary language. He said that the problem was created by the dualist especially Descartes. He asserted finally that there is no mind and body dualism, no mind as an entity, so both mind and matter are feasible in the behaviour.

THE DUALIST PROBLEM

Plato and St. Augustine represent the classical dualist concept of the mind - body relationship. According to the dualist position, two substances, that is "mind" and "matter" are different but they relate somehow to form the composite whole known as man. The

dualists have the problem of explaining how different substances related. If they interact, then by what mechanism does the mind strike a response in the body or conversely receive an impulse from the body since they are radically different?

Plato and Augustine did not give us a concise explanation on how mind and matter relate. Thomas Aquinas on his own part claimed that the mind can exist independently of the body. The problem is how two distinct substance of two different categories constitute a person, and interact with each other. The question is, do the mind and the body casually relate with each other, and interact with each other?

Descartes admitted that there is a casual relation between the mind and body. This made him to say that

What happens to the mind affects the body and what happens to the body affects the mind. He gave an unsatisfactory explanation of the relation between the mind and the body. The explanation is that the mind and body meet and interact with each other at the pineal gland, which is situated in the middle of the brain substance.²⁵

But the problem that still remains is, "is the pineal gland a spiritual or a physical substance? Obviously, it is a physical substance. The problem still remains.

Arnold Geulinx was of the view that the mind and matter are separate substances but there is no interaction between them. He opines that, "when for example, the mind wills something and the body moves to execute it, it is not the mind that moves the body nor is it my body that causes pain in the mind. It is God that moves my body when I decide in my mind to do something." This theory of Geulinx further goes to show the difficulties of explaining the mind -body interaction with a dualistic solution. Thus a dualistic solution has not been able to satisfy our demand.

THE IDEALIST APPROACH

This theory gives primacy to spirit or ideas over matter in the conception of reality. Idealists generally deny the existence of matter as an autonomous entity or substance existing on its own, independently of any mind or spirit. Basically subjective idealism denies the existence of matter and maintains that what we call material objects are in fact ideas in the mind who perceives. Objective idealism on the other hand also denies the independent existence of matter as a separate substance different from the spirit. It maintains that material object is merely self-projections or manifestation of a spiritual reality underlying it. The representative of subjective idealism is George Berkeley, while that of objective idealism is Hegel.

On this note, we cannot say that there is mind and matter interaction because both the body and mind are basically one and the same spirit.

THE INTEGRATIONIST APPROACH

This theory sees the mind - body interaction problem as a product of a wrong conception of man and the dualistic conception. The integrationist approach views the human spirit as part of a being, and not as an autonomous being or spirit, It is just a substance of the human parts.

For the human person is only one substance. According to them, the problem of mind – body interaction in the human person therefore does not arise. One can only talk of the interaction of two separate substances. But since the human spirit and body are not two substances, the question as to how they interact does not arise.

V

CONCLUDING REFLECTIONS:

In this work on mind and matter relation, we have seen explicitly and basically the actual nature of mind and matter, coupled with their functions. The main topic of discourse which is on "the relation between mind and matter" has been treated thoroughly, especially the different analytic views of John Searle, Ryle, Hampel and Wittgenstein. The relation problem has also been discussed based on different approaches like the dualist, idealist, integration list and logical behaviourist approaches.

However, it sounds funny that we do not have a universally accepted explanation of the mind and matter relationship. All the analytic views that we have examined, to an extent have faulted in their attempt to explain correctly the interaction. They are actually relying on their opinions, which is rather biased or one sided.

John Searle's biological naturalism which opines that the mind and matter relation can be explained in terms of our behavior is not wholly correct because at times, facial expression may not reflect the actual state of the mind because appearances are deceitful and not reality. Somebody may be in pains yet smiling, on this note how can somebody explain fully the relation between the mind and the body.

Gilbert Ryle's own explanation was totally against the dualistic theory, which keeps the mind and matter as separate substances and called this a category mistake. But of the truth, the mind and matter are two separate substances, any attempt to assume that they are one tantamounts to a fallacy of ambiguity.

Wittgenstein argued against the possibility of a private language and also the possibility of private mental experiences. The nature of the mind is more private than public, Being private should not be an embarrassment. Because communication is meant for the public and mental states do not adhere to the public principles, does not mean that private mental states do not exist.

Moreover the dualist position was correct but they only failed to give us a concise explanation on how the mind and matter related in the pineal gland which is a physical substance: The integrationist approach which sees both mental and physical state as part of the human person were still not capable of delivering us from the same difficulty. It is still possible that the mind and body which are parts of the human person could interact in away. Finally, all the views that have been argued or examined have made serious attempts to explain to us how the mind and matter relate but their contrasting views have not been satisfactory. More need to be discovered than what has been discovered,

So far it has been on the relationship between mind and matter which has been represented in diverse form like mind and body, mental and physical and so on. We have come to realize

that there are- some things that have not been known, which should still be an assignment for the philosophers. A single problem, which can only be tackled from different perspectives without any possible solution, is actually a problem indeed. If it is God that cause body to act when the mind decides, as Geulinex said, how are we to know this? But all the same, the mind and matter relation is a reality, which can only be explained from divergent angles, but a single general option is needed from philosophers as to solve this long aged problem.

REFERENCES

1. A.S. Hornby, *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*, Oxford; Oxford University Press, 1998, p. 739.
2. Plato, Phaedo in "*The Collected Dialogues of Plato*", E., Hamilton et al (eds), Princeton: Princeton University, Press 2003, 105a, p 82.
3. S. C; Stumpf, *Philosophy, History and Problems*, New York; McGraw-Hill Inc, 6th ed, 1994 p. 27.
4. P., Edwards et al, *20th Century Philosophy: the Analytic Tradition*; New York: Free Press, 1960 p. 16
5. D., Garrett (ed), *The Cambridge Companion to Spinoza*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996 p. 65.
6. G.W.F. Hegel, *The Phenomenology of Mind*, J.R Baillie (trans), New York: Harper and Row Publishers Inc, 1967, p. 464
7. B., Russell, *A History of Western Philosophy*, New York: Simon and Schuster, 1945 p 792
8. J.P., Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*, New York: Gramercy Books, 1994, p. 433
9. M., Robinson (ed) *Chambers 21st Century Dictionary*, Edinburgh: Chambers-Harrap Publishers Ltd, 2004 p. 291
10. S. Blackburn, *Oxford Dictionary of Philosophy*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996, p.234.
11. E., O'Brien, *The Essentials of Plotinus*, New York: New American Library, 1964, p 125.
12. Aristotle, Metaphysics in *The Basic Works of Aristotle*, R. McKeon (ed), New York: Random House, 1941, 9952b5, p. 716
13. F. E., Baird et al, *Ancient Philosophy*, New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc, 4th ed Vol 1, 2003, p. 483.
14. D., Cornposta, *History of Ancient Philosophy*, M.A., Cizdyn, (trans), India: Theological Publication, 1990, p. 78.
15. R., Watson, *Cogito Ergo Sum: The Life of Rene Descartes*, New Hampshire; David R. Godine Publishers, 2002 p. 9
16. R. Popkin et al, *Philosophy Made Simple*, London: William Heinemann Ltd, 2nd ed, 1993, p. 283.
17. J.R, Searle, *The Rediscovery of the Mind*, Cambridge: J.V lit Press, 1992, pp 23-24
18. J.R., Searle, *The Rediscovery of The Mind*, Cambridge: MIT Press 1992, p. 38.
19. E. D., Klemke, (ed) *Contemporary Analytic and Linguistic Philosophers*, New York: Prometheus Books, 1983 p. 353.
20. G., Ryle, *The Concept of Mind*, Chicago: The University Press, 1949 p. 56
21. Ibid, P 60.
22. L., Wittgenstein, *Philosophical Investigation*, G.E.M., Anscombe (trans), London: Basil Blackwell mott Ltd 1958, p 5.
23. R.R . Ammerman (ed), *Classics of Analytic Philosophy*, New York: M-C. Graw Hill Inc, 1965 p, 217.
24. Ibid
25. R., Descartes, *Meditations in Descartes Selected Philosophical Writings*, D, Murdoch et al (trans) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006, p. 113.