Mind, Body, and Nature: Arguing in Favor of Spinoza's Naturalistic Metaphysics

By Leah Moradi

The fundamental nature of reality and consciousness has been debated for centuries, with philosophers René Descartes and Baruch Spinoza offering two crucial yet opposing metaphysical systems. In his Meditations, Descartes establishes a rigid division between the mind and body, asserting them as distinct mental and physical substances. Contrarily, in Ethics, Spinoza presents a singular conception of existence where mind and physical matter are merely two expressions of one unified reality. This paper will argue that Spinoza's monism not only resolves the core problems of Cartesian dualism but also aligns with modern neuroscience's view of consciousness as an emergent natural phenomenon.

This paper will first explain Descartes' substance dualism and its empirical weaknesses, particularly the unresolved problem of mind-body interaction. Next, I will analyze Spinoza's monistic alternative through his framework of substance, attributes, and modes, showing how it avoids Descartes' difficulties. Then, I will demonstrate how Spinoza's naturalistic metaphysics is supported by contemporary neuroscientific findings, revealing its explanatory power for mind-body unity. After establishing this alignment, the paper will address two potential objections to Spinoza's system: its seeming dissolution of personal identity and its handling of finite modes. Finally, I will conclude by showing why Spinoza's system, despite these challenges, offers a more coherent account of reality than dualism.

Descartes' Substance Dualism

Descartes' metaphysics is rooted in his absolute distinction between two irreducible types of substance. He defines substance as "a thing which exists in such a way as to depend on no other thing for its existence," thereby branching reality into the distinct substances of mind and body (P51). In the Meditations, he asserts that his "essence consists solely in the fact that [he] is a thinking thing," his mind a non-spatial and indivisible entity known with certainty through introspection (MVI109). In contrast, he defines the body purely as "an extended, non-thinking thing"—a physical substance governed by geometry and mathematics (MVI109). This separation aims to preserve the mind's immateriality while acknowledging the corporeal nature physical science describes. For Descartes, corporeal substance is characterized by extension, the property of a substance that occupies space with length, width, and breadth (P53).

Despite this clear distinction, Descartes' Principles of Philosophy reveals the tension between the mind and body. While they exist separately by God's power, they are posited to causally interact—where thoughts can move parts of the body or sensations provoke thought. This relationship between mind and body substances creates a fundamental flaw in Descartes' system, requiring two substances to affect each other without violating their fixed attributes.

Key Objections to Descartes

Descartes' substance dualism faces two insurmountable objections that reveal its limitations as a metaphysical system. The interaction problem between thinking and corporeal substances immediately exposes the theory's incoherence. In his absolute distinction, Descartes manufactures the separateness of mind and body while ignoring their empirical inseparability in lived experience. Assuming they are two distinct and wholly isolated substances, there's no explanation for how an immaterial mind can initiate motion in extended matter or how bodily states can produce mental reactions. Descartes' Principles of Philosophy asserts there is no crossover between the unextended mind and the extended body, ruling out any possible connection that could explain their causal relationship.

The unity of consciousness problem, a similar but crucially different objection to Descartes' system, challenges how there can be a single, cohesive experience when the mind has so many varying mental states. Descartes informally addresses the unity of consciousness, referring to his immaterial self as "A thing that doubts, understands, affirms, denies, is willing, is unwilling, and also imagines and has sensory perceptions" (MII39). He follows this by asking, "Is it not one and the same 'I' who is now doubting everything?" (MII39). Though Descartes lists a variety of mental acts, he insists they all belong to a simple "I." However, he assumes this as a self-evident feature of the mind rather than addressing it as a potential problem that would require a solution. In Meditations VI, Descartes explicitly supposes the unity of mind, writing, "I am unable to distinguish any parts within myself; I understand myself to be something quite single and complete" (MVI119). While he acknowledges and affirms the unity of the mind, Descartes does not explain how this wholeness comes to be or why different mental states should belong to a single subject. Rather, he assumes unity as an essential aspect of the immaterial human, circumventing the need to account for the unity of consciousness.

Spinoza's Monism

Faced with these objections to Cartesian dualism, Spinoza constructs a fundamentally different framework of metaphysical philosophy in Ethics, one which dissolves Descartes' challenges at their core. While dualism begins with two separate and independent substances, Spinoza defines substance as "that which is in itself, and it conceives of itself"—a singular and infinite reality that he identifies interchangeably as God or Nature (1d3). This singular reality manifests through infinite attributes, with thought and extension representing merely two of its immeasurable expressions (1d6). This directly avoids the objections raised against Descartes' system, including the unity of consciousness, by repositioning mind and body as different aspects of a single reality.

Spinoza accounts for the unity of consciousness by grounding it in the causal and conceptual coherence of modes under the attribute of thought: each mind is a finite expression of God's infinite intellect, unified by its deterministic connection to the whole. Therefore, where Descartes merely assumes the mind's indivisibility, Spinoza derives it from the necessity of substance. This maintains rational consistency while considering the empirical observations that challenged Descartes' philosophy—that mental states are interconnected with physical states, not

through a causal relationship, but because they are born from the same substantial ground. In his monistic system, Spinoza achieves a metaphysical theory in which the concept of substance dualism is maintained while its shortcomings are systemically overcome.

Objections to Spinoza

Though Spinoza's metaphysical system resolves the objections to Descartes' separation of mind and body, a challenge emerges from his reconception of individuality. Central to this problem are his concepts of mode, a finite manifestation of substance's attributes, and modal essences, the patterns through which modes express infinite aspects of God (1d5, 1p29). According to Spinoza, all finite beings are merely modes of a single substance, God; however, this makes it difficult to explain the persistence of distinct identities in experience (1p25). When we make statements about "my mind" or "your body," we presuppose the boundaries Spinoza disregards as an illusion or resolutely redefines through his theory of modal essence in Proposition 29. If every mode's existence follows from divine nature, then our perception of an individual's autonomy becomes a mere illusion of eternal causation. For example, a human body would be no more distinct from its surroundings than a triangle from the geometric principles that define it. While Spinoza's system is logically consistent, it weakens basic notions of personal identity, dissolving the distinguishable boundaries between individuals.

Another challenge to Spinoza's system, proposed by scholar Don Garrett, emerges from his argument that God's existence arises necessarily from the definition of substance provided by Proposition 11. This raises the question of why this same logic would not prove the existence of finite modes, which require causal explanations (1p28). Considering that all modes should express God's essence if God's existence is inferential from the notion of substance, shouldn't the existence of particular modes be equally demonstrable? Garrett's critique suggests a possible asymmetry between Spinoza's conception of infinite and finite existence.

Naturalism as the Decisive Philosophical Advantage

While the objections to Spinoza's system should be taken into consideration, their weight is lessened when measured against the fundamental advantage of his naturalistic framework. Spinoza's assertion, "whatever is, is in God," grounds his naturalist approach. In stark contrast, Descartes' substance dualism struggles to reconcile the interaction between the mind and body, while Spinoza demonstrates that mental and physical phenomena are equal expressions of nature's order (1p15). Spinoza's single substance system upholds the fundamental principles of naturalistic metaphysics, meaning the notion that all phenomena—including mental states—are causally dependent on and grounded in nature's unified structure, dictated by a framework of laws. The characteristic of monistic metaphysics demonstrates an adherence to naturalistic principles, anticipating modern science's reliance on the primacy of physical laws. With the advancement of science throughout the past centuries, in which mental activities are increasingly understood as biological processes, Spinoza's observance of natural principles as a singularity is a foresight of modernity.

The objections to Spinoza's metaphysical system are not so much flaws as they are necessary trade-offs for coherent naturalism. Just as the modern understanding of physics challenges our everyday notions of solid, independent objects by uncovering a world of interconnected fields and forces, Spinoza's metaphysics challenges our intuitive sense of strict boundaries between our minds and bodies. Though his monistic vision contradicts what many view as common sense, this philosophical risk makes Spinoza's system more compelling than Descartes' seemingly conventional but inconsistent dualism.

Della Rocca on Spinoza's Naturalism

As interpreted by Michael Della Rocca, a core aspect of the compelling nature of Spinoza's system is grounded in its complex reworking of traditional ontological philosophies. Della Rocca reveals how Spinoza's rethinking of modes as temporary states of a single substance fundamentally advances a naturalistic perception of the world (Spinoza, 59). The Principle of Sufficient Reason (PSR) functions as Spinoza's methodological core, demanding that all phenomena, including consciousness, have complete explanations through natural laws, directly challenging Descartes' appeal to mental exceptionalism. Della Rocca shows how Spinoza's attribute parallelism follows necessarily from the PSR (Spinoza, 63-65). Mental states cannot claim special status because they must be as fully determined and explicable as physical states. This systematic approach leaves no room for Cartesian dualism's interaction problem; what we call consciousness is simply how a substance's thought-aspect manifests, just as extension manifests physically.

The most compelling evidence comes from Della Rocca's argument that Spinoza's naturalism treats subjectivity as thoroughly law-governed as physics (Spinoza, 75). When Descartes posits an unextended mind, Spinoza's system rejects this as violating the PSR by creating brute facts (Spinoza, 71). Instead, all mental phenomena must follow from the substance's nature with geometric necessity.

Della Rocca acknowledges this view's counterintuitive consequences, in which individual conscious experience becomes as determined as planetary motion (Spinoza, 78). However, this consistency gives Spinoza's system its explanatory power, anticipating modern neuroscience's demonstration that mental phenomena emerge from physical processes.

Modern Neuroscience and Spinoza's Naturalist System

Spinoza's assent to naturalism in his philosophy provides a unified foundation for explaining reality, one that requires no inexplicable interactions or exceptions to natural laws. He offers a framework where mental and physical are two ways of understanding the same fundamental reality. This observation grows more plausible as scientific discoveries continue to demonstrate the physical basis of cognitive phenomena. Modern neuroscience has empirically validated Spinoza's rejection of Cartesian dualism, revealing how our minds work and how our brains start preparing decisions before we are even aware of making them ("Decoding and predicting intentions," 9-18). Spinoza's claim that "in Nature there is nothing contingent" is

upheld in studies where brain activity predicts decisions before conscious awareness (1p29). Recent studies show that when people think they are acting spontaneously, scientists are actually able to predict that choice from brain activity seconds earlier. This aligns with the predictions made by Spinoza's naturalist system, which treats mental and physical happenings as two facets of the same natural process, as opposed to two separate substances inexplicably interacting. Where Descartes' dualism struggles to explain how a non-physical mind could influence the brain, Spinoza's vision perfectly aligns with today's neuroscientific discoveries. As scientific discoveries continue to progress, the evidence that mental phenomena emanate from physical systems increases, just as Spinoza philosophized centuries ago. While Descartes' dualism requires non-scientific exceptions, Spinoza's naturalistic approach becomes more compelling as science develops.

Spinoza's naturalist framework can be seen in contemporary research and studies regarding the biological origins of emotion and decision-making. Studies in neuroscience have revealed that what we experience as a consciously made choice, moral reasoning, or even subjective feelings are rooted in the physical processes of the brain and body ("Unconscious determinants of free decision in the human brain," 543-45). Rather than being the product of an immaterial mind, these mental phenomena come from complex neural networks, chemical interactions, and sensory feedback—all of which function within the unfailing laws of physics. This emphasis on deterministic science coincides with Spinoza's monism, in which the mental and physical are not separate, demarcated realms but different expressions of the same substance. Where dualism is challenged by the question of how an intangible mind could influence matter, modern science uncovers the integration of thought, emotion, and physiology. As humans continue to uncover the brain's role in shaping perception, intention, and identity, Spinoza's naturalist system increasingly becomes philosophically coherent and empirically validated. While substance dualism requires a mysterious jump to fill the gap left between mind and body, Spinoza's monism finds confirmation in modern scientific discovery.

Objections to Spinoza's Monism

Although Spinoza's monism comports with scientific perspectives, his system faces the challenge of explaining conscious experience—the raw and subjective quality of sensations, emotions, and thoughts. Science can follow how neural activity mechanically produces behavior, but it faces difficulty when accounting for why certain brain processes actually feel like anything. While the parallelism of attributes evades Descartes' problem of interaction, it leaves unresolved the issue of how and why subjective experience arises from what is presented as merely different ways of comprehending the same substance. This gap becomes especially glaring when considering phenomenal consciousness—the raw feeling of experiencing something. Spinoza's metaphysics fails to fully bridge the conceptual difference between the mechanistic neural processes under the attribute of extension and their subjective manifestation under the attribute of thought. The system's neutral monism, while strong in its equal treatment of body and mind, becomes a limitation when confronting difficult problems of consciousness.

However, while it is true that Spinoza's system does not fully explain the emergence of subjective experience, this criticism assumes that such an explanation must bridge a causal gap between two fundamentally different kinds of substance. For Spinoza, there is no such gap to bridge, for mind and body are not separate entities interacting, but two parallel expressions of the same underlying reality. The subjective quality of experience, the raw feeling, is simply the finite mode of substance under the attribute of thought, just as neural processes are modes under extension. Rather than a failure, Spinoza's refusal to prioritize one attribute over another avoids the dualist pitfalls that make consciousness seem so mysterious in the first place.

Another possible objection to Spinoza's system is that his strict naturalism risks dulling meaningful human experience into mechanical necessity. By making all thoughts, emotions, and actions follow the same inevitability as physical motion, Spinoza's system challenges the coherence of concepts like freedom, responsibility, and individuality. If human behavior is as determined as the movement of planets, it becomes difficult to preserve a normative distinction between ethical and unethical actions. While neuroscience supports the physical basis of mental phenomena, it does not automatically dissolve the need for frameworks that account for human dignity and moral agency. While powerful, Spinoza's commitment to explanatory completeness may come at the cost of erasing the distinctiveness of subjective life.

However, Spinoza would argue that this objection misunderstands the nature of freedom and individuality within his system. Freedom is not the absence of causality but the recognition of it—the ability to act according to the necessity of one's own nature rather than being driven by external forces. Far from erasing dignity or ethical life, Spinoza grounds them more deeply by connecting human flourishing to understanding and participating in the rational order of nature. Genuine autonomy, for Spinoza, lies not in escaping natural laws but in aligning thought and action with their necessary causes.

Conclusion

The enduring conflict between dualist and monist visions of existence finds a compelling resolution in Spinoza's system, which emphasizes a unified reality. Where Descartes' insistence on the division of mind and matter introduces paradoxes that defy explanation, Spinoza's framework diffuses these tensions, presenting thought and extension as insoluble facets of a singular and all-encompassing substance. While critics may question the implications of monism on personal identity or the necessity of finite modes, these concerns are overshadowed by the system's broader virtues of naturalism, its rejection of arbitrary divisions, and its compatibility with modern scientific findings. As neuroscience and physics continue to reveal the profound interdependence of mental and physical processes, Spinoza's metaphysics transforms from a mere supposition of early modern philosophy into a relevant outline for understanding a universe ruled by causal order. Spinoza's vision of unity not only resolves the metaphysical crises of dualism but also offers a philosophical foundation compatible with a scientifically ordered, natural universe, making his monism not just relevant but necessary for modern thought.

Works Cited

Della Rocca, Michael. Spinoza. Routledge, 2008.

Descartes, René. René Descartes: Meditations on First Philosophy: With Selections from the Objections and Replies. Edited by John Cottingham, translated by John Cottingham, Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Haynes, John-Dylan. "Decoding and Predicting Intentions." Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, vol. 1224, no. 1, 2011, pp. 9-18.

Soon, Chun Siong, et al. "Unconscious Determinants of Free Decisions in the Human Brain." Nature Neuroscience, vol. 11, 2008, pp. 543-45.

Spinoza, Benedictus de. Spinoza: Ethics: Proved in Geometrical Order. Edited by Matthew J. Kisner, translated by Matthew J. Kisner and Michael Silverthorne, Cambridge University Press, 2018.