

Chapter 1 of *Time and Free Will*: "The Intensity of Psychic States"

John Protevi / LSU French Studies / Permission granted to reprint for academic use
protevi@lsu.edu / www.protevi.com/john/Bergson/TFW1.pdf

- I) First step: analyze a badly formed problem: quantity of intensity of psychic states?
 - A) Quantitative comparison implies a container / contained relation
 - 1) This works for numbers
 - 2) It can't work for psychological states ("intensities")
 - B) The notion of "intensive magnitude" is no help
 - 1) Assumes something in common btw intensive and extensive magnitudes
 - 2) But intensities are unextended (so we have difference in kind)
 - (a) Since we need extension to compare quantity
 - (b) Then "intensive quantity" is contradiction
 - 3) Origin of the illusion:
 - (a) Image of coiled spring
 - (b) Thus we mistakenly think of psych states in spatial terms
 - C) Refutation of two possible responses
 - 1) Distinguishing intensities by objective causes
 - 2) Distinguishing intensities by reduction to atomic movements
- II) Second step: establish difference in kind btw feelings vs efforts and sensations
- III) Third step: analyze states in terms of time [= changes in quality], not space
 - A) Inner states of cness (feelings)
 - 1) Desiring feelings
 - (a) Passion as paradigm case: change of quality of all psychic states
 - (i) Notice the affective language concerning reflective cness: philosophy requires effort directed against natural affective inclinations of thought
 - (i) Dynamic view is *repugnant* to the reflective cness
 - (ii) Reflective cness *delights in* [aime]
 1. clean distinctions expressed in words
 2. sharp outlines, as in things in space
 - (ii) the illusion is result of "hypostatization"
 - (i) putting into form of a single growing [extensively changing] state
 - (ii) change in quality of "confused heap of co-existing psychic states"
 - (b) Hope: idea of future more appealing than future itself
 - (c) Joy
 - (i) Description:
 - (i) Turning of states of cness toward future
 - (ii) Faster turnover of ideas and sensations = decreasing effort
 - (iii) Tingeing of states with an "indefinable quality" akin to heat / light
 - (ii) Formulation: series of qualitative alterations of whole of psychic state
 - (iii) Genesis of illusion:
 - (i) We know if joy pervades all our states or only some of them
 - (ii) We thus set up divisions via intervals separating two forms of joy

- (iii) Transition lets them appear as diff intensities of same feeling changing in magnitude
 - (d) Sorrow: orientation to past
 - 2) Aesthetic feelings: even better examples of seeming increase in magnitude
 - (a) Grace
 - (i) Analysis of progression:
 - (i) Perception of ease in outer movements leads to feeling of increasing ease of anticipated / linked movements
 - 1. Jerky, broken up movements
 - 2. Smooth curves
 - (ii) Pleasure in mastering flow of time: holding future in present
 - (iii) Rhythm and music accompaniment make us feel we control dancer
 - 1. There is a sort of communication set up
 - 2. Our hands move of their own accord
 - (iv) A kind of "physical sympathy" here; affinity w/ moral sympathy
 - 1. Cf. "entrainment"
 - 2. Cf. mirror neurons and simulation theory
 - (ii) Essence of grace: virtual / nascent sympathy
 - (iii) Conclusion: qualitative / interwoven progress [duration] interpreted as increase in quantity bcs of desire for simple thoughts and bad fit of language for expressing psych states [IOW, spatialized thought]
 - (b) Beauty
 - (i) Art as "weakened hypnosis"
 - (ii) Nature: expresses feelings rather than suggesting them
 - (c) Moral feelings
 - (i) Pity: progression from horror to fear to sympathy to humility
- B) Surface states of cness (with external causes)
 - 1) Muscular effort
 - (a) Preliminary remarks
 - (i) Key component in illusion of intensive magnitudes
 - (ii) Seems to psychically pre-exist its physical manifestations
 - (iii) Science seems to agree with common sense (except for Wm James)
 - (b) James offers us the key: feeling of effort is centripetal, not centrifugal
 - (c) Bergson: feeling of greater effort from extent of muscle involvement
 - (i) Examples: fist, lips, lifting
 - (ii) Conclusion:
 - (i) Illusion of quantity of effort from quantity of muscles involved and qualitative change in some
 - (ii) Thus, again a qualitative progress betrayed by reflective cness
 - 2) Intermediate states: btw superficial efforts and deep feelings
 - (a) Attention ("intellectual effort"): muscles of scalp / face
 - (b) Violent emotions ("psychic tension"): e.g. rage, fear, aversion, shame, etc.
 - (i) Reduced to organic disturbance coordinated by idea of action
 - (ii) Bergson conflates, it seems to me, basic emotions w/ social emotions
 - (i) Basic emotions = affect programs = primitive inheritances
 - (ii) Social emotions (e.g., shame) = much higher cognitive input

3) Sensations

(a) Affective sensations: pleasure and pain

(i) Analysis:

(i) We associate affect with past conditions

(ii) But B will show affect has a future orientation

1. Higher organisms interrupt reflexes

a. (MM = “zone of indetermination”)

b. “nascent freedom”

2. Affect as resistance to reflex via sketch of deferred reflex action

(iii) How does this simplify the analysis?

1. Past conditions are molecular / unconscious

2. But affect is cness of reflex action as invitation to choose btw

a. Prefigured reflex action

b. Or another, chosen, action

(iv) Conclusion: affect is thus cness of sketched involuntary reactions

(ii) Genesis of illusion:

(i) we confuse the “choir” of many body reactions

(ii) with growth of a single state (“pain” or “pleasure”)

(b) Representative sensations

(i) Mixed with affect

(ii) Purely representational

(i) General analysis: (= “acquired perception”)

1. First we associate quantity of cause w/ quality of effect

2. Then we transfer

a. Idea into sensation

b. That is, quantity of cause into quality of effect

(ii) Examples:

1. Sound:

a. Intensity: we interpret quality of sensation as quantity of effort to produce such a sound

i. high-intensity range, by effort of striking an object

ii. mid-range, effort we would need to produce

b. Pitch: picturing notes on scale is transposition of quality

i. you’re really just thinking of effort to produce that note

ii. verticality of scale bcs “high” notes resonate in head and effort is to breath air up and out of chest

2. Heat and cold: difference in kind

a. Differences in quality of heat attributed to

i. Distance from source of heat

ii. Or extent of body surface affected

b. Thus, again, we have put the cause into the effect

3. Pressure and weight

a. Weight sensation = centripetal synthesis of distributed efforts

b. Related to belief in homogeneous movement in hom. space

i. Belief via comparison of qualitatively different movements

ii. “materialization” of movement at extremity of moving arm

- c. Here again reflective cness overrides immediate cness
 - i. Impression of homogeneous motion / space imposed on
 - ii. Immediate cness of sensation of “heavy movement” which can be analyzed (method of intuition) into series of qualitatively different sensations (duration)

4. Light

- a. B’s prelim analysis: number of diff factors involved in gathering info about light source
 - i. E.g., We overlook changes in hue; we insist on fixed colors and attribute qualitative changes to quantitative changes in “intensive magnitude” of light
 - ii. IOW, “We thus substitute, once more, for the qualitative impression received by our [immediate] cness, the quantitative interpretation given by our understanding [reflective cness]”
- b. Analysis of experiments
- c. Conclusion: psycho-physics only renders precise common sense assumption of magnitude of sensations

IV) Recap of Ch 1 / Forecast of Ch 2

A) Recap of Ch 1: Intensity

- 1) Difference in kind of illusions in outer and inner sensations
 - (a) Outer = “acquired perception”
 - (b) Inner = “confused perception”
- 2) Intensity at intersection of two streams of idea of extensive magnitude
 - (a) from external causes,
 - (b) or from “inner multiplicity”

B) Forecast of Ch. 2: we will treat psych states not in isolation, but in the “concrete multiplicity, in so far as they unfold themselves in pure duration.”

- 1) Task:
 - (a) Just as we isolated intensities from causes
 - (b) We will isolate duration from the “space” in which it is thought to unfold
- 2) Stakes
 - (a) Mere “obscurities” via confusion of quality and quantity re separate states
 - (b) But we get “problems” by introducing space into duration
 - (i) Zeno’s paradoxes
 - (ii) Free will
 - (c) Instead of seeking to solve the [badly stated] problem “we shall show the mistake of those who ask it”