

## Phil. 4360

### Notes #27: For Determinism (Blanshard)

#### I. Definitions

- *Determinism*: Two definitions have been popular:
  1. Every event has a sufficient cause.
    - Events include persistences of states as well as changes.
    - Distinguish 3 kinds of “cause”: Necessary cause, sufficient cause, and influence.
  2. If  $P_0$  is a complete and correct description of the state of the universe at time  $t$ ,  $L$  is a complete statement of all the laws of nature, and  $P$  is a description of any (actual) event occurring after  $t$ , then  $(P_0 \ \& \ L)$  entails  $P$ .
- *The Free Will Thesis*: The view that someone, at least sometimes, has free will.
  - $S$  has free will: Some of  $S$ 's actions are free.
  - Free action: Two requirements:
    1. Self-control (subject controls own actions).
    2. Alternate possibilities ( $S$  could have done otherwise).
  - More about alternate possibilities:

For some  $p$ ,  $S$  has a choice about the fact that  $p$ .  
 $S$  has a choice about the fact that  $p$ :  $p$ , but  $S$  could have made it the case that  $\sim p$ .
  - FWT does *not* mean:

$S$  has a choice about everything.  
All of  $S$ 's actions are free.  
 $S$  can do whatever  $S$  wants. (These are all absurd.)
- *Compatibilism*: The view that free will is compatible with determinism.
- Three traditional positions:
  1. *Hard Determinism*: Determinism +  $\sim$ FWT.
  2. *Soft Determinism/compatibilism*: Determinism + FWT.
  3. *Libertarianism*: FWT +  $\sim$ Determinism.

#### II. Arguments against Determinism (Blanshard)

- A. The stubborn feeling of freedom: No matter how much we learn, we always still feel free in all of our actions.
  - This is just because when you are making a choice, your attention is normally focused on the future consequences of your action, not on the present causes of your choice.
  - But why does this feeling not go away when you learn about determinism?
    - When you are actually making a choice, you are never attending to the causes of your choice. [?]
- B. The argument from modern physics: Quantum mechanics has rejected determinism.
  - About the Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle: Four interpretations:
    1. It is a mere limitation on the accuracy of our measuring techniques.
      - No relevance for determinism.
    2. The elementary particles are not the *sort* of thing to have positions/momenta.
      - This also has no relevance for determinism.
    3. They have positions/momenta, but these are indeterminate, i.e., violations of the law of

excluded middle.

- This is nonsense.

4. They have positions/momenta at any given time, but these are causally unrelated to anything that went before.

- But how could one ever confirm this?

- The practice of science presupposes determinism. When we do not know the causes of things, we have always assumed there were hidden causes.
- Human beings are large enough physical objects to be for all practical purposes deterministic systems (governed by classical physics).

C. The moral argument:

- The following things presuppose ~determinism: praise/blame, punishment, remorse, duty.
- Determinism means that people are just machines.

*Reply to the latter:*

- We need not & should not accept *physicalism*. Mental states are different from physical states.
- Mental states have different kinds of causal relations.
  - We can see why one mental state causes another.
  - Logical relationships between the contents of thoughts are part of how they cause one another.
- To be free is to be moved by an impersonal ideal, viz. the sense of duty. (Compare Kant.)  
“What we want is control by the objective requirements of the case.”

[Comments:

- Are Blanshard’s responses on each of these points convincing?
- Did he give any arguments *for* determinism?]

## Phil. 4360

### Notes #28: Against Free Will (Edwards)

#### Soft determinists say:

- There is no conflict between 'free action' and determinism.
  - A free action is one which is
    - a) Not constrained, compelled, or caused by outside forces,
    - b) Not the product of abnormal psychological compulsions, etc., and
    - c) The product of the agent's own (conscious) desires.
  - Thus, a free action is caused. It is merely caused in a different way from an unfree action.
- There is no conflict between determinism & moral responsibility.
- Not only can people have FW with respect to their actions; they can also have FW with respect to their characters.

#### The hard determinist says:

- Two proposed conditions on responsibility:
  - a. Lack of constraint, compulsion, abnormal psychology.
  - b. Choosing one's own character.
- Softies only recognize (a). Hardies insist on (b) also. In defense of (b):
  1. S is responsible for X  $\supset$  S is responsible for the cause of X.
  2. S's character is the cause of his actions.
  3. S is responsible for his actions  $\supset$  S is responsible for S's character. (From 1, 2.)
  4. S is responsible for his character only if S chose his character.
  5. Therefore, S is responsible for his actions, only if S chose his character. (From 3, 4.)
  6. No person chooses his character.
  7. Hence, no person is responsible for his actions. (From 5, 6.)

#### Possible objections: (not in Edwards)

##### A. (by Hospers)

- The consequent of (5) is a contradiction. For:
  - To choose something, S must first exist.
  - If S exists, S already has a character; one cannot exist w/o a character.
  - To choose one's character, one must not already have a character.
  - Hence, to choose one's character, one must both exist and not exist.
- But the notion of responsibility is not self-contradictory.
- Hence, the consequent of (5) is not a condition on responsibility.

##### B. Is premise (1) true?

- Consider alternative premise: S is responsible for X only if S *is* (part of) the cause of X.

##### C. What does "the cause of" mean? A sufficient cause? Partial cause? Necessary condition?

- Suff. cause  $\rightarrow$  (2) begs the question, may be false.
- Nec. cause  $\rightarrow$  (1) says, "S is responsible for X only if S is responsible for every necessary condition on X"  $\rightarrow$  Obviously false.

##### D. Is (6) true?

### **III. Better Arguments Against Free Will** (not in Edwards)

#### A. The argument from physics:

1. All human actions are constituted by the motions of particles.
2. The motions of particles are determined, or at least not controlled by FW.
3. Therefore, all human actions are determined, or at least not subject to FW.

#### B. Determinism by desires

1. All human actions are caused by beliefs and desires.
2. If A causes B, then S has a choice about B only if S has a choice about A.
  - S could avoid B only if S could avoid A.
3. We do not have a choice about our beliefs and desires.
  - Note: Infinite regress threatens.
4. Therefore, we do not have a choice about any of our actions.

## Phil. 4360

### Notes #29: For Compatibilism (Stace)

#### W. T. Stace: preliminary remarks

- Free will is important to morality. “S should do A” entails “S has free will.”
- Responsibility & punishment require free will.
- All deniers of free will really believe in it in real life.
- The problem is merely verbal. It arises from a confusion about the meaning of “free”.

#### The meaning of ‘free will’:

- It has commonly been assumed that ‘free will’ implies indeterminism.
- Meanings to be determined by common usage. Observe common usage:

J: I once went without food for a week.

S: Did you do that of your own free will?

J: No. I did it because I was lost in a desert and could find no food.

G: I once fasted for a week.

S: Did you do that of your own free will?

G: Yes. I did it because I wanted to compel the British Government to give India its independence.

J: Did you sign this confession of your own free will?

P: No. I signed it because the police beat me up.

- What is the distinguishing characteristic of free actions?
  - Not the absence of causes. For (a) the free actions all have causes. (b) Even if indeterminism is true, there is no reason to think the unfree actions were any more determined than the free actions.
  - *“Acts freely done are those whose immediate causes are psychological states in the agent. Acts not freely done are those whose immediate causes are states of affairs external to the agent.”* (286-7)
    - Objection: What if a thug points a gun at you and demands your money? You hand it over. The cause of your action is the fear of death, which is an internal psychological state. Is your action free?
- What does this mean: “S could have done otherwise”?
  - S could have done otherwise if he wanted to  $\approx$  S *would* have done otherwise if he wanted to.
- Understand why all of this means that FW is compatible with determinism.

#### Punishment:

- Why do we punish people?
  - To supply causes to modify their behavior.
- This is the same as the reason why we give fertilizer to a plant. [Is this true?]
  - “The only difference is that different kinds of things require different kinds of causes to make them do what they should. Pain may be the appropriate remedy to apply, in certain cases, to human beings, and oil to the machine. It is, of course, of no use to inject motor oil into the boy

or to beat the machine.” (290)

- Punishment presupposes determinism--human actions have causes.

**Free will requires determinism:**

“If there were no determinism of human beings at all, their actions would be completely unpredictable and capricious, and therefore irresponsible.” (291) [Is this true?]

1. If human actions lack causes, they are random.
2. If random, they are not free.
3. Therefore, freedom requires determinism.
4. If freedom requires determinism, then it doesn't require *indeterminism*.
5. Therefore, freedom doesn't require indeterminism.

## Phil. 4360

### Notes #30: Against Compatibilism (van Inwagen)

*To prove:* the existence of free will is incompatible with determinism.

#### **Rough, informal idea:**

If determinism is true, then my actions are the (logical) consequences of events in the remote past, together with the laws of nature. But it is not up to me what went on before I was born, and it is not up to me what the laws of nature are either. Therefore, the consequences of these things, including my present actions, are not up to me.

#### **Preliminaries:**

$Np$  = No one has any choice about the fact that  $p$ . [Note: “N” is a sentential operator. “ $Np$ ” implies that  $p$  is true in fact, and no one could have rendered  $p$  false.]

$P_0$  = A complete & correct description of the state of the universe at some instant in the remote past.

L = The conjunction into a single proposition of all the laws of nature.

P = An arbitrarily chosen (correct) description of anything happening after that time.

Determinism: The thesis that *at any given time, there is exactly one future course of events that is consistent with the state of the universe at that time and all the laws of nature.*

I.e.,  $(P_0 \ \& \ L)$  entails P.

#### **Some plausible rules of inference:**

*Rule  $\alpha$ :* From  $\Box p$ , deduce  $Np$ . (‘ $\Box$ ’ denotes metaphysical/logical necessity.)

*Rule  $\beta$ :* From  $Np$  and  $N(p \supset q)$ , deduce  $Nq$ .

Alternate pair of rules (these are equivalent as a pair):

*The Conjunction Rule:* From  $Np$  and  $Nq$ , deduce  $N(p \ \& \ q)$ .

*The Entailment Rule:* From  $Np$ , deduce  $Nq$ , whenever  $p \models q$ .

#### **Formal Argument:**

*First Version (van Inwagen):*

- |    |                                   |                                 |
|----|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1. | $\Box[(P_0 \ \& \ L) \supset P]$  | Assumption, def. of determinism |
| 2. | $\Box[P_0 \supset (L \supset P)]$ | 1; exportation                  |
| 3. | $N[P_0 \supset (L \supset P)]$    | 2; rule $\alpha$                |
| 4. | $NP_0$                            | Premise                         |
| 5. | $N(L \supset P)$                  | 3, 4; rule $\beta$              |
| 6. | NL                                | Premise                         |
| 7. | NP                                | 5, 6; rule $\beta$              |
| 8. | Determinism $\supset$ NP          | 1-7; conditional proof          |

*Alternate Version:*

- |    |                          |                        |
|----|--------------------------|------------------------|
| 1. | $(P_0 \ \& \ L) = P$     | Assumption             |
| 2. | $NP_0$                   | Premise                |
| 3. | NL                       | Premise                |
| 4. | $N(P_0 \ \& \ L)$        | 2,3; conjunction rule  |
| 5. | NP                       | 1,4; entailment rule   |
| 6. | Determinism $\supset$ NP | 1-5; conditional proof |

*Commentary:*

- We assume for conditional proof that determinism holds (1).
- We infer that no one has a choice about an arbitrarily chosen fact.
- Thus, if determinism, then no one has a choice about anything. Thus, soft determinism fails.

### Examining the premises and rules

There are 4 premises/rules involved:

- a)  $NP_0$ .  
We have no choice about the past.
  - b) NL.  
We have no choice about the laws of nature. This seems to follow from the meaning of “law of nature.”
  - c) If  $\Box p$ , then  $Np$ .  
We have no choice about logically necessary truths.
  - d) If  $Np$  and  $N(p \supset q)$ , then  $Nq$ .  
Suppose one of the following:
    1. ‘S has a choice about the fact that  $p$ ’ = ‘S has access to some possible world in which  $\sim p$ .’
    2. ‘S has a choice about the fact that  $p$ ’ = ‘S can do some act A such that if S did A, it might not be the case that  $p$ .’  
 $Np$  = For every act A that S can perform, if S did A, it would definitely still be the case that  $p$ .

If either of these is correct, then rule  $\beta$  (and the conjunction rule) come out valid.
- PvI thinks (d) (rule  $\beta$ ) is the only one that could reasonably be questioned.

### A third, simpler argument:

1. If, in order for me to do A, something would have to have happened in the past that did not in fact happen, then I cannot now do A.
2. If determinism is true, then in order for me to do something different from what I actually do, things would have to have happened in the past that did not in fact happen.
3. Therefore, if determinism is true, then I cannot now do anything different from what I actually do. (From 1, 2.)
4. Free will requires alternate possibilities.
5. So, if determinism is true, then I have no free will. (From 3, 4.)

## Phil. 4360

### Notes #31: For Free Will: The Self-Refutation Argument

#### The Presupposition of Thought

• Lucas phrases this as an argument against determinism, but it seems he is really arguing against *physicalism*. Not completely clear what his argument is. Perhaps:

1. If physicalism holds, then all beliefs have only non-rational causes. (Random or mechanistic movements of insentient little particles.)
2. If a belief has only non-rational causes, then
  - a. it cannot be true;
  - b. it cannot be justified;
  - c. we have no adequate reason to think it likely to be true;
  - d. the person holding it has no adequate reason to think it likely to be true; or
  - e. it cannot be held *because* it is true.
3. Therefore, if determinism is true, then
  - a. it is not true;
  - b. we are not justified in believing it; or
  - c. we don't believe it *because* it is true. (From 1, 2.)
4. If we know that we don't believe *p* because it is true, then we aren't justified in believing *p*/don't know that *p*.
5. Therefore, determinism is
  - a. false (from 3a); or
  - b. unjustified (from 3b or 3c + 4).

#### Is Determinism Self-Refuting? Yes.

##### *Preliminaries:*

- Presupposition of rational thought: One should believe only what is true (avoid false beliefs).
- 'Ought' implies 'can' principle: 'S should do A' implies 'S can do A.'
- Def. of (hard) determinism:  
No person ever has more than one course of action available. Or:  
(S)(A) (S can do A  $\supset$  S does A).
- Def. of MFT (the Minimal Free-will Thesis):  
 $\sim$ Determinism. Or:  
( $\exists$ S)( $\exists$ A) (S can do A & S does not do A).

##### *Determinism is self-refuting:*

1. With respect to the free will issue, we should believe only what is true.
2. If S should do A, then S can do A.
3. I believe MFT.
4. Assume determinism. Then if S can do A, S does A.
5. If S should do A, S does A. (From 2, 4.)
6. With respect to the free will issue, we believe only what is true. (From 1, 5.)
7. MFT is true. (From 3, 6.)

## Objections:

- A) “Sometimes, we should do the impossible”? Consider some similar situations:
- x is impossible, & S ought *to attempt* to do x.
  - x is impossible, & x *would be good*.
  - x is impossible, & S is obligated to *do x if he can*.
- B) “Instead of (1): we should believe only what is *justified*.”
- C) “(1) is ‘begging the question,’ because if determinism is true [given that 2 and 3 are also true], (1) is false.” Three conceptions of begging the question:
- 1) An argument begs the question iff: If the conclusion is false, then a premise is false.
  - 2) An argument begs the question iff: The conclusion is, or is contained in, one of the premises.
  - 3) An argument begs the question iff: The conclusion is used to justify (argue for) a premise.
- D) “There are two senses of ‘should’, in (1) and (2), epistemic and moral.”
- E) “(1) is false because: people have no control over their beliefs / believing is not an action.”
- F) “This must be wrong, since it derives a contingent conclusion from necessary premises.”

## Phil. 4360

### Notes #32: For Free-Will: The Lucas-Gödel Argument

#### I. Lucas' General Position on Free Will

- Lucas is a libertarian.
- Mechanism: The view that the human mind is a “machine” or machine-like. Lucas appears to view this as equivalent to determinism. (p. 113)  
“Our idea of a machine is just this, that its behaviour is completely determined by the way it is made and the incoming ‘stimuli’: there is no possibility of its acting on its own...”
- Lucas has two arguments against mechanism:
  - 1) Determinism is self-refuting.
  - 2) Gödel's Theorem refutes mechanism.

#### II. About Gödel's Theorem

##### *Definitions:*

- *Gödel's Theorem:* Any formal system capable of representing arithmetic on the natural numbers, is either inconsistent or incomplete.
- *Formal systems:* A formal system contains:
  - i) A set of symbols;
  - ii) Formation Rules: a set of *formal* (syntactic) rules defining how symbols may be combined to form ‘sentences’;
  - iii) Axioms: sentences that the system starts with; and
  - iv) Transformation Rules: a set of formally (syntactically) defined rules for when you can derive on sentence from other sentences.
- *Inconsistency:* A formal system is inconsistent iff a formula of the form  $(P \ \& \ \sim P)$  can be derived. Also: any proposition whatsoever can be derived.
- *Incompleteness:* A formal system is incomplete iff there is at least one statement which is true in all the intended models, but cannot be derived by the rules of the system.
- G's theorem was initially a proof of the incompleteness of *Principia Mathematica* (PM), the system of Whitehead and Russell.
- *How was Gödel's Theorem proved?* Five major stages:
  1. He showed that every statement of PM could be associated with a unique natural number (its “Gödel number”).
  2. He showed that every formal operation on a sentence or set of sentences corresponded to an arithmetical operation on the Gödel number(s) of the sentence(s).
  3. From (2), it follows that there exists a definite arithmetical property that belongs to all and only the Gödel numbers of sentences that can be formally derived in the system.
  4. Finally, he showed that there was a sentence of PM which says, of *its own* Gödel number, that it does not have that property. Call this the Gödel sentence for PM.
  5. Either the Gödel sentence is true, or it is false.
    - a. If it is true, then the Gödel sentence is unprovable in PM; hence, there is a true but

unprovable sentence of PM. Hence, PM is incomplete.

- b. If it is false, then the Gödel sentence *is* provable in PM. Hence, PM is capable of deriving a false arithmetical statement. Hence, PM is unsound. (In this particular case, its unsoundness would also entail inconsistency.)
- To notice about this:
    - Gödel shows not only that *there is* a true but unprovable statement of PM; he provides *a method for constructing the statement*.
    - The method can be applied to any formal system that can represent arithmetic. Hence, it shows that *any* consistent formal system that can represent arithmetic is incomplete.

### III. Lucas' argument from Gödel's Theorem

1. If mechanism is true, then there is a formal system that accurately represents all human thinking.
2. Assume, for reductio, that there is such a system. Call it F.
3. F is not an inconsistent system. (Premise.)
4. F is capable of representing arithmetic. (Premise.)
5. F cannot be used to derive the Gödel sentence for F. (From 3, 4, and Gödel's Theorem.)
6. A human mathematician can derive the Gödel sentence for F. (Premise.)
7. Therefore, F does not correctly represent all human thinking. (From 5, 6.)
8. No formal system correctly represents all human thinking. (From 2-7, RAA.)
9. Mechanism is false. (From 1, 8.)

### IV. Objections

- (a) Suppose we were to supplement F by adding in its Gödel sentence, as an axiom.  
*Answer:* Then there will be a new Gödel sentence, for the enlarged system.
- (b) What if we add an infinite series of Gödel sentences?  
*Answer:* Then there will be a new Gödel sentence, for the enlarged system. (Note that (a) and (b) are objections to Gödel's Theorem itself.)
- (c) But computers can do lots of things humans cannot, so computers are better than human minds! Also, no human mind can surpass all machines simultaneously.  
*Answer:* This isn't the issue.
- (d) Suppose we added to the system an operation for provisionally adding unproven sentences?  
*Problem:* How to ensure that the system would choose to add the Gödel sentence, and not the negation of the Gödel sentence?
- (e) But people are inconsistent. Perhaps human minds are modeled by an *inconsistent* system.  
*Answer:* (i) No, for an inconsistent *formal system* is a system in which *every* statement is derivable. (ii) Human inconsistencies are *mistakes* (like malfunctions), not set policies as in an inconsistent formal system.
- (f) Perhaps some future, more sophisticated machines will be developed that are not completely predictable.  
*Answer:* But then these wouldn't be "machines" in the intended sense.

## Phil. 4360

### Notes #33: The Problem of Personal Identity

#### Dennett's story:

Yorrick = Dennett's brain.

Hamlet = Dennett's body.

#### • Where is Dennett?

(1) Dennett is where Hamlet is. (Cf. answer 1 below.)

*Problem:* Brain transplant cases. In a brain transplant, you want to be the donor, not the recipient. When Dennett gets a new body, he still exists.

(2) Dennett is where Yorrick is. (Cf. answer 2 below.)

*Problem:* (a) He doesn't seem (to himself) to be in the vat. (b) If Dennett robbed a bank, the state wouldn't lock up his brain and leave his body to roam free.

(3) Dennett's location is determined by his 'point of view.'

*Problem:*

- Implies that people are infallible about their locations. Can't people get lost? Yes, but even then you still know you're 'here.'

- What about people in the Cinerama? Or people in laboratories operating feedback-controlled mechanical arms to handle dangerous materials?

- This leads to the conclusion that Dennett is an immaterial object.

- When he loses radio contact between his brain and his body, his location shifts from under Tulsa to Houston.

- No physical object shifts location.

- So he must be a nonphysical thing.

(4) Dennett is in a scattered location.

#### The Problem of Personal Identity

- Q1: What are you?

Q2: Fill in the blank: "x is the same person as y iff \_\_\_\_\_."

- *Not* the question: (a) When are two people identical with each other? (b) When is x qualitatively identical with y? (c) When are you still you?

#### Possible answers:

1. (Q1) You are your body. (Q2) x has the same body as y.

*Problem:* Brain transplant cases. (You have your brain transplanted into another body. The recipient body then becomes *your body*.)

2. (Q1) You are your brain. (Q2) x has the same brain as y.

*Problems:* (a) Mind transplant case? (Your brain's information is transferred into another brain.) (b) The 'brain of Theseus' case. (Neurons of your brain are replaced one at a time.)

3. (Q1) You are your mind. (Q2) x has the same mind as y. *But what is your mind? When does x have the same mind as y?*

3a. x has the same mind as y iff x and y have the same soul (or mind-stuff).

- Problems:* Is there a soul? Where do they come from? How do they get hooked up to bodies?
- 3b.  $x$  has the same mind as  $y$  iff  $x$  has (some of?) the same memories as  $y$ . (**Locke**)  
*Problem:* Circular, because “memory” presupposes personal identity. (**Reid**) See also under (3c).
- 3c.  $x$  has the same mind as  $y$  iff  $x$ 's quasi-memories are a subset of  $y$ 's quasi-memories, or vice versa. (modified version of **Locke**)  
 (“*Quasi-memories*”: mental states that are qualitatively just like memories, but the events they represent need not have actually happened, nor need they have happened to the person who has the quasi-memory.)  
*Problems:* (a) Amnesia case. (b) Normal forgetting. Entails non-transitivity of identity. (**Reid**) (c) Entails that more than one person can be you.
- 3d.  $x$  has the same mind as  $y$  iff  $x$  and  $y$  have the same character traits.  
*Problems:* (a) People's character traits can change over time. (b) Entails that more than one person can be you.
- 3e.  $x$  has the same mind as  $y$  iff  $x$  and  $y$  have the same beliefs, desires, and character.  
*Problems:* Same as 3d.
- 3f. Some combination of 3c, 3d, and 3e. For example,  $x$  has the same mind as  $y$  iff  $x$  and  $y$  have the same character traits, *and*  $x$ 's quasi-memories are a subset of  $y$ 's quasi-memories or vice versa.  
*Problems:* Same as 3c and 3d.
4. (Q1) You are a mind-body combination. (Q2)  $x$  has the same body as  $y$  *and*  $x$  has the same mind as  $y$ .  
*Problems:* (a) Brain-transplant case. (b) Mind-transplant case? (c) What is required to have the same mind?
5. (Q1) You are a mind-brain combination. (Q2)  $x$  has the same brain as  $y$  *and*  $x$  has the same mind as  $y$ .  
*Problems:* (a) Mind-transplant case? (b) Brain-of-Theseus case? (c) What is required to have the same mind? (See 3a-3f above.)
6. (Q2) The continuity theory:
- 6a.  $x$  is the same person as  $y$  iff  $x$  and  $y$  are connected by a spatiotemporally continuous sequence of person-stages. (You are a 4-D spacetime worm.)  
*Problem:* (a) Fission case. Entails that more than one person could be you. (b) Impossibility of teleportation? (c) Brain-transplant case (implies that you cease to exist)? (d) Mind-transplant case (implies that you continue to exist in the original body).
- 6b.  $x$  is the same person as  $y$  iff  $x$  and  $y$  are connected by a psychologically continuous sequence of mind-stages.  
*Problems:* (a) Entails that more than one person could be you. (b) Sleep, unconsciousness.
- 6c.  $x$  is the same person as  $y$  iff  $x$  and  $y$  are connected by a spatiotemporally

and psychologically continuous sequence of person-stages.

*Problems:* Same as 6a (a, b, c) and 6b (a, b).

7. (Q2) The skeptical theory: there are no facts about personal identity. It's just a matter of convention/a semantic question.

*Problem:* General craziness. Implies either (a) that you don't exist (because there's no such thing as personal identity), or (b) that you can make yourself immortal by just adopting an appropriate convention (because personal identity is conventional).

8. (Q2) The closest-continuer theory: Immediately after some change occurs, the entity that is *you* is the entity (if any) that (a) has at least some minimum level of similarity to you, and (b) is the best candidate for being you of all the then-existing entities.

- The criteria for the best candidate include one or more of the above suggestions (e.g., continuity, having the same character, etc.), possibly a weighted combination.

*Problems:* (a) Implies that identity is extrinsic. (b) Implies that identity is not symmetric. More than one thing can be (earlier stages of) you.

### **A General Problem:**

- Most accounts of personal identity seek a *qualitative criterion* of personal identity.
- Any purely qualitative condition (and many not-purely-qualitative conditions) can be satisfied by more than one thing.
- But more than one thing cannot be you.
- Conclusion: There cannot be a purely qualitative criterion of personal identity.
  - Any criterion of personal identity (or criterion of being identical with you) must be such that it is logically impossible for more than one thing to satisfy it with respect to you.

### **Question:**

- Why doesn't this work: Every person is identical with himself and nothing else?
- Because the problem is not to say when two people are identical. The problem is: when are two person-stages stages *of the same person*? (I.e., how must all of a person's stages be related to each other?)

**Phil. 4360**  
**Notes #34: Hume's Crazyiness**

**Traditional view:**

There is a thing called "the self".

- We are directly introspectively aware of it. It is present in all conscious experience.
- It is not a mental state (like a belief, experience, desire, etc.). It is a single thing that has all of a person's mental states.
- Often said to be "simple"; also often said to be immaterial. (See Descartes.)

**Hume: The self does not exist.** Arguments:

A)

1. All ideas are copies of impressions.
2. There is no impression that the idea of self can be a copy of.
  - a. Self is not any one impression; it is supposed to "underlie" all our impressions.
  - b. We don't find anything common in all our impressions.
3. Therefore, there is no idea of self.

B)

1. We never observe the self by introspection.
  - We only observe particular perceptions, and the self is not one of these.
2. So the self either does not exist, or is just the collection of perceptions.
  - Therefore: I don't exist when I am asleep.

Conclusion: A person is "nothing but a bundle or collection of different perceptions."

**Reid's Response:**

"[I]t is certainly a most amazing discovery, that thought and ideas may be without any thinking being. A discovery big with consequences which cannot easily be traced by those deluded mortals who think and reason in the common track. We were always apt to imagine, that thought supposed a thinker, and love a lover, and treason a traitor: but this, it seems, was all a mistake; and it is found out, that there may be treason without a traitor, and love without a lover [...]: or if, in these cases, ideas are the lover, the sufferer, the traitor, it were to be wished that the author of this discovery had farther condescended to acquaint us, whether ideas can converse together and be under obligations of duty or gratitude to each other [...] It seemed very natural to think that the *Treatise of Human Nature* required an author, and a very ingenious one too; but now we learn, that it is only a set of ideas which came together, and arranged themselves by certain associations and attractions." (35)

1. The following principle is *self-evident*. It neither needs proof nor can be proved.:  
An action cannot exist without a thing that acts. A property or state cannot exist without a thing that has it.

Applications of this principle:

Sensation cannot exist without a mind that senses. Thought cannot exist without a thinker.

Further indications of this self-evidence: (a) the ease of making fun of Hume. (b) The fact that even Hume can't keep to his philosophy consistently.

2. What is wrong with Hume's argument:

- Hume's argument rests on *the theory of ideas*: The view that the (direct) objects of awareness are always "ideas".
- The history of "ideas" in philosophy:
  - Originally introduced to *explain awareness*, e.g., perception of physical objects.
    - Perception is held to consist of an object's causing an "image" of itself to appear in the subject's mind.
  - Led to rejection of secondary qualities. "Fire is not hot, nor snow cold, nor honey sweet."
  - Then led to rejection of primary qualities. (Berkeley)
  - Finally, led to rejection of the mind itself, leaving nothing but ideas in existence.
- Theory of ideas should be rejected, for:
  - a) No proof for the existence of "ideas" was ever given to begin with.
    - Why can't one just say we are aware of the actual, real objects?
  - b) The theory of ideas has lots of absurd consequences.
  - c) It undermines the very motivation for introducing "ideas" to begin with.

## Phil. 4360

### Notes #35: Review of Unit 4

#### You should know these terms:

- Free will
- Determinism
- Hard determinism
- Soft determinism
- Libertarianism
- Compatibilism/incompatibilism
- Problem of personal identity/Criterion of pers. identity
- Quasi-memory
- The “theory of ideas”

#### Know what positions these people held (incl. which of the above positions they held):

- Brand Blanshard
  - His explanation for the ‘feeling of freedom’
  - The diff. between people & machines, how we are ‘free.’
- Paul Edwards
  - Why we’re not responsible for our actions/character.
- W. T. Stace
  - Why free-will is important.
  - What ‘free’ means & his main argument for this.
  - What ‘could have’ means.
  - Why we should punish people for things.
  - How FW requires determinism.
- Peter van Inwagen
  - Know his basic argument, incl.:
  - The operator ‘N’
  - The 2 premises
  - The 2 rules of inference

Mike Huemer

the proof of FW, its 3 main premises.

J. R. Lucas

The presupposition of thought

What is Godel’s Theorem

The Godel sentence, & how it helps refute a mechanistic conception of the mind.

John Locke

on personal identity

David Hume

on persons

Thomas Reid

his criticisms of Locke & Hume

#### Be able to argue against each of these theories of personal identity:

the body theory

the brain theory

the Cartesian dualist theory

the memory theory

the personality/beliefs/desires theory

the spatiotemporal continuity theory

the psychological continuity theory

the conventionalist theory

the closest-continuer theory

qualitative criteria in general (the general argument against such)