

## Re: The Road with no Branches argument

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2004-10/0960.html>

---

**From:** X's Lover (*together\_at\_hell.com*)

**Date:** 10/22/04

Date: Fri, 22 Oct 2004 02:32:48 -0400

In article <1pSdnbZKSsaBP-XcRVn-3Q@comcast.com>, "Immortalist" <Reanimator\_2000@yahoo.com> wrote:

> *If this intuition pump nevertheless continues to engage us, it is because we*  
> *think that our range of possible choices is constrained by two factors: the*  
> *laws*  
> *and the past. We can't change or break the laws; we cannot causally affect*  
> *the*  
> *past. (Even if backwards causation is logically possible, it is not within*  
> *our*  
> *power.) These two premises are the basis of the best known contemporary*  
> *argument*  
> *for incompatibilism: the Consequence argument. More of this later.*

It's interesting to note your choice of language — language that I wouldn't necessarily use for these comparisons. These may also be influenced by notions of time and space. I tend to use expressions like travelling along, following, toward and the like. Similarly, I tend to use expressions like moving through time, to the past or to the future, rather than directional indications such as backwards and forwards.

It is further interesting in that, if travelling down a road (a direction) is movement to the future then the word more likely would be on or up the road.

Further, I find the choice of language self-limiting. Why won't we (versus can't) change the past directly or casually? Or what do we need to know to do so?

This also seems an indirect route. Changing the now may require changing the past, however, one could simply choose the future of multiple options now and avoid having to dabble in the past at all.