

Re: The Road with no Branches argument

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2004-10/0961.html>

From: X's Lover (*together_at_hell.com*)

Date: 10/22/04

Date: Fri, 22 Oct 2004 02:46:05 -0400

In article <K8KdnQkn3NNYP-XcRVn-3g@comcast.com>, "Immortalist" <Reanimater_2000@yahoo.com> wrote:

>
> *Now why would anyone's intuitions suggest that if I am right, then if and
> when I
> ever have occasion to refuse such an offer, my refusal would not count as a
> responsible act? Perhaps this is what some people think: they think that if I
> were right when I claimed I could not do otherwise in such cases, I would be
> some
> sort of zombie, "programmed" always to refuse thousand-dollar bribes. A
> genuinely
> free agent, they think, must be more volatile somehow. If I am to be able to
> listen to reason, ... they think, ... I must be able to pause, and weigh up
> the
> pros and cons of this suggested bit of lucrative torture [so that there would
> be
> some chance I might change my mind]....*

I think it's useful to clarify would and could. I believe that you would not torture another for money. That you could not do this is another matter entirely. Allowing for your argument of responsibility, it is a choice that you don't or won't torture others for money, rather than a can't.

Why must money be involved anyway? There is enough sadism and masochism in the world that infliction of pain and suffering is its own pleasure and reward.