

## Re: The Road with no Branches argument

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2004-10/0988.html>

---

**From:** Immortalist (*Reanimater\_2000\_at\_yahoo.com*)

**Date:** 10/22/04

Date: Fri, 22 Oct 2004 12:21:50 -0700

"Keynes" <Keynes@earthlinkspam.net> wrote in message  
news:l5gin0pj8c4vl917eet7tc4qnplp69llsk@4ax.com...

> *On Thu, 21 Oct 2004 22:58:22 -0700, "Immortalist" <Reanimater\_2000@yahoo.com>*

> *wrote:*

>

> *>Whenever we make a choice we are doing (or think we are doing) something like*

> *>what a traveler does when faced with a choice between different roads. The*

*only*

> *>roads the traveler is able to choose are roads which are a continuation of the*

> *>road he is already on. By analogy, the only choices we are able to make are*

> *>choices which are a continuation of the actual past and consistent with the*

*laws*

> *>of nature. If determinism is false, then making choices really is like this:*

*one*

> *>"road" (the past) behind us, two or more different "roads" (future actions*

> *>consistent with the laws) in front of us. But if determinism is true, then our*

> *>journey through life is like traveling (in one direction only) on a road which*

> *>has no branches. There are other roads, leading to other destinations; if we*

> *>could get to one of these other roads, we could reach a different destination.*

> *>But we can't get to any of these other roads from the road we are actually on.*

*So*

> *>if determinism is true, our actual future is our only possible future; we can*

> *>never choose or do anything other than what we actually do.*

>>

> *>This is a powerful intuition pump, since it's natural to think of our future*

*as*

> *>being "open" in the branching way suggested by the road analogy and to*

*associate*

> *>this kind of branching structure with freedom of choice. But several crucial*

> *>assumptions have been smuggled into this picture: assumptions about time and*

> *>causation and assumptions about possibility. The assumptions about time and*

> *>causation needed to make the analogy work seem to include the following: that*

*we*

> *>"move" through time in something like the way that we move down a road, that*

*our*

> *>"movement" is necessarily in one direction only, from past to future, that the*

> *>past is necessarily "fixed" or beyond our control in some way that the future*

is

> >not. *These assumptions are all controversial; on some theories of time and causation (the 4D theory of time, a theory of causation that permits time travel*

> >and backwards causation), they are all false (Lewis 1976, Horwich 1987, Sider > >2001).

> >

> >*The assumption about possibility is that possible worlds are concrete spatiotemporal things (in the way that roads are) and that worlds can overlap (literally share a common part) in the way that roads can overlap. But most possible worlds theorists reject both assumptions and nearly everyone rejects the*

> >*second assumption (Adams 1974, Lewis 1986).*

> >

> >*Determinism (without these additional assumptions) does not imply that our "journey" through life is like moving down a road; the contrast between determinism and non-determinism is not the contrast between traveling on a branching road and traveling on a road with no branches.*

> >

> >*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.*

> >

> ><http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/incompatibilism-arguments/>

> >[http://www.campusprogram.com/reference/en/wikipedia/e/el/elbow\\_room.html](http://www.campusprogram.com/reference/en/wikipedia/e/el/elbow_room.html)

> ><http://actiontheory.free.fr/Actionpuzzles.htm>

> >

>

> *The analogy of a forking road is valid. Determinism taken to absurdity says that there is no changing of any course. But this position assumes that one is always his own master. In fact we can and do change courses due to influences outside of ourselves.*

>

> *Our original inclination is due to causes, and our future course is also due to causes, and all those causes are Not in the self to begin with. So apparent decisions and changes of course depend on what is considered outside of one, and the appearance of decision, and the Fact of changeable course do not defy determinism.*

>

> *To assume determinism removes choice is naive. We make rational and irrational choices, but all choice can be traced to causes, even the choices of the insane. From a God's eye view, the path may seem inevitable, but down on the ground we make choices that are important to us all the time.*

>

> *To despair at the God's eye view, or to think that it removes human significance*

sci.logic: Re: The Road with no Branches argument

- > *is to take an inhumanly demoralizing God-like position we ignorant thoughtless*
- > *groundlings are not entitled to, and likely to suffer for. (Without proper*
- > *moral and spiritual preparation.)*
- >

I think I agree. I was thinking earlier about the principle of the conservation of energy. Whereupon no energy can be destroyed or created in the universe but can just change form.

Now we could say that there are no real things but just this energy as we might similarly say there are no real choices as there are only caused events.

Or we might say there is no time in a spacetime because everything is there at once and therefore those things you thought happened didn't? Howash.

- >
- >
- >