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Many philosophers have held that determinism (the doctrine that everything that happens has a cause) excludes the possibility of the human exercise of free will.

In Section VIII of *An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding* (“Of Liberty and Necessity”), Hume discusses this issue, arguing that when human freedom (‘liberty”) and causation (“necessity”) are properly understood, there is no conflict.

Explain in your own words how Hume argues for this conclusion, brining out how his solution to the problem depends on his own account of the idea causal necessity.

“uses causal necessity to account for human freedom”

Briefly, do you find Hume’s solution to the problem fully convincing? If not, why not? If so, suggest a reason why others might disagree.

Length: around 5 pages.

Due: 12 PM, April 29 (electronic submission).

Explain incompatibility problem free will and determinism

If get rid of determinism

Rip off ability to trace people’s cause of their activities

Absolute freedom & free in small area

You can do what you want to do is not unique to him

His uniqueness: is thinking about causation itself

No abs necessity, it is just what we impose, not strict

Pattern but not necessity

Physical laws are just generalizations to him

Not that hopeless of human freedom

At end of the prompt: is it his account of free will that leans to his will of causality

Matap makes false assumptions

State the tension -> compatibility theory -> causation solution -> explain -> criticize (addressed problem to a bigger hole)

1. Tension

Free will vs determinism

1. How people address, leave no room for compatibility
2. Hume’s thesis (well understood, free means not strictly free, then compatible)

If necessity, cause well understood, then compatible

Regularity causes so called “human nature”

Liberty or free will, then, does not depend on actions being disconnected from their motives. Rather, it means simply that actions depend on determinations of the will. Liberty, then, should be contrasted with constraint--the inability to obey one's own will--rather than with necessity

1. How he accounts for that using causality

Argue in two approaches:

1. causal is not that necessary -> not necessarily determining
2. if free will exists in nondeterminism -> 没有规律,你怪谁 -> you cannot account for people’s bad behavior -> cannot exclude certain causes(所以是有个叫uniformity/regularity的东西)

Use broader necessity in mind to account for necessity

1. Is it convincing? In some sense yes, but in some sense not, Leibniz, Spinoza will disagree (ultimately caused), causation are necessary connection

L,S: 你他妈这还是metaphysical的(认为uniformity就是necessary的), maybe you are determined to be blamed

你怎么知道别人就是这么想的(1.别人不一定在想necessity：乱assume，2.别人也许认可determinism和free will共存：你说人要被blame，如果做了坏的cause，但是这个度怎么把握？如果cause再深一步就blame不了人了

)

摘抄 笔记 网络

笔记：cannot define anything into existence

matters of fact come to be known through generalization(expectation), but leave space of anything could happen

examine thru experience but not why: calc example, you generalize the sun rises, but do not know why (only applies to some instances: black swan white swan cannot generalize)

only criteria: not contradictory

theoretical VS practical

mind body problem by L,S [see my pic]

H: body power > god power

框框的总结

nec is just habit

causal reasoning ~~ moral reasoning

Goodness:

* Make preparation for anything possible to happen
* 归纳总结法

Criticize:

* only shows not bad, but didn’t show goodness of using causal inference as a way to reason
* uniformity involves necessity
* assume our habits are necessary

deny necessity: blame on fleeting things, how come?

Absurd according to human emotion -> too arbitraty (haven’t answered the question of blame by standard of emotion or blame by god at first)

Blame on our perception

Freedom vs ability(有没有freedom不知道，但是你的human nature是在的)

牺牲大画面来解释physics not nec这很危险

1  Point out the tension between free will and necessity for a lot of people as a background

2      And according to Hume, how people address the tension and leave no room for compatibility (If nec, no blame). But if we understand them properly (not nec, but regularity, “nec” springs from our mind, just habit; not blame by other cause but our motivations), they are compatible, Regularity causes so called “human nature”, use this to judge people because they act on their will:

Liberty or free will, then, does not depend on actions being disconnected from their motives. Rather, it means simply that actions depend on determinations of the will. Liberty, then, should be contrasted with constraint--the inability to obey one's own will--rather than with necessity

Freedom vs ability(有没有freedom不知道，但是你的human nature是在的)

3      ”Hume’s thesis that people's idea of necessity and causation arises from uniformity observable in operations of nature, from which the mind tend to infer one from another”

4      How he develops the flow of his arguments, and the connection between the problem and his account for causal necessity. Mention part2

Part1: 看书，摘抄(anything could happen as counter example) Part2: cannot abandon any of them

5    My opinion: Praise Hume for goodness of his originality. Also criticize him for overly relying on the uniformity that might also be determined. And give examples of how other Philosophers can argue against him.

Goodness:

* Make preparation for anything possible to happen
* 归纳总结法

Badness:

L,S: 你他妈这还是metaphysical的(认为uniformity就是necessary的, showed nec doesn’t work, didn’t show uniformity works(b/c he assume uniformity+habit exists)), maybe you are determined to be blamed

你怎么知道别人就是这么想的(1.别人不一定在想necessity：乱assume，2.别人也许认可determinism和free will共存：你说人要被blame，如果做了坏的cause，但是这个度怎么把握？如果cause再深一步就blame不了人了

)

Absurd according to human emotion -> too arbitraty (haven’t answered the question of blame by standard of emotion or blame by god at first)

所以啊，牺牲physics大画面来解释容易出问题呀

examine thru experience but not why: calc example, you generalize the sun rises, but do not know why (only applies to some instances: black swan white swan cannot generalize)