

# Summaries

## **Rational Capacities and Metaphysical Freedom**

FERENC HUORANSZKI

The paper distinguishes two senses of freedom. In one sense, freedom is the aim of human action; in another, it is a precondition of the possibility of moral evaluation of actions. I argue that virtuous actions manifest the exertion of rational capacities and that they require alternative possibilities in the sense of the ability to act otherwise. Hence freedom understood as the condition of exerting rational capacities is a metaphysical concept. It is also argued that abilities are not dispositions and that the traditional conditional analysis of free will captures well the sense of ability that is needed for the possibility of rational and virtuous behavior.

## **Frankfurt-Cases and Alternatives: Answering the Dilemma**

ÁKOS GYARMATHY

The article summarizes the so-called dilemma defence argument, which was developed against the Frankfurt-style examples attacking the principle of alternate possibilities. First I explain why other versions of the Frankfurt-cases fail to answer the dilemma defence argument; then I provide a new and original Frankfurt-example, which, I hold, is successful. If my arguments are sound, then the original version of the principle of alternate possibilities, according to which it is a necessary condition of responsible action that the agent is able to avoid her action, is false. I also show that related options for responsibility conditions, such as the agent's deliberation or her masked ability to do otherwise are still potential candidates, but these are not related to the question whether the agent is really able to avoid her action.

## **Free Will and Agent-causation**

JÁNOS TÓZSÉR – LÁSZLÓ BERNÁTH

In recent years, some philosophers argue that the concept of agent-causation cannot solve the problem of free will, because it faces the very same problems as event-causal libertarianism. According to the critics, if one is a friend of either event-causation or agent-causation, then she cannot solve the luck problem. That is, these conceptions are unable to explain how free choices are possible that are not a matter of chance.

By refuting Peter van Inwagen's Rollback Argument which is one of the most well-known luck arguments against agent-causation, we attempt to show that agent-causation can solve the luck problem if the agent-causationist denies that there are prior probabilities of free actions (Section 1–2). After that we argue that only the theory of agent-causation is able to do so, because event-causationist and non-causationist approaches of free will are not able to provide a detailed and plausible metaphysics of such free actions that have no prior probabilities (Section 3–4). In the last section (Section 5), we argue that if one denies the prior probabilities of free decisions and actions, she is still able to provide a plausible answer to the question of how rational free decisions are possible at all. We claim that even though the outcomes of free decisions cannot fully be explained in terms of intrinsic reasons of the agent, free decisions are not irrational but superrational given that free choices, in part, are based on internal reasons.

*Keywords:* agent-causation, libertarianism, Rollback Argument, probabilities, rationality

### **Indeterminism, Quantum Mechanics and Free Will in Karl Popper's 'Open Universe'**

LÁSZLÓ SZÉKELY

Whereas Karl Popper criticizes the naive form of modern Epicureism according to which physical indeterminism (and thus quantum mechanical indeterminism) offers a solution to the traditional philosophical problem of free will, he considers physical determinism incompatible with moral freedom and human creativity and hence, in this regard, even he follows the Epicurean tradition. According to him, however, physical indeterminism is not enough. It should be completed with the causal openness of the physical world (that is his world 1) toward the mental sphere (that is his world 2) as well as with the relative autonomy of the second world to the first. Free will is possible only because the relatively autonomous mind is capable to determine the indeterministic physical processes according to its own choices and decisions and free will realizes itself through this influence of mind upon the physical world. Applying the argument formulated by Carneades against "the swerve of atoms" of Epicureism, which is reported by Cicero's work *De Fato*, we argue that in the context of this notion physical indeterminism is unnecessary: if one assumes (as indeed Popper does) that the mind is autonomous, and has a power to influence the physical world (that is the physical world is "causally open" toward the mind), then it is hard to reason why we could not also assume that this power is enough strong to change the courses of physical processes even if they were originally physically determined. There is strong parallelism between the Cartesian and the Popperian notions of free will: both postulate an agent autonomous with regard to the physical world and both assume that this agent is capable of influencing the physical processes. If we reject both materialistic and mentalistic monisms as bad solutions, the Cartesian-Popperian framework will appear as the most adequate framework for the problem of free will. However, Descartes is more consequent than Popper since he sees that the point is not whether physical processes are deterministic or indeterministic, but the nature of the agent's will and its relation to the physical world.

**„The intellect is not, like the body, at the mercy of chance”:**

**Spinoza on the Freedom of Intellect in the Context of a Medieval Debate**

OLIVÉR ISTVÁN TÓTH

The relationship of intellect and imagination in Spinoza’s Ethics is problematic because, on the one hand, ideas constituting the intellect are on definition adequate and therefore free and, on the other, every idea of an actual finite mind is part of the durational world and thereby subject of the causal axiom which – together with the infinite length of causal chains (Shein 2015) – might render the notion of adequacy and freedom impossible. Two ways of interpretation have been pursued so far. The mainstream interpretation holds that there are two sets of ideas constituting the finite mind: inadequately caused ideas of imagination and ideas of intellect that are either infinite modes themselves (Marshall 2008; Schnepf 2006), or are “of” infinite modes (Yovel 1989; Garrett 2009) and therefore they are generated by a causal chain of finite length. The problem with this interpretation is that it cannot account for the unity of the finite and infinite modes (Boros 1997) and has unwelcome innatist implications (Curley 1973; Renz 2016). The alternative interpretation has been proposed by Della Rocca (Della Rocca 2008) according to which adequate and inadequate ideas in actual finite minds only differ in degree and actual adequate causation happens only in the eternal realm. This interpretation cannot account for the places where Spinoza seemingly treats the intellect as an actual part of the finite human mind.

In my paper I argue that if we approach the problem not from the Cartesian background, but rather from the medieval discussion of the material intellect (Davidson 1992) which was known by Spinoza (Adler 2014) then we can develop a new interpretation of the relationship of imagination and intellect. On this interpretation the actual finite mind is constituted by actual finite modes of thought which have two aspects: a content and a formal aspect. The content aspect is called imagination and provides the representational content and phenomenal quality, while the formal aspect is called the intellect and provides the belief, judgment and volition involved by the idea. Error can arise either if the content aspect does not correspond to the object, or if powerful external causes force the mind to entertain ideas with contrary formal aspects. If the ideas of the human mind are linked to common notions the first – and hopefully the second – of these errors is fended off and the formal aspect orders the ideas according to the order of intellect. Since the common notions are common to all, in these cases the causal chains will not be infinitely long and therefore these ideas can be called genuinely free.

**Freedom as Autonomy: Kant**

NÓRA SZEGEDI

The starting-point of Sartre’s famous essay on Descartes’ concept of freedom is the conviction that various experiences lie hidden behind the different approaches to this notion. When investigating Kant’s theory of freedom from a phenomenological point of view, we find that, at least in the critical period, freedom is inseparable from moral experience. The well-known identification of freedom and autonomy is the expression of this connection.

In my paper I examine the consequences of the Kantian position with regard to the notion of freedom. I look at Kant's mature ethical works from the *Groundwork to the Metaphysics of Morals* (1785) to the *Metaphysics of Morals* (1797) focusing on the various forms of the experience of freedom. Along the way, I take a stand on some important and much debated issues concerning the development of the Kantian concept of freedom.

### Hegel, Tocqueville and Two Concepts of Freedom

CSABA KISS

“Negative” and “positive” freedom, understood in their customary sense, are hard to reconcile. Only two of the political thinkers of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, Hegel and Tocqueville, attempted to synthesize them. Although the method they used, and the philosophical tradition which they belonged to, were quite different, both of them thought that there is no individual freedom without participation in political institutions or communities. The intention of this paper is to analyse their political philosophies focusing on their account of freedom, and to show how similar their conclusions about the possibility of political freedom in the modern age are.

### Sartre and the Limits of Freedom: Three Dimensions of Passivity in Sartre

BENCE PÉTER MAROSÁN

According to Sartre consciousness is a pure, transparent, self-enclosed region of activity which is limited only by itself (*L'Être et le Néant*. Éditions Gallimard, 2009. 325f.). In his opinion one would reify the consciousness if one brings passivity into it, as its integral moment. That is to say: if one interprets the consciousness as being passive from a certain point of view, then one would make it a dead thing, similar to a stone or a tarpaulin (cf. *Esquisse d'une théorie des émotions*. Éditions Hermann, 1995. 63). Man is essentially an active being, and the Being, the “being-in-itself” (*l'Être-en-soi*) is essentially passive, a dead matter (2009. 31f.). The consciousness as an entirely free, active power and the Being as entirely passive, immobile, in itself “dead” entity are “two incommunicable regions” (2009. 31). Many interpreters (such as Merleau-Ponty, *Phénoménologie de la perception*, 1946) understood Sartre's conception of freedom – on the basis of these statements – as a rigid, Cartesian view of consciousness and activity. We should remark immediately that Sartre in his above mentioned works and also in other writings made many other statements concerning consciousness and reality which refine this conception.

In my paper I would like to show that altogether Sartre had a very concrete concept of freedom, which is deeply embedded into the world and real life. Despite the fact that in Sartre the active character of freedom is in the foreground (a character which – in some analyses of the author – endows the consciousness with a “Protean”, from a certain point of view faceless character), due to which the consciousness is able to transcend every actual situation, I think we could also show that in the Sartrean conception of freedom there is also the element of passivity, which appears inside the freedom, which essentially belongs to it, and which functions as a counter-power against activity. Sartre emphasizes this passivity explicitly concerning my relation to the Other, when he says that my

freedom could be limited only by the freedom of the Other (2009. 326). In this paper I would like to demonstrate that in Sartre's analyses of consciousness we could find the concept of passivity in three essential points: 1) in the phenomena of dispositions and emotions, 2) in the phenomenological interpretation of the body (*la chair*), and 3) in the relation of me and the Other. These topics were particularly important in post-war French phenomenology and philosophy as well – and in my opinion it was Sartre, who played a major role in this development.

I would like to make it clear that we cannot interpret adequately Sartre's concept of freedom if we abstracts from the moments of passivity in his philosophy.

