

UNITED WISDOM

Determinism: Does Causation Mean Predetermination?

World and Consciousness

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

W23 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Determinism: Does Causation Mean Predetermination?

Epigraph

> *if we choose to move, we also may.*

David Hume, An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding, VIII, § 73; an exact conditional clause excerpt. Acting according to the will requires an available possibility; the following text excludes a prisoner in chains. The quotation promises no universal availability of every action to every person.

What this article is about

An action has causes: does that make deliberation irrelevant? The conclusion often merges different questions: explaining an action, a unique outcome under specified conditions, predicting it, and acting without coercion. This article separates them through bounded Laplace and Hume readings and a distinct physical comparison limit. Laplace's imagined intelligence retains all required conditions rather than promising an available human forecast. Hume's freedom definition remains philosophical without closing every free-will dispute. Within UW's Action, the original practical question is which conditions are known, what constrains a deed, and which step is available now. Deliberation, information, and others' consent can belong within the action situation instead of standing outside causal description. This proves no metaphysical freedom and does not turn every difficulty into an inward choice. Quantum chance, another person's motives, and universal predetermination receive no confirmation from a historical philosophical quotation.

I. Different meanings within one confident conclusion

Take an original simple problem: y = a + b. Given a and b, the expression determines y. That does not mean replacing b leaves the result unchanged, or that someone knows the result without knowing b. Rule, conditions, and knowledge can be examined separately. The problem models neither an entire life nor the structure of choice. It reveals a substitution: determination under specified values becomes an assertion that values are irrelevant or available changes affect nothing. The latter does not follow from the former even here. A well-defined result under fixed inputs provides no argument for ignoring an input or silently describing a changed problem as the same one.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Cause also needs a specified question. It may mean a circumstance helping explain an action, a sequence model, or a full condition set merely assumed. Causal explanation is not automatically exhaustive here. Someone choosing a meeting because of a changed deadline reports a stated ground. A complete decision history needs further information; universal uniqueness of every event needs a different argument. An intelligible explanation deserves consideration within its scope without settling nature's entire causal structure through one useful example. Respecting an account does not require assigning it all possible explanatory authority. Its relevance can be acknowledged while additional claims remain conditional, unexamined, or genuinely open.

Predetermination in ordinary speech may instead mean that outcomes are independent of action, making action useless. Call that inference fatalistic here and distinguish it from a result determined under complete conditions. If action is included among conditions, a result under them does not establish that action can be omitted unchanged. This is a conceptual distinction rather than an established verdict about the universe. Our expression cannot arbitrarily lose b and remain the same problem. In a human situation, identify whether the subject is a possible outcome, a deed, or an assumption that effort never matters. The last needs its own grounds instead of being hidden inside a different claim about conditions.

Absent prediction does not independently prove absent causes. A condition may be unknown, a question imprecise, or an explanation incomplete. The article does not promise a discoverable single hidden ground behind every uncertainty; not knowing remains possible. For a contemporary example, that can suffice: a forecast is unconfirmed while available actions remain discussable. Nobody must settle metaphysics before clarifying a meeting, requesting assistance, or revising an arrangement. Failure to settle it supplies no grounds for declaring those deeds useless in advance. A limited practical question can remain meaningful without being expected to determine which general account of the world's causes is ultimately correct.

II. Laplace's intelligence and human prediction

In Laplace's Chapter II, an imagined intelligence knows all forces and positions and can analyze the data. Past and future would be determined for it. The author also stresses actual human knowledge's distance from the ideal. The text is Truscott and Emory's 1902 translation; the French was not checked. This is a historical explanatory thesis with demanding conditions, rather than a confirmed technology for forecasting every deed or a description of contemporary artificial intelligence. A conditional intellectual ideal should not silently become an available method merely because part of its formulation resembles a familiar prediction task.

The conditions matter as much as the striking conclusion. Retaining only complete determination removes what makes the intelligence exceptional. Partial information does not equal every necessary datum; one calculation does not equal the required comprehensive analysis. Even a successful forecast of one subject confirms none of the remaining powers. This is the logic of a conditional assertion. Applying it to a person or device requires establishing corresponding conditions separately. No correspondence is established here. A confident promise to predict someone else's decision therefore gains no proof from Laplace's name or a convenient image of total knowledge. The promise remains a further claim with a separate evidential burden.

Consider our own meeting arrangement. Someone knows the proposed time but not another participant's availability or whether the message arrived. The proposal can be recorded precisely while the outcome remains unconfirmed. More information changes the question's status: a reply arrives, a condition becomes clear, or unavailability is discovered. This is neither a determinism experiment nor an illustration of omniscience. It separates fact from expectation. A decision may require one clarification rather than the world's complete history. If unavailable, choose with the limit stated; an assumption should not become proven consent, and no reply should not become evidence of inevitable refusal. The information gap and its practical consequence can be considered directly.

A constructed model also differs from confidence in its application. A model can give a unique result for specified inputs while real inputs remain unknown or fail to match its formulation. Calculation accuracy does not then establish forecast accuracy. The original y = a + b problem shows this without a scientific promise: without b, the answer remains conditional. In life, missing information need not reduce to a number, and another person need not become a transparent calculation object. They may answer, revise a decision, or decline. Respecting that boundary does not prove every deed uncaused; it simply preserves what is and is not known within the actual interaction.

III. Hume: regularity and inference

In Hume's Section VIII, §§ 64 and 71–72, necessity is examined through regularity and inference rather than direct perception of hidden force. This differs philosophically from Laplace's comprehensive ideal. The read edition is Selby-Bigge, 1902. Historical human-nature generalizations are not adopted as verified current statistics. The argument identifies a transition from observation to explanation without providing an infallible motive-reading method. It gives a question about inference, not a ready answer about the exact reasons behind a participant's present action or a general permission to assume that reasons have already been established.

In a contemporary illustration, someone notices that a participant usually replies after work. This can suggest when clarification is appropriate if conditions are known. Previous observation does not confirm the current motive for silence. Work may have changed, the message may not have arrived, or the question may need another response. A specific inference needs corresponding information. This caution does not prohibit using experience; it distinguishes a working expectation from an established claim. Usually and certainly are not interchangeable even when a familiar sequence helped before. Past usefulness can support a limited next step without confirming every proposed explanation of a different current case.

Regularity also depends on what counts as the same case. Messages can share length while differing in conditions; refusals can arise under different resources and agreements. Comparison needs an appropriate subject rather than resemblance alone. Ask which circumstance was considered relevant, what remained unknown, and why an inference transfers to a new case. This is an inquiry into one's explanation, not a general behaviour theory. Sometimes situations cannot be compared confidently. Clarification may then be a better step than constructing a rule from a small or unclear set. Acknowledging that limit preserves the possibility of using suitable experience later, once the relevant conditions are identified rather than assumed.

A causal account can explain without justifying. A new deadline preventing a meeting helps identify a refusal's condition, while an earlier promise and its consequences require separate inquiry. Causes can be examined alongside what is needed now. Neither rejecting explanation entirely nor dismissing every responsibility is required. This follows from the illustration rather than a legal standard or clinical assessment. Circumstances, action availability, and the needed agreement remain separate questions. The statement that an action had causes does not alone close further discussion. A participant may still need clarification, a changed arrangement, or acknowledgment of a consequence even after one relevant part of the explanation is accepted.

IV. Freedom as an available deed

In § 73, Hume defines the freedom under discussion as acting or not acting according to the will, retaining external constraint through his prisoner example. This is a conditional philosophical definition rather than a promise to remove every coercion. It separates a decision's causes from action availability. It proves no resolution of every free-will dispute and assesses no person's actual capabilities by itself. The practical distinction is narrower: wanting an action and having conditions to perform it need not be the same fact. Both can matter while further philosophical questions about choice remain unresolved by the definition alone.

Suppose someone wants to leave for a meeting but transport is unavailable. Intention creates no route automatically. Alternatively, leaving is possible but the time remains unagreed; or

movement is possible but staying is preferred for a stated reason. These differ in availability and decision. “Did not act” is insufficient explanation. Identify the absent condition and the deed considered. Within Action, this is more useful than demanding proof of free will through vivid inner experience. External constraints remain facts despite clear wishes, and an independent refusal need not indicate deficient intention. The question should preserve which circumstance actually belongs to the case rather than substituting an imagined unlimited opportunity.

An unavailable deed should not turn causal discussion into blame that correct thinking would have solved everything. Resources, health, spatial accessibility, dependence on another decision, or coercion may constrain it. No diagnosis or universal remedy is proposed. Name the needed condition and examine possibilities in the particular situation. A changed plan or assistance may be available; sometimes there is no suitable step now. A negative answer about one deed is not a general characterization of a person. It concerns this action under current conditions, which cannot silently become imagined unlimited capacity. Clearer description can identify a limit without demanding its removal by intention alone.

Discussed alternatives also do not independently prove metaphysical freedom. Someone can name options without being able to perform them, have an opportunity without knowing consequences, or decide under a significant constraint. Option, availability, and grounds for choice are therefore separate questions. They may help an ordinary agreement while a philosophical dispute remains open. Hume's distinction supplies a question; participants own the contemporary decision. Agreement with desire guarantees no correctness, and an action need not lack every cause to deserve substantive discussion. The practical inquiry can remain useful without claiming to establish the final relationship between a person's will and every condition affecting its expression.

V. Deliberation belongs within action conditions

“If everything has causes, thinking is pointless” excludes deliberation from the situation without explaining why. In our example, someone receives a time clarification, considers route availability, and revises a plan. Information and consideration belong to what occurred. Their grounds can be examined without declaring them nonexistent. Universal determinism is not proved; an inference's boundary is considered. A process's causal character does not entail a result independent of its components. That independence needs separate support instead of being presented as an inevitable conclusion of any causal discussion. A described relationship between conditions and an outcome cannot justify ignoring one condition merely because it includes a decision or a thought.

In y = a + b, changing an input under the same rule changes the result. This models no consciousness, but exposes the inference “a rule exists, therefore the input is irrelevant.”

Clarification, decision, or assistance can be significant conditions where the particular evidence supports that assessment. Not every deliberation is promised to improve an outcome. Further discussion may merely repeat known information, allowing it to stop. A step's value depends on the task and available change rather than continuous analysis as proof of freedom or the usefulness of every reflective minute. The illustration distinguishes a supported practical claim from a universal requirement to think more before any action can count as meaningful.

Deliberation also cannot substitute for another participant's action. A carefully prepared request still lacks consent; understanding a need still lacks an obtained resource. Preparation is not worthless: it has its own result, while further conditions need establishment separately. Name the stage without attributing a completed decision to others. Causal language can preserve actual contributions from different circumstances. It does not make another will a precalculated plan component or turn refusal into a technical error necessarily corrected by a more convincing account of one's intention. A clear explanation may help discussion while leaving the other person's response open, independent in its practical status, and unavailable to declare on their behalf.

A discussion changing a decision does not settle metaphysics either. New information and a subsequent deed can be described while choice's complete structure needs a different argument. Practical precision needs no exaggeration. A participant can say that a deadline is known and an option available, then propose it. Another can respond differently. Their exchange remains substantive with the philosophical question open. Within Action, the available step has a named ground. It requires no proof of an uncaused decision and promises no removal of external constraints or universal agreement through a correct formulation. Its adequacy can be assessed against the actual task without becoming a test of an entire theory of freedom.

VI. Determination, prediction, and time direction

A separate physical boundary prevents conflation. In Lebowitz's paper, pp. 32 and 38, dynamical sensitivity does not substitute for macroscopic direction's explanation; description and conditions matter. This establishes no predetermined personal life. Physics is used only as a comparison boundary; a substantive chaos account is outside this article. Quantum chance supplies no inference to human freedom either. A separate physical question cannot become an answer about a participant's autonomy merely through shared words about uncertainty, change, or an unpredictable next event.

Even the original simple problem separates prediction by what is known from determination by what is specified. An observer without b does not know y; their ignorance does not alter the expression. Changing b creates another problem with another condition. A question about

direction in a real process needs physical information the expression does not contain. All three distinctions can remain visible without selecting a slogan: everything is calculable, random, or mood-dependent. In each case identify the subject and grounds for the transition. A model can demonstrate a small logical point without being expected to supply a physical account of every phenomenon described alongside it.

For a person, this does not mean treating them as a simple expression. Mathematics illustrates an inference structure without measuring motives, values, or consent. A real decision needs suitable information and the participant's opportunity to explain their position. Not knowing their future answer proves neither absence of causes nor an already fixed motive. A question can be clarified, one's conditions named, and an available answer awaited. If none arrives, decide with a knowledge boundary. An ideal-intelligence image cannot remove it: the historical account explicitly assigns conditions unavailable to us. Using the image honestly requires retaining that difference instead of presenting ordinary uncertainty as a mere failure to exercise supposedly accessible total knowledge.

Event direction prescribes no moral evaluation of the future. A past deed occurring does not make a next step useless; changing some conditions does not establish complete restoration. These questions remain separate from a causal thesis. A failed meeting permits discussion of another time without declaring earlier waiting never occurred. If another time is impossible, acknowledge the constraint without concluding every further attempt inevitably fails. Current decision accuracy depends on its named subject rather than a universal fate narrative explaining and justifying every sequence beforehand. A bounded answer can support action while declining a larger story for which the example supplies no adequate grounds.

VII. Explanation does not justify harm

In §§ 78–81, Hume examines a theological objection and difficulties relating causal argument to evaluation; the objection is not his final conclusion. His treatment of suffering does not let a concrete experience be replaced by promised universal good. The article resolves no theological problem and derives no modern responsibility standard from the historical text. A boundary remains: even a strong causal account supplies no automatic moral justification. Explaining an event, evaluating its consequences, and deciding what to do about them require their questions to remain visible rather than receiving one answer from the existence of a cause alone.

Our own example can explain why a mistaken time entered a message while acknowledging consequences for someone else. An error history does not erase lost time. It may help prevent recurrence if a relevant condition is actually identified, but that is another task, not complete consequence removal. Correction and a new agreement can be discussed without requiring anyone to call the event a useful lesson. Their attitude need not match the sender's

explanation. No legal obligation is inferred here; the subject is a limited contemporary discussion of conditions and available action. The fact of a consequence remains relevant even when one part of the history has been explained convincingly.

“It had to happen” may conceal missing grounds. The phrase can report confidence without proving unique outcomes under all conditions or an event's justification. The first needs an appropriate model and information; the second needs independent moral grounds. Ordinary discussion can be more precise: it occurred, some causes are known, consequences are identified, and a next question is open. This requires no universal predetermination and no universe-wide dispute before a particular correction. A knowledge boundary can accompany accessible action when its conditions and purpose are named. A concrete account may be sufficient for a decision without pretending to prove that no other outcome was possible in every relevant sense.

Causation also warrants no general accusation. Dependence on conditions does not require a participant to control them all. Assistance that could have changed a result was not necessarily available. An explanation found now was not necessarily known before. Assessment needs temporal position, actual capabilities, and others' participation preserved. No final answer to every difficult question is promised. They remain specific instead of being replaced by a philosophical formula for what someone could actually do, what they did, and which limits matter now. Better causal description can expose an unexamined question without authorizing an unsupported judgment that every necessary condition was under the person's control.

VIII. An available step with the larger question open

Within Action, start with one present question rather than await a final free-will verdict. Is a time clarification, plan change, request for help, or withdrawal from an unmanageable promise needed? Naming the subject identifies information. A meeting needs agreement and availability; assistance needs possibility and response; a revised plan needs its changed condition stated. This is original UW application, not a Laplace or Hume protocol, and its benefit is not experimentally established. It simply makes a next step discussable and checkable where a causal account became too broad to help the selected task. The proposal should be assessed in that limited role rather than treated as an answer to every theoretical dispute.

Distinguish known, unknown, and constrained. A time is proposed, a reply unknown, and a route restricted. These should not merge into “everything is predetermined.” Unknowns sometimes permit clarification, constraints sometimes alternatives, and established facts may need no further check. If no suitable step exists now, say so. This proves neither absent freedom in every sense nor weak intention. It describes the current subject. Proportionate inquiry preserves autonomy without promising an immediate exit for every question or control

of every external condition through one's decision. The distinction can identify what remains open even where practical action is presently limited or depends on information another person has not supplied.

After acting, check the result within its scope. A sent request is not obtained help; a personal calendar entry is not shared agreement; a decision is not performance. Naming these stages preserves the next question. Another participant may suggest a different option or decline, and new information may require reconsideration. None automatically confirms a single metaphysical answer. A substantive step needs action and evidence instead of a promise to prove freedom, defeat causation, or establish the only correct history of every future event. The limited result can be reported honestly without claiming that all conditions, responses, and consequences have already been secured by choosing it.

Causal explanation can therefore be used without excessive authority. It examines conditions without making prediction omniscient; includes decision without eliminating availability and coercion; describes an event without independently justifying harm. Those boundaries permit choosing with a knowledge limit named. A person may continue philosophical inquiry or stop at the present task. For UW, the useful report is what is known, what is missing, and what can be proposed now. It preserves actual circumstances and participants' autonomy without turning a causal history into prewritten permission for inaction or blame. A practical choice remains discussable even when the larger question stays open, conditional, and beyond this article's evidence.

What this means in practice

Choose one current question where predetermined obscures a next step. Leave it alone if not relevant now. This is original UW application without established efficacy or a demand to settle free will before an ordinary action.

Separate explanation, forecast, and availability. What is known about causes, what is anticipated, and which condition constrains action? Do not turn missing information into someone's certain motive or vivid intention into an available resource. A stated cause need not be an exhaustive account. Identify what your actual decision requires rather than searching for an explanation of everything.

Select a proportionate step: clarify a condition, propose an option, check help's availability, or withdraw from an unmanageable promise. Preserve others' right to answer differently. Deliberation is not consent received, and a step's possible usefulness is not proof of metaphysical freedom. Name the condition that still requires another participant's response.

After acting, report a confirmed result and an open question. Stop when the answer suffices, or acknowledge that no suitable step exists now. Neither outcome requires declaring life

wholly uncaused or predetermined. The proposal clarifies a present action domain while preserving constraints and participants' decisions.

Key quotation

> *nothing would be uncertain*

Pierre-Simon Laplace, A Philosophical Essay on Probabilities, II; an exact complete-clause excerpt from Frederick Wilson Truscott and Frederick Lincoln Emory's 1902 translation. It requires an imagined intelligence knowing all needed forces and positions and capable of analysis. The adjacent account stresses actual human knowledge's distance from the ideal. No forecast of every deed is promised.

Connections between traditions

Comparison question	What the selected passages say	Similarity and significance for the topic	Specific boundary
An ideal intelligence and grounds for causal inference	Laplace, II, describes an intelligence that could encompass past and future in one formula given complete knowledge of forces and positions and sufficient analytical capacity. Hume, VIII, §§ 64, 71–72, relates necessity to observed constant conjunction and the mind's inference from one event to another; hidden power does not become directly observable.	Both ask what grounds a connection among events. For this article, their comparison separates a comprehensive conditional explanation from what experience supplies to a human causal inference.	Laplace's global ideal is not identical to Hume's analysis of regularity and inference. A shared question about connection does not turn their metaphysical grounds into one doctrine.
Determination and a limited forecast	Laplace, II, explicitly places human intelligence at an infinite distance from his ideal intelligence. Hume, VIII, §§ 66–68, explains variation in conduct through character, customs, and circumstances, and relates apparent exceptions to counteracting causes that an observer may not know.	Both distinguish a predictor's limitations from a claim about an event's causes. A failed forecast therefore does not prove absent causes, while a causal claim alone supplies no particular person with an accurate forecast.	Laplace posits a conditional global ideal; Hume argues through experience and human conduct. These historical arguments establish neither contemporary universal determinism nor reliable access to another person's motives.

Comparison question	What the selected passages say	Similarity and significance for the topic	Specific boundary
Causes of a decision and ability to act	Hume, VIII, §§ 73, 77, defines liberty conditionally as the ability to act or refrain according to the will and retains the qualification about a prisoner in chains. Laplace, II, includes motives of choice in a causal explanation and disputes a decision without a determining ground.	The comparison separates why a decision arose from whether a person can carry it out without the specified obstacle. It lets the article discuss practical freedom without treating every causal explanation as proof of coercion.	Hume's definition does not resolve every competing conception of freedom. Laplace's motive claim establishes no absence of imprisonment, pressure, disability, or inadequate resources in a particular situation.
Information and dependence on others	Hume, VIII, § 69, shows how a person's actions rely on expected conduct by others, including work and cooperation. Laplace, II, relates probability assessment in the urn example to available information: changed knowledge alters the grounds of calculation without necessarily changing the case itself.	Both include an observer's situation and available connections in explaining judgement or action. The article's original UW question about missing information and available help is consequently part of a choice situation, rather than an attempt to escape every cause.	Hume's social expectations and Laplace's mathematical comparison of information conditions concern different subjects. The proposed question remains an original UW application, with no efficacy or guaranteed outcome established by these passages.
A strong thesis and the limits of an answer	Laplace, II, extends sufficient reason to events and the causes of choice. Hume, VIII, § 75, separates a thesis's truth from objections to its dangerous consequences; in § 81, he leaves the theological difficulty beyond what this reasoning can adequately resolve.	Both selected moves distinguish the content of a strong argument from grounds for accepting it. For this topic, a completed formulation must not become proof that a person already knows the entire course of the future.	Laplace's explanatory thesis and Hume's discussion limit perform different roles. Historical authority establishes no contemporary universal theory, existence of God, or current standard of responsibility.

Comparison question	What the selected passages say	Similarity and significance for the topic	Specific boundary
Explaining an event and evaluating harm	Hume, VIII, §§ 79–80, considers the limits of consolation through universal good: philosophical reasoning does not remove concrete suffering or distinctions among actions. Laplace, I, discusses probabilistic judgement in the moral sciences where knowledge falls short of strict demonstration.	The passages distinguish explanation, evaluation, and decision under limited knowledge. In this article, naming a cause of harm does not replace questions about consequences, available protection, and a next action.	Hume's theological dispute is not Laplace's discussion of probabilistic judgement. Neither passage justifies inflicted harm or supplies a contemporary legal or clinical decision rule.
Causal determination and the direction of events	Laplace, II, conditions ideal complete prediction on knowledge of law and state and sufficient analytical ability. Lebowitz, pp. 32 and 38, distinguishes chaotic behavior with few degrees of freedom from macroscopic irreversibility and relates directional behavior to typicality and preparation conditions.	Both require us to identify what an asserted explanation needs. The comparison separates causal determination, forecasting capacity, and the physical direction of a macroscopic process; predetermination alone does not replace these three questions.	Laplace's ideal intelligence and Lebowitz's specified statistical mechanics do not describe one subject. Conditions of a physical explanation prove neither a predetermined personal life, decision efficacy, nor a spiritual law of entropy.

Primary sources

1. David Hume, An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding, original English; L. A. Selby-Bigge, second edition, 1902, posthumous 1777 text. VIII, Parts I–II, §§ 62–81: causal inference, liberty, and theological limits. Historical generalizations are not contemporary empirical findings.

2. Pierre-Simon Laplace, A Philosophical Essay on Probabilities, Frederick Wilson Truscott / Frederick Lincoln Emory, from the sixth French edition; John Wiley & Sons / Chapman & Hall,

1902. I–II and III opening: ideal intelligence and knowledge conditions. The ideal intelligence is not presented as an available omniscience technology.

3. Joel L. Lebowitz, Boltzmann's Entropy and Time's Arrow, Physics Today, 46, September 1993, pp. 32–38; original English. The selected physical domain limits comparison; quantum and cosmological conjectures supply no contemporary answer about human freedom.

Tags

determinism, causation, predetermination, freedom, action, Hume, Laplace, causal explanation, prediction, conditions, intention, will, coercion, availability, choice, information, regularity, necessity, fatalism, responsibility, consequences, cooperation, consent, ideal intelligence, knowledge boundary, model, physics, autonomy

About the authors

Andrey Zarinsh is the author and founder of United Wisdom. He explores inner transformation, the unity of traditions, intercultural dialogue, and contemporary spiritual discipline. Instagram: @andrey.zarinsh.

Maria Evilkut is a co-author of United Wisdom. Alongside her research, she seeks to test these ideas in practice and observe how principles of unity and mutual understanding work in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.