

Chapter 1 : 12 Things Successful People Do Differently

This dissertation comprises five chapters on the metaphysics of persistence, persons and vagueness. Chapter one investigates extant formulations of the two main competing views about persistence, viz., endurantism and perdurantism. These formulations are criticized on the grounds that they fail to.

Impact on Campus Speech. The Effect. 33 2. Suppression of Discussed Topics and Viewpoints. The Supposed Right Not to be Offended. The Vitality and Functioning of Our Universities. Debunking Some Common Justifications: Protecting Minority Students from Injurious Speech. 59 1. Counterspeech is the Most Effective Response. Eliminating Prejudice and Advancing Equality. Censorship Leads to Dangerous and Counterproductive Outcomes. 75 3. Speech Codes Are Rarely Enforced. The Continual Prevalence of Speech Codes. More and Different Types of Policies Examined. Conflicting Statements and Explanations. 82 V. Continued Speech Code Litigation. Public Exposure and Advocacy. 82 C. Changing the Cultural Norms. Temple University [8] being the most significant among the recent decisions. As a strongly worded federal circuit court decision, DeJohn should send an unequivocal message to university administrators that speech codes are legally untenable in the university setting. Currently, however, speech codes are commonplace on college campuses, and they severely restrict the ability of students to participate in, and contribute to, a true marketplace of ideas. The topic of speech codes has been covered in both legal scholarship [17] and in mainstream publications. This article seeks to fill the gap in the literature. It then outlines the case law on speech codes, under which courts have uniformly struck down speech codes challenged through litigation. It proceeds to analyze the ways in which speech codes have led to the restriction of free speech in higher education. The most direct of these is to continue to challenge the constitutionality of speech codes in court. A second measure is public exposure of speech codes, since they tend to be heavily disfavored by the public at large and universities frequently wish to avoid the negative publicity generated by such exposure. The Origins and Legal History of Speech Codes In this section, I will begin by tracing the origins of speech codes, which began to appear on college campuses roughly two decades ago and proliferated quickly. I will then lay out the case law on speech codes, under which every single legal challenge to a speech code has been decided in favor of free speech. The Sudden Rise of Speech Codes Starting roughly two decades ago, speech codes seemingly appeared out of nowhere and began to proliferate across college campuses. There is no consensus to explain why this occurred, and commentators have posited various theories to account for the development. What is uncontroverted is that once they began to appear, they spread rapidly. For instance, one estimate is that between the years of and alone, colleges and universities adopted new speech codes. The first category argues that speech codes were a nationwide response to violent episodes of racial and other intolerance which took place on many college campuses in the s and early s, creating a generally unreceptive environment for racial and ethnic minorities, female students, and other historically disadvantaged groups. Commentators espousing this theory start with the backdrop of increased enrollment and access to education for minority groups over the previous decades. As I shall later discuss, [34] they have had a tremendously harmful impact upon the state of free speech on campus. But first, I turn to the legal history of speech codes in the courts. The Case Law on Speech Codes: A Uniform Rejection It did not take long after the rise of speech codes on campuses nationwide for plaintiffs to begin successfully challenging their constitutionality in court. University of Michigan, [36] was handed down in A federal district court found that the policy was facially vague [39] as well as overbroad [40] because it

stifled protected speech, both within and outside classroom discussion, on the basis of its mere offensiveness. Central Michigan University [47] was the first speech code case decided by a federal appellate court. Also in , a California state court decided the first and to date only speech code case involving a private university, Corry v. Leland Stanford Junior University. Shippensburg University, [65] a decision, involved a speech code with several flawed provisions. Reed, [73] a case, a federal court issued a preliminary injunction enjoining the enforcement of several speech code provisions, finding that the overbreadth challenges to them were likely to prevail on the merits. Temple University, [78] arising from a facial overbreadth challenge to a sexual harassment policy. The most recent speech code decision was handed down in by a California federal district court in Lopez v. Doctrinal Problems As demonstrated by the case law outlined in the previous section, speech codes present several doctrinal problems under the First Amendment, most fundamentally overbreadth, vagueness, and content-based and viewpoint-based discrimination. A publicly told offensive joke or the use of vulgar or indecent language, for example, would not come close to meeting any of the carved-out exceptions to the First Amendment. Universities would be hard-pressed to distinguish such policies appreciably from the speech codes which have previously been struck down on overbreadth grounds. Vagueness Second, university speech codes are often unconstitutionally vague. Under the Texas Southern policy, for example, it is not immediately clear what type of verbal conduct would constitute an attempt to cause emotional or mental harm. Policies such as these are far too vague to withstand a constitutional challenge. Content- and Viewpoint-Based Discrimination Third, many speech codes impermissibly discriminate against speech on the basis of content or viewpoint. Paul [] that, even within otherwise proscribable classes of speech such as fighting words, the state cannot discriminate on the basis of content or viewpoint by, for instance, prohibiting the expression of fighting words directed at particular groups while allowing similar expression directed at other groups. As a result, it too presents the danger of guiding campus dialogue in a particular direction. Legal commentators have recognized that many speech codes discriminate against expression on the basis of content or viewpoint. Impact on Campus Speech Due to their many constitutional flaws, speech codes have had, and continue to have, a severely harmful impact on campus speech. Second, speech codes suppress disfavored speech. Third, speech codes invite a feeling of entitlement, or a perceived right not to be offended, among many students. The Chilling Effect As discussed in the previous section, speech codes are often overbroad or vague or both. They typically fail to provide students with adequate notice of the categories of speech that are prohibited and the forms that remain permissible. Students must necessarily guess as to the scope of the speech code, and additionally, an administrator attempting to enforce the speech code in a particular case must arbitrate the imprecise language and uncertain reach of the code. Such chilling of expression is fundamentally impermissible under First Amendment law. They represent a blatant attempt to evade the constitutional scrutiny attached to written speech codes. Suppression of Disfavored Topics and Viewpoints Second, speech codes suppress the discussion of disfavored topics and expression of disfavored viewpoints. As previously discussed, many speech codes discriminate against expression on the basis of content or viewpoint. When universities maintain and enforce such policies, they effectively drive certain beliefs and ideas out of campus discussion. This results in a one-sided debate on particular issues and thus an incomplete marketplace of ideas. Furthermore, when campus debate is restricted to only that which is comfortable and orthodox, those who hold those prevailing views are themselves harmed. This is due to the fact that unchallenged viewpoints tend to be poorly thought-out and weakly constructed, and therefore easily discredited. Moreover, these speech codes encompass clearly protected expression and contravene longstanding jurisprudence holding that there is no exception to the First Amendment for speech which is merely offensive, prejudicial, or vile. This is harmful in that a modern liberal arts education requires exposure to, and tolerance of, a wide range of ideas and interactions, some of which may be disagreeable or offensive. Critical education, however, would require the toleration of all ideas, however uncivil. Simply claiming offense and demanding that a university administration intervene, on the other hand, does not benefit them in the long run. Thus, the perceived right not to be offended perpetrates significant harm on the college campus. The Vitality and Functioning of Our Universities By chilling much campus speech, restricting the expression of disfavored ideas and viewpoints, and contributing to a perceived right not to be offended, speech codes have caused and continue to cause

tremendous cumulative harm on college campuses. A university education then becomes indoctrination rather than development of the mind to challenge what is and to discover what ought to be. Moreover, speech codes hinder the development of effective leaders for the future. Responses to Speech Code Proponents In spite of the myriad problems presented by speech codes, as well as their uniform rejection by the courts, some legal commentators have defended their use in higher education. These commentators have put forth several arguments that, taken in conjunction with each other, attempt to justify their continued presence on college campuses. In this section, I will respond to these arguments by demonstrating that speech codes in fact do not offer the benefits that their proponents claim and that, rather, the harms they create strongly counsel against their continued enactment and application. There are five major arguments that I will address in this section. While none of them are dispositive on their own, in the aggregate, they attempt to show that the benefits offered by speech codes outweigh the harms. The first argument is that speech codes actually operate in favor of campus speech by providing clear notice of what is protected speech and what is prohibited. Second, some commentators posit that sexist, racist, and other prejudicial or demeaning speech is of low social value and thus may rightfully be banned. Third, other theorists argue that speech codes are necessary to protect historically disadvantaged minorities from injurious speech. Fourth, still others make the argument that speech codes combat racism, sexism, and other forms of prejudice in our society. The fifth and final argument which I will address is that speech codes are rarely enforced and therefore do not pose a major threat to free expression. Speech Codes Provide Clear Notice to Speakers Some argue that speech codes are actually beneficial to campus speech because they provide speakers with some notice about what speech is permissible and what is prohibited. Thomas Grey, one of the drafters of the Stanford University policy struck down in *Corry*, [] espoused this view in defending that policy. The alternative to defining that speech is uncertainty about how far the regulation extends, and this casts a chill on speech. As an initial matter, far too many speech codes are in fact unconstitutionally vague, as demonstrated by the speech codes case law [] as well as by several of the sample policies I have provided in this article. To the extent that speech codes are unconstitutionally vague, they fail to provide adequate guidance with respect to prohibited speech and therefore contribute significantly to a chilling effect on campus speech. Additionally, even when speech codes avoid the vagueness problem by providing clear, concrete statements of what is prohibited and what is not, they often encompass protected speech and thus fail the overbreadth doctrine or constitute content- or viewpoint-based discrimination. This too has been borne out in the case law [] and also can be seen in some of the example policies discussed in this article. This explains why other commentators have rejected arguments touting the benefits of speech codes for campus speech. However, the only way to improve speech is to abolish all speech codes. As illustrated in the aforementioned *Iota Xi* case, [] implicit speech codes allow university administrators to selectively censor expression which they deem to be disagreeable or unwanted.

Chapter 2 : 7 Habits Of Highly Persistent People

Thesis (Ph. D.)--University of Notre Dame, Thesis directed by Alvin Plantinga and Peter van Inwagen for the Department of Philosophy. "March " Includes bibliographical references.

Vagueness doctrine Save In American constitutional law , a statute is void for vagueness and unenforceable if it is too vague for the average citizen to understand. There are several reasons a statute may be considered vague; in general, a statute might be called void for vagueness reasons when an average citizen cannot generally determine what persons are regulated, what conduct is prohibited, or what punishment may be imposed. Criminal laws which do not state explicitly and definitely what conduct is punishable for example are void for vagueness. To summarize the contents of the doctrine, it establishes specific criteria all laws, or any legislation must meet, to qualify as constitutional. Such criteria includes the following: Definitions of potentially vague terms are to be provided. Roots and purpose In the case of vagueness, a statute might be considered void on constitutional grounds. Specifically, roots of the vagueness doctrine extend into the two due process clauses, in the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution. The courts have generally determined that vague laws deprive citizens of their rights without fair process, thus violating due process. The following pronouncement of the void for vagueness doctrine was made by Justice Sutherland in *Connally v. The void for vagueness doctrine is a constitutional rule. This rule requires that criminal laws are so written that they explicitly and definitely state what conduct is punishable. The void for vagueness doctrine thus serves two purposes. All persons receive a fair notice of what is punishable and what is not. The vagueness doctrine helps prevent arbitrary enforcement of the laws and arbitrary prosecutions. When a law does not specifically enumerate the practices that are either required or prohibited. In this case, the ordinary citizen does not know what the law requires. When a law does not specifically detail the procedure followed by officers or judges of the law. As a guard, a law must particularly detail what officers are to do, providing both for what they must do and what they must not do. Judges must, under the doctrine, have a clear understanding of how they are to approach and handle a case. To satisfy the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment, individuals are entitled to understand the scope and nature of statutes which might subject them to criminal penalties. It is derived from the due process doctrine found in the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution. No one must risk criminal prosecution merely because he or she cannot reasonably understand what conduct is prohibited under the law. Jacksonville and *Kolender v. Lawson* were two Supreme Court cases where the court struck down laws against vagrancy for unconstitutional vagueness; in restricting activities like "loafing", "strolling", or "wandering around from place to place", the law gave arbitrary power to the police and, since people could not reasonably know what sort of conduct is forbidden under the law, could potentially criminalize innocuous everyday activities. The *Flipside, Hoffman Estates, Inc.* The Court sided with the village, holding that in such a lawsuit the plaintiff must demonstrate that the law would be "impermissibly vague in all its applications. Supreme Court, in *City of Akron v. United States* , the Supreme Court ruled that the residual clause in the Armed Career Criminal Act was unconstitutionally vague and a violation of due process. The residual clause provided for an enhanced prison sentence for people who had previously been convicted of 3 or more violent felonies, which was defined as "use of physical force against the person of another," "burglary, arson, or extortion," "involves use of explosives," or "otherwise involves conduct that presents a serious potential risk of physical injury to another. Supreme Court case about the meaning of the residual clause" involved whether possession of a short-barrelled shotgun was a violent felony.*

Chapter 3 : Donald Porter Smith, Persistence, Persons, and Vagueness - PhilPapers

people (it was me who bought the book) and the persistence of books (this is the book I bought). Our attitudes to objects often depend partly upon their histories.

We all have our own examples of super successful people like these who we admire. But how do they do it? Here are twelve things they do differently that the rest of us can easily emulate. They create and pursue S. Successful people are objective. They have realistic targets in mind. They know what they are looking for and why they are fighting for it. Successful people create and pursue S. Measurable â€” There must be a logical system for measuring the progress of a goal. To determine if your goal is measurable, ask yourself questions like: How will I know when the goal is accomplished? When you measure your progress, you stay on track, reach your target dates, and experience the exhilaration of achievement that spurs you on to continued efforts required to reach your goal. Attainable â€” To be attainable, a goal must represent an objective toward which you are both willing and able to work. In other words, the goal must be realistic. The big question here is: How can the goal be accomplished? Relevant â€” Relevance stresses the importance of choosing goals that matter. Timely â€” A goal must be grounded within a time frame, giving the goal a target date. A commitment to a deadline helps you focus your efforts on the completion of the goal on or before the due date. This part of the S. When you identify S. You develop the necessary attitude, abilities, and skills. You can achieve almost any goal you set if you plan your steps wisely and establish a time frame that allows you to carry out those steps. Goals that once seemed far away and out of reach eventually move closer and become attainable, not because your goals shrink, but because you grow and expand to match them. They take decisive and immediate action. Sadly, very few people ever live to become the success story they dream about. They never take action! Growing happens when what you know changes how you live. So many people live in a complete daze. Knowledge and intelligence are both useless without action. Success hinges on the simple act of making a decision to live â€” to absorb yourself in the process of going after your dreams and goals. So make that decision. For some practical guidance on taking action I highly recommend Getting Things Done. Most things make no difference. Being busy is often a form of mental laziness â€” lazy thinking and indiscriminate action. Just take a quick look around. The busy outnumber the productive by a wide margin. Busy people are rushing all over the place, and running late half of the time. They barely have enough free time for family get-togethers and they rarely get enough sleep. Yet, business emails are shooting out of their smart phones like machine gun bullets, and their daily planner is jammed to the brim with obligations. Their busy schedule gives them an elevated sense of importance. Review your commitments and goals. Put first things first. Do one thing at a time. Take a short break in two hours. And always remember, results are more important than the time it takes to achieve them. They make logical, informed decisions. Sometimes we do things that are permanently foolish simply because we are temporarily upset or excited. Decisions driven by heavy emotion typically contain minimal amounts of conscious thought, and are primarily based on momentary feelings instead of mindful awareness. The best advice here is simple: Slow down and think things through before you make any life-changing decisions. They avoid the trap of trying to make things perfect. Many of us are perfectionists in our own right. I know I am at times. We set high bars for ourselves and put our best foot forward. We dedicate copious amounts of time and attention to our work to maintain our high personal standards. Our passion for excellence drives us to run the extra mile, never stopping, never relenting. But what happens when we do get carried away with perfectionism? True perfectionists have a hard time starting things and an even harder time finishing them, always. I have a friend who has wanted to start a graphic design business for several years. When you sift through her extensive list of excuses it comes down to one simple problem: She is a perfectionist. It rewards people who get things done. Only by wading through years of practice and imperfection can we begin to achieve momentary glimpses of the perfection. So make a decision. Take action, learn from the outcome, and repeat this method over and over again in all walks of life. Also, check out Too Perfect. They work outside of their comfort zone. In other words, they feel uncomfortable and believe they require additional knowledge, skill, experience, etc. Sadly, this is the kind of thinking that stifles personal

growth and success. Because most great opportunities in life force us to grow emotionally and intellectually. Significant moments of opportunity for personal growth and success will come and go throughout your lifetime. They keep things simple. Here in the 21st century, where information moves at the speed of light and opportunities for innovation seem endless, we have an abundant array of choices when it comes to designing our lives and careers. But sadly, an abundance of choice often leads to complication, confusion and inaction. Several business and marketing studies have shown that the more product choices a consumer is faced with, the less products they typically buy. After all, narrowing down the best product from a pool of three choices is certainly a lot easier than narrowing down the best product from a pool of three hundred choices. If the purchasing decision is tough to make, most people will just give up. Likewise, if you complicate your life by inundating yourself with too many choices, your subconscious mind will give up. The solution is to simplify. Choose something that you think will work and give it a shot. They focus on making small, continuous improvements. How do you eat an elephant? One bite at a time. This philosophy holds true for achieving your biggest goals. Making small, positive changes – eating a little healthier, exercising a little, creating some small productive habits, for example – is an amazing way to get excited about life and slowly reach the level of success you aspire to. When I started doing this in my life, I was so excited I had to start this blog to share it with the world. Start with just one activity, and make a plan for how you will deal with troubles when they arise. It will be hard in the beginning, but it will get easier. As your strength grows, you can take on bigger challenges. They measure and track their progress. They step back and assess their progress regularly. They track themselves against their goals and clearly know what needs to be done to excel and accelerate. Imagine if, while running a small business, you made it a point to keep track of how many pencils and paperclips you used. Would that make any sense? Pencils and paperclips have no bearing on income, customer satisfaction, market growth, etc. The proper approach is to figure out what your number one goal is and then track the things that directly relate to achieving that goal. I recommend that you take some time right now to identify your number one goal, identify the most important things for you to keep track of, and then begin tracking them immediately. On a weekly basis, plug the numbers into a spreadsheet and use the data to create weekly or monthly trend graphs so you can visualize your progress.

1 PERSISTENCE, VAGUENESS, AND LOCATION Antony Eagle University of Adelaide, www.nxgvision.com
Forthcoming in *The Journal of Philosophy* I will discuss two arguments in favor of perdurance.

The argument is defective – “I submit” – and in a number of ways that is worth looking into. So once all the gaps of the argument are filled in, the three-dimensionalist is left with the burden of a response that cannot rely on a passive plea for common sense. The argument is not a threat to common sense as such; it is a threat to the three-dimensionalist faithfulness to common sense. Bananas ripen, houses deteriorate, people lose hairs and acquire new body cells. How can we say that they are the same things, if they are no longer the same? What grounds our belief that the things around us and ourselves, too may survive from day to day, in spite of the many changes that affect them? In this world of flux, persisting things are the only anchor we have, but the source of their persistence appears to be a genuine puzzle – a puzzle that has been with us since the Presocratics. Today, a growing number of philosophers believe that the puzzle betrays a wrong metaphysics of persistence. Just think of time as another dimension along which objects extend, just as they extend across the three spatial dimensions. Then the puzzle disappears. Just as an object can change in space, insofar as its spatial parts can have different properties, so it can change in time – its temporal parts can have different properties. We have got the same thing – “the same banana” – but its temporal parts are not quite alike, just as its spatial parts are not alike. It changes over time just as it changes over space: This way of resetting the issue is extremely effective but also, of course, deeply revisionary. True, the scientific picture of the world seems to provide evidence in favor of the claim, at least since the formulation of special relativity theory. But for many philosophers the challenge is to make the scientific picture compatible with common sense, not to replace one for the other. So to reset the issue along the lines indicated above is to trade one problem for another: And that is no easier question to settle. Can it be settled? One striking feature of the recent debate on these matters is that many more arguments have been offered in favor of the revisionary, four-dimensional conception than in support of the traditional, three-dimensional view. The three-dimensionalist can therefore play defensively: And most three-dimensionalists would insist that none of the arguments offered by their opponents is decisive enough. Still, as the arguments pile up the burden of defense gets heavier, and the three-dimensionalists can no longer satisfy themselves with the generic support that comes from the intuitive plausibility of their view. Adherence to common sense is a desideratum, not a strength. One argument that has been put forward recently is particularly instructive in this regard, and that is what I intend to focus on in this paper. The argument is instructive because it is easy to find it defective and to rest content with such a diagnosis. However, to reject an argument as defective is to accept at least one of the countermodels that it engenders, or to reject one of the premises. Three-dimensionalists may have different views regarding these models, and such differences will affect the details of their metaphysical story. But all such models are, in some important way, compatible with the common-sense picture of the world that three-dimensionalism is meant to defend. With the argument from vagueness the situation is different. The argument is defective, and in a number of ways that is worth looking into. So the argument as such is not a knock-down, that is true. But once all the gaps are filled in, the challenges it raises are nonetheless serious, and one is left with the burden of a response that can no longer rely on a passive plea for common sense. The argument is not a threat to common sense as such; it is a threat to the three-dimensionalist faithfulness to common sense. In a nutshell, the argument says that four-dimensionalism is the only plausible metaphysics of persistence unless one is willing to countenance some form of ontic indeterminacy, i. Other views – three-dimensionalism in *primis* – would be committed to answers that are either implausible or else irredeemably vague, and vague in a way that can only be explained in terms of ontic indeterminacy. Consider the following question – henceforth the Diachronic Composition Question: Given various times and various objects existing at each, under what conditions will there be something that is composed of all and only those objects at those times? So in the end the Diachronic Composition Question amounts to this: Now, on the face of it, there are only three possible answers to this question: A1 Under no conditions at all Nihilism A2 Under certain conditions

but not under others Moderatism A3 Under any conditions whatsoever Universalism One might observe that, strictly speaking, nihilism is logically inconsistent unless composition is understood as strict composition, i. On the other hand, with composition understood as strict composition, the nihilist answer is hardly tenable though there are philosophers who sympathize with itâ€”e. Rosen and Dorr Surely there are mereologically complex objects. My body, for example, is composed of body cells. That is, if the relevant class of times, I, consists of the times at which my body exists, and if the various objects existing at each such time are those body cells of mine that exist at that time, then there is something that consists of all and only those objects at those timesâ€”namely, my body. So, one way or the other, the nihilist answer is out of the game. The real alternative here is between the second answer and the thirdâ€”between moderatism and universalismâ€”and this is essentially the option between asserting some form of restricted composition versus asserting unrestricted composition. Sider argues that moderatism entails ontological vaguenessâ€”which is badâ€”and concludes that universalism, the only remaining option, entails four-dimensionalism. Why should moderatism entail ontological vagueness? Intuitively, a moderate answer to the Diachronic Composition Question is certainly plausible and many philosophers have tried to specify the relevant conditions. David Wiggins, for example, famously tried to come up with conditions that match up with ordinary intuitions, and many have followed in his footsteps. Butâ€”Sider arguesâ€”this is illusory. No such moderate answer can be given. That is, no moderate ontologically determinate answer can be given. It comes in two parts. First, it is claimed that any restricting conditions on compositionâ€”whether synchronic or diachronicâ€”are bound to be vague. Second, it is argued that if the conditions under which composition obtains were vague, it would be a vague matter how many objects there are, hence the vagueness in question would have to be of the ontological sort. Concerning the first pointâ€”to the effect that any restricting conditions on composition would have to be vagueâ€”consider first synchronic composition, i. There is no question that we feel more at ease with certain composites than with others. Is there any principled way of drawing a line between those composites that we find acceptable and those that make us queasy? Indeed, we can easily construct a soritical series that takes us from a clear case where composition obtains the fusion of my current body cells, the relative distance among any two of them being 5 less than n nanometers to a case where composition would seem not to obtain the fusion of my current body cells, were their relative distance increased to n kilometers, and the possibility of such a construction is a sign of vagueness. As we have seen, there certainly is an object that at each time at which I exist consists exactly of those body cells of mine that exist at that timeâ€”namely my body. So, intuitively there are cases where composition clearly obtains my body and cases where composition appears not to obtain a klable. Yet, again, there is no principled line to be drawn between the two sorts of cases. One can always come up with a series of cases any two adjacent elements of which are virtually indistinguishable, though the beginning of the series strikes us as a clear case of composition while the end makes us queasy. Whether we understand it synchronically or diachronicallyâ€”the argument goesâ€”restricted composition is prone to the sorites paradox, hence it falls prey to vagueness. After all, the vocabulary of mereology is needed to state the question, and to assume that this vocabulary is semantically non-vague is to assume what has to be proved. Sider is more careful here: This means that it would be objectively indeterminate how many objects there are. And to say 6 that it is objectively indeterminate how many objects there are is to say that the world is indeterminate. Putting the pieces together, the advertised claim now follows: Any moderate answer to Q entails ontological vagueness. Since this sort of vagueness is unacceptableâ€”Sider arguesâ€”there is only one option left, namely universalism. And according to Sider this is an option that only the four-dimensionalist can afford. Three-dimensionalism is of a piece with moderatism. Problems and Loose Ends Here, then, is the argument from vagueness in its entirety: Why did I say that this is a defective argument? Formally it is valid, at least insofar as the two main inferences are concernedâ€”from 1 â€” 3 to 4 and from 4 â€” 6 to 7. But it is an argument with many premises. And although Sider has done a great job to back up some of them, there is still room for several replies that are worth looking into. Let us go through them. But let us do so with an eye at the costs involved in such replies. For, eventually the question will be whether the three-dimensionalist can accept any of 7 themâ€”whether she can reject the argument and still claim faithfulness to common sense. The first inference Let us begin with the inference from 1 â€” 3 to 4. Premise 1 is analytic, hence uncontroversial.

As we have already seen, a metaphysics according to which the world consists of time-bound mereological atoms is beyond the point. So it is premise 3 that carries the burden of the inference to 4, which is why Sider himself devotes most of his efforts to a defense of this premise. We have seen that this defense takes the form of a deductive argument based on the three claims in 3. So in the end it is those claims that we have to scrutinize. This is obviously controversial, but so be it: So let us focus on the other two claims. The obvious reply to 3. For one thing, one could simply insist that whether composition obtains is a brute fact see e. If it is a brute fact whether composition obtains, then every numerical statement must have a definite truth-value and no soritical series could be constructed to show the vagueness of restricted composition. On the other hand, it is certainly hard to believe in brute facts on the grounds of a generic appeal to common sense. One could still argue as follows. What must be vague, on the face of it, is restricted composition at a time: This means that composition-at-a-time must be fully unrestricted:

Chapter 5 : Vagueness doctrine | Revolv

The standard view in ontology concerned with persistence is known as endurantism. This view has faced many problems in recent decades, mainly problems concerning the nature and possibility of change, the problem of predication (including the problem of temporary intrinsics), the problem of constitution and, most prominently, the problem of ontological vagueness.

References and Further Reading 1. Understanding the Problem of Personal Identity The persistence question, the question of what personal identity over time consists in, is literally a question of life and death: These adventures do not have to be theoretically as fancy as the cases, to be discussed later, of human fission or brain swaps: Furthermore, theories of personal identity have ethical and metaphysical implications of considerable magnitude: It is not surprising, therefore, that most great philosophers have attempted to solve the problem of personal identity, or have committed themselves to metaphysical systems that have substantial implications with regards to the problem, and that most religious belief systems give explicit answers to the persistence question. Neither is it surprising that virtually everybody holds a pre-theoretical theory of personal identity, if only in the sense of having beliefs about afterlives and the meaning of death. The task of solving the metaphysical problem of personal identity essentially involves answering the question of how the phenomenon or principle in virtue of which "entities like us" persist through time is to be specified, under the widely but not universally accepted premises that there is such a phenomenon or principle and that it can be specified. We are concerned, in other words, with the truth-makers of personal identity statements: Criteria and the Identity Relation Answers to the persistence question often provide a criterion of personal identity. A criterion is a set of non-trivial necessary and sufficient conditions that determines, insofar as that is possible, whether distinct temporally indexed person-stages are stages of one and the same continuant person. A temporally indexed person-stage is a slice of a continuant person that extends in three spatial dimensions but has no temporal extension. To say that C is a necessary condition for E is to say that if E is the case, then C is the case as well, and to say that C is a sufficient condition for E is to say that if C is the case, then E is the case as well. Consequently, to specify such a criterion is to give an account of what personal identity necessarily consists in. Let us distinguish between numerical identity and qualitative identity exact similarity: X and Y are numerically identical iff X and Y are one thing rather than two, while X and Y are qualitatively identical iff, for the set of non-relational properties F Fn of X, Y only possesses F A property may be called "non-relational" if its being borne by a substance is independent of the relations in which property or substance stand to other properties or substances. Personal identity is an instance of the relation of numerical identity; investigations into the nature of the former, therefore, must respect the formal properties that govern the latter. The concept of identity is uniquely defined by a the logical laws of congruence: Although exact similarity is, by congruence, a necessary condition for synchronic personal identity, it is neither necessary nor sufficient for diachronic personal identity, that is to say, the persistence of a person over time: This is not to say, however, that it is ruled out that lack of similarity over time may obliterate numerical personal identity: The question a criterion of personal identity answers is: This gives a distinctive sense to the claim that a criterion of personal identity is to be constitutive, not merely evidential: Hence, many elements of our successful everyday reidentification practices, such as physical appearance, fingerprints, or signatures, are inadequate if considered as constituting ingredients of personal identity relations: However, wearing a Yankees jacket is not what it is for Larry to persist through time: Does the logic of the concept of identity impose further restraints on the concept of personal identity? Some commentators believe that identity is an intrinsic relation, that is, that if two person-stages at different times are stages of one and the same person, that will be true only in virtue of the intrinsic relation between these two stages cf. Noonan ; Wiggins Others hold identity to be necessarily determinate, that is, that it is necessarily false that sometimes there is no answer to the question of whether X is identical with Y. These commentators typically reason as follows: Since it is determinate that X is identical with X, under the assumption that congruence and predicate logic apply, X must be determinately identical with Y. Therefore, by modus tollens, if X is not determinately identical with

Y, X is not identical with Y cf. Evans ; Wiggins Consequently, the question does in fact have an answer, and the claim that identity is indeterminate is self-contradictory. This conclusion is strengthened, in the case of personal identity, by the widely shared intuition that even if the identity of some objects might be indeterminate, this could not be true of the identity of persons: As it turns out, however, there may be good reasons to deny both the intrinsicness and the determinacy of personal identity cf. Personhood While the formal properties of the concept of identity are necessary constraints on our discussion, the truth of our identity judgments is subject to material conditions of correctness, which these formal properties cannot provide. These material conditions must be supplied by the nature of the relata judged to stand in an identity relation. The obvious suggestion is that, given that we are dealing with personal identity, these relata are person-stages located at different times. This proposal, however, violates the requirement that the persistence question ought to specify its relata without presupposing an answer: Fetuses, infants, or human beings in a persistent vegetative state, for example, plainly do not fulfill the criteria envisaged by Locke. As a result, since these beings do not possess cognitive capacities, if they do at all, that qualitatively attain those of thinking beings, couching the persistence question in terms of persons entails that none of us has ever been a fetus or infant or ever will be a human vegetable Olson a; Mackie To be sure, these initially baffling claims could be true. However, since these are clearly substantial questions about our persistence, we should not consider ourselves justified to settle the matter by definition. Consequently, we should prefer vagueness over chauvinism and pose the persistence question in terms of the wider notion of human being, postponing the question of whether and in what sense the notions of person and human being ought to be distinguished: Theories of Personal Identity In order to discover what your pre-philosophical attitude towards this question is, ask yourself the following: Collect a few possible answers and ask yourself whether the resulting being, the freshly created being that is now a candidate for being identical with you before you died, is in fact you. For example, do you believe that If you believe any of these options, then you must also believe, respectively, that Let us discuss these theories of personal identity in more detail. The Simple View Some commentators believe that there are no informative, non-trivial persistence conditions for people, that is, that personal persistence is an ultimate and unanalyzable fact cf. We must distinguish between two versions of this view. Either it is non-reductive and wholly non-informative, denying that personal identity follows from anything other than itself. This makes the label Identity Mysticism "IM" most appropriate cf. X at t_1 is identical to Y at t_2 iff X at t_1 is identical to Y at t_2 , Identity Mysticism plays only an indirect role in contemporary personal identity theory. Although it may be poorly understood, due to limitations of space this article will disregard the view. IM is to be distinguished from a more popular version of the simple view, according to which personal identity relations are weakly reductive WR and in independence non-informative INI: Initially the idea underlying this claim may appear prejudicial; ultimately it is based on a number of widespread but not universally accepted beliefs about the naturalness of the world and the nature, validity and theoretical implications of physicalism. According to this general stance, either both psychological and physiological continuity relations are fully reducible to a domain in which physical explanations are couched, perhaps in terms of the basic elements of a final and unified theory of physics, or they belong themselves to such a domain. It is merely weakly reductive, however, because the identity of the phenomenon that specifies the necessary and sufficient conditions for personal identity does not itself follow from anything other than itself. While a weakly reductive criterion of personal identity relations is explicable in terms of the identities of phenomena other than persons, the identities of these phenomena themselves are not explicable in other terms: Nowadays, the Simple View is disparaged as a theory only maintained by thinkers whose religious or spiritual commitments outweigh the reasons that speak against their views on personal identity. This is due to the fact that it is assumed that a theory of personal identity cannot be weakly reductive without involving appeal to discredited spiritual substances or committing itself either to the acknowledgment of yet unrecognized physical entities or to an Identity Mysticism on the level of persons. As a consequence, many philosophers think that the problems that infiltrate dualism and Cartesian theories of the soul, such as the alleged impossibilities to circumscribe the ontological status of souls and to explain how a soul can interact with a body, render the Simple View equally problematic. Although the options mentioned are exceedingly difficult

to defend, why should they have to be regarded as the only options available to the Simple Theorist? Arguably, many respectable philosophical ideologies, such as conceptualism or Neo-Kantianism, may issue in theories of personal identity along Simple lines without appeal to Cartesian Egos. Note, however, that these ideologies, with regards to the problem of the persistence of people, may also be, and in fact have been, construed along physiological or psychological lines. This suggests that we do not only need a better understanding, and above all more promising articulations, of the Simple View, but also a new taxonomy of theories of personal identity: General Features Modern day personal identity theory takes place mainly within reductionist assumptions, concentrating on the relative merits of different criteria of identity and related methodological questions. Reductionist theories of personal identity share the contention that Facts about personal identity stand in an adequate reduction-relation to sets of sub-personal facts SF1. The sets of necessary and sufficient conditions determined by these sets of sub-personal facts constitute the various criteria of personal identity. It must be noted that the biconditionals in question need not to be understood in such a way as that circularity is an objection to them: McDowell ; Wittgenstein , 3. Only when the concepts "person" and "personal identity" become the target of what may be referred to as an authentic reduction circularities become vicious. The need for the distinction between authentic and inauthentic reductions arises due to an equivocation that ought not to confuse the present discussion: Let us speak of authentic reductions if the ontological status of members of the reduced category is, in a way to be made precise, diminished in favor of the allegedly "more fundamental" existence-status of members of the reducing category. The question of whether an authentic reductionism about persons must claim that it is not only able to give a criterion of personal identity without presupposing personal identity but also that facts about persons are describable without using the concept "person" is a matter of current controversy cf. In a search for the necessary and sufficient conditions for the sustenance of personal identity relations between subjects, which type of continuity-relations could SF describe? There are two main contenders, physiological continuity-relations and psychological continuity-relations, which will be discussed in turn. Psychological Approaches Psychological Criteria of personal identity hold that psychological continuity relations, that is, overlapping chains of direct psychological connections, as those causal and cognitive connections between beliefs, desires, intentions, experiential memories, character traits and so forth, constitute personal identity cf. Two apparently physiological theories of personal identity are at bottom psychological, namely i the Brain Criterion, which holds that the spatiotemporal continuity of a single functioning brain constitutes personal identity; and ii the Physical Criterion, which holds that, necessarily, the spatiotemporal continuity of that which sustains the continuous psychological life of a human being over time, which is, contingently, a sufficient part of the brain that must remain in order to be the brain of a living person, constitutes personal identity cf. These approaches are at bottom psychological because they single out, as the constituting factors of personal identity, the psychological continuity of the subject. Consider a test case. Imagine there to be a tribe of beings who are in all respects like human beings, except for the fact that their brains and livers have swapped bodily functions: Imagine the brain criterion to be true for human beings. Would we have sufficient reason to believe the brain criterion to be true for members of the tribe in question as well, if we were aware of all facts about their physiologies? There is nothing special about the 1. We can further distinguish between three versions of the psychological criterion: The Narrow version, we may note, is logically equivalent to the Physical Criterion. One might think that brain criterion and physical criterion, to varying degrees, combine the best of both worlds: In fact, however, the opposite is the case: A criterion of personal identity tells us what our persistence necessarily consists in, which means that it must be able to deliver a verdict in possible scenarios that is consistent with its verdicts in ordinary cases. One scenario that has been widely debated is the following: The information is sent to a replicator device on Mars, which at t2 creates a qualitatively identical duplicate, Y cf. Should teletransportation be unreliable, all criteria of personal identity but the Widest version of the Psychological Criterion are false. Consequently, should appeal to such scenarios as Teletransportation be acceptable and should the intuition above be widely shared, the brain criterion and physical criterion are false. Quasi-Psychology Many people regard the idea that our persistence is intrinsically related to our psychology as obvious. The problem of cashing out this conviction in theoretical terms, however, is notoriously difficult.

Chapter 6 : Personal Identity | Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy

Recent work on vagueness and persistence has it that Diachronic Plenitude either precludes three-dimensionalism or renders it untenable. I show that these claims are false.

Talent, genius, and education mean very little when persistence is lacking. Flickr user bigwavephoto] By Harvey Deutschendorf 4 minute Read In any discussion of the attributes of successful people, persistence is always mentioned, often as the, or one of the, most important factors in success. Here are some of the things that persistent people have in common that keeps them going long after most people have given up: An All-Consuming Vision Persistent people have a goal or vision in mind that motivates and drives them. They are often dreamers and visionaries who see their lives as having a higher purpose than simply earning a living. Their vision is deeply ingrained, and they focus on it constantly and with great emotion and energy. They often think of this vision first thing when they wake up and last thing before they go to bed. Reaching this goal becomes the focal point of their life and they devote a major portion of their energies and time toward reaching it. What keeps highly persistent people going is their powerful level of desire. Persistent people have the inner energy and intensity to keep them motivated and going through these tough times. Having a highly developed sense of who they are allows the highly persistent to continue on without being greatly affected by what others think of them or, being understood, or being appreciated by those around them. While that inner confidence gets challenged and shaken, it never gets destroyed and constantly acts as a source of courage and determination. Habit is what keeps you going. They have come to rely upon their self-discipline and developing habits they can count on to continue down the path toward their eventual goals. They believe the results of the efforts they make today may not be seen for a long time, but they strongly believe that everything they do will count toward their outcome in the end. Ability To Adjust And Adapt Persistent people have the ability to adjust and adapt their action plan. They do not stubbornly persist in the face of evidence that their plan is not working, but look for better ways that will increase their chances of success. The highly persistent see their journey as a series of dead ends, detours, and adjustments but have complete faith they will reach their final destination. They are not tied into their ego and are quickly willing to admit when something is not working. As well, they are quick to adapt the ideas of others that have been shown to work well. Commitment To Lifelong Learning Persistent people realize that any goal worth reaching will take time, effort, and continuously learning new skills and thinking patterns. They welcome change and new ideas and continue looking for ways they can incorporate these into their lives. Ongoing learning is seen as part of a process through which the highly persistent continually expand the range of tools that they have to work with. Naturally curious, persistent types not only see learning as a way to reach their goals more quickly, but they also see self-development as a way of life. Learning and continual growth do not end at a certain age or stage of life, but they are the essence of life itself, and therefore never-ending. You will know who these people are since persistent people will often quote them. Persistent people usually stand out from their environment and are often misunderstood or ridiculed because they can make those around them feel uncomfortable. Having strongly ingrained models helps persistent people sustain and motivate themselves in an environment that is not always supportive.

Vague existence can seem like the worst kind of vagueness in the world, or seem to be an entirely unintelligible notion. This bad reputation is based upon the rumour that if there is vague.

Things include concrete material objects from natural to artifactual and biological entities, as well as pure abstract objects like concepts and ideas that may be "universals. In this case, a change in the instant of time also destroys every material object, followed instantaneously by the creation of an almost "identical" object. The Academic Skeptics argued that an individual cannot survive material change. When any material is subtracted or added, the entity ceases to exist and a new numerically distinct individual comes into existence. The Stoics were following Aristotle. They believed the material substrate is "transformed" when matter is lost or gained. He said that generation and destruction are material changes that do not persist. The Stoics argued that the peculiarly qualified individual does persist. Aristotle had commented on his use of words about persistence: It is therefore obvious that the form or whatever we should call the shape in the sensible thing is not generated—generation does not apply to it—nor is the essence generated; for this is that which is induced in something else either by art or by nature or by potency. But we do cause a bronze sphere to be, for we produce it from bronze and a sphere; we induce the form into this particular matter, and the result is a bronze sphere. For if we consider the matter carefully, we should not even say without qualification that a statue is generated from wood, or a house from bricks; because that from which a thing is generated should not persist, but be changed. This, then, is why we speak in this way. Yet when the Academics hold that the puzzle is not altogether easy or straightforward, these people [sc. Yet they themselves not only fail to save our conceptions but also pervert sense-perception. The Hellenistic Philosophers, Long and Sedley, v. The debtor at that earlier time had not persisted. When the lender strikes the debtor and the debtor threatens a lawsuit, the lender says the person who struck the debtor no longer exists, so he, the current version of the lender, is not responsible! Perdurantism The basic definition of persistence is to show that an object is the same object at different times. Although this may seem trivially obvious for ordinary objects, information philosophy shows that there is strictly no such thing as identity over time. The "same" object at two different times contains different information minimally, its time coordinate in four-dimensional space-time has changed. Metaphysicians say it is better considered as two objects that are not absolutely identical. The great Anglo-American philosopher Alfred North Whitehead attributed the continued existence of objects from moment to moment to the intervention of God. Without a kind of continuous creation of every entity, things would fall apart. This notion can also be traced back to the American theologian Jonathan Edwards, who thought God creates every person anew from moment to moment, and is responsible for the way the world is at every instant. Willard van Orman Quine proposed that we consider an object as existing in "stages. He proposes temporal parts as a solution to the problem of persistence. He calls his solution "perdurantism," which he distinguishes from "endurance," in which the whole entity exists at all times. Our question of overlap of worlds parallels the this-worldly problem of identity through time; and our problem of accidental intrinsics parallels a problem of temporary intrinsics, which is the traditional problem of change. Let us say that something persists iff, somehow or other, it exists at various times; this is the neutral word. The road parts do not exactly persist. They are intrinsically different parts. The enduring entity does persist simpliciter. Matter that disappears and reappears violates the conservation laws for matter and energy.. Something perdures iff it persists by having different temporal parts, or stages, at different times. Perdurantism corresponds to the way a road persists through space; part of it is here and part of it is there, and no part is wholly present at two different places. Endurance corresponds to the way a universal, if there are such things, would be wholly present wherever and whenever it is instantiated. On the Plurality of Worlds, p. The idea of a four-dimensional manifold of space and time supports the idea that the "temporal parts" of an object are as distinct from one another as its spatial parts. This raises questions about its continued identity as it moves in space and time. There is no physical basis for the wild assumptions of past metaphysicians and theologians, from Jonathan Edwards to Alfred North Whitehead, that the contents of the universe cease to exist and then reappear de

novo at the next instant. This notion violates one of the most fundamental of physical laws, the conservation of matter and energy. More metaphysically significant, neither temporal nor spatial "slices" carve nature at the joints. They are arbitrary mental constructions imposed on the world by philosophers that have little to do with "natural" objects and their component parts. Endurance It is metaphysically necessary, both logically and in terms of an information analysis, the case that everything is identical to itself. Self-identity is a necessary truth. If you exist, you do not exist necessarily, as Timothy Williamson claims, but you are necessarily self-identical at each instant of time. If you exist, you are very nearly identical to yourself a moment ago. This will make the perdurantists happy, but the change in information is a tiny fraction of your total, so endurance theorists are closer to the truth in the problem of persistence. On the plurality of worlds. Sider, Ted, , , Four-Dimensionalism, Oxford:

Chapter 8 : Antony Eagle, Persistence, Vagueness, and Location - PhilPapers

This article discusses two arguments in favor of perdurance. The first is Sider's argument from vagueness, "one of the most powerful" in favor of perdurantism. I make the observation that endurantists have principled grounds to claim that the argument is unsound, at least if endurance is.

Provisions introducing serious criminal liability without, or at any rate, extremely blurred and vague signposts. A criminal statute is constitutionally required to be specific and unambiguous. This is because vague statutes such as these can lead to arbitrary and discriminatory prosecutions and cause the concentration of far too much power in the hands of the law enforcers. A resultant of which would be selective prosecution, based on mere whims and caprice of the power holders. The need for certainty in defining the limits of criminal sanction is ultimately borne out of a natural fear of Rule of Men, as opposed to the Rule of Law. It penalized offensive online speech causing annoyance or inconvenience. This provision was struck down by the Supreme Court in *Shreya Singhal v. Union of India*. This doctrine of unconstitutional vagueness has been pressed into action to strike down a wide range of statutes across the world, including: This pernicious law was rightly held by the Court to be too vague to serve as the basis of criminality [4]. These are the hazards of vague criminal laws. For instance, Section 90 of the PDP Bill attaches criminal liability to the act of "obtaining, transferring or selling of personal data by any person in contravention of its provisions, in two circumstances: That the Act was done knowingly, intentionally or recklessly; and That such an act of obtainment, disclosure, transfer, or sale of data results in significant harm to the data principal. This is an extremely wide definition and rather unprecedented in a criminal statute. Here we have a definition that fails to define. It is wide, open-ended, vague and vests the friendly police officer in the neighborhood far too much power and makes a due-process lawyer cringe. Can we really trust our often technically unequipped police officers to make an objective judgment as to whether a particular case of disclosure of data which may be totally negligent, since intent is not a condition precedent to criminality! What this effectively leads to is: In this regard, a recent decision by the United Supreme Court in *Sessions v. Academics for Free Speech*. The facts, in a nutshell were: The US Supreme Court found this to be extremely vague and struck it down. To make matters worse, the offence is also non-bailable, which means an accused must mandatorily go behind the bars, and bail can be granted only by the Court, at its discretion, and after arrest. There is no manner of doubt that, this provision, if allowed to stand, may lead to frivolous prosecutions and arrests. There is an urgent need to rethink this. Two ways in which the rigors of this section can be diluted, and it made less prone to misuse are: The views of the authors are personal. The Authors can be reached at bchugh@luthra.com. O " US , Rutledge, J. State Fla, Subscribe Livelaw.

Chapter 9 : Jiri Benovsky (University of Fribourg) - PhilPeople

The Persistence of Memory, portrays an abstract view of time and visions that Dali envisioned. Perhaps, his most famous work was The Persistence of Memory, which he painted in his younger years in the 30s.