

Introducere în filosofie – seminar 9

Teme de discuție

Cele doua baloane de sapun

Suflu într-o paleta de facut baloane de sapun. Balonul se umfla, dar in loc sa-l “eliberez”, il las sa se dezumfle la loc. Apoi suflu din nou si dau drumul in aer balonului rezultat. E vorba de un singur balon sau de doua baloane?

pt. discutie: Aici se vede mai clar despre ce e vorba:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ISKime4z5sA>

Thunderprow

The Greeks were great ship builders. They built a particularly fine warship to a special design with a reinforced hull capable of ramming enemy boats. It was said that the gods themselves had so blessed the ship that it could never be sunk or even fail to sink any ship it attacked.

Having made many successful raids the ship, nicknamed Thunderprow by its happy band of slave oarsmen, had to come in for repairs to its prow. In fact, it needed such extensive repairs that almost half of all the timbers had to be replaced.

Because of the esteem the craft was held in, the old timbers were kept, even down to the original, now bent and rusty, nails, by the proud citizens, with a view to making a sculpture tribute some day.

The next year saw Thunderprow in more exploits and it needed another third of its timbers replacing the following winter, although it was noted that none of the new timbers had suffered. In fact, the following season, it soon became apparent that the old timbers were not really taking the strain as well as the new ones. The captain, Sorites, ordered her back to the boatyard, where he instructed that all the remaining original timbers be replaced now. And to complete the job, he ordered new sails and other fittings throughout, so that the entire boat would be at its best for the annual naval display.

As before, all the old bits were stored carefully. Only now a funny thing happened. Whilst Thunderprow was out scuttling enemy ships, the good people of the port carefully rebuilt the ship using all the old timbers and nails—not as a warship, true, the bits were too damaged for that, but as a land monument to their crowning naval achievement.

When Thunderprow returned next to port it was in disgrace. Time after time at sea it had either missed ships it had been attempting to ram, or had caused insufficient damage. In one case it had actually snapped off some of the famous

prow on an enemy which had carried on virtually unscathed.

When the weary crew reach port this time, they start muttering and pointing at something. There, sitting on trestles is another boat with a specially reinforced hull. In fact, the only difference is that this one has a plaque inviting the public to come on board ‘the original Thunderprow’.

‘Idiots!’ Sorites remarked, uncivilly, to the proud townsfolk. ‘By building this, our boat has ceased to be Thunderprow and now the only boat blessed by the gods is a heap of junk sitting here uselessly on trestles!’

The townsfolk insisted that this could not possibly be the case. Why, there was no question that the captain’s boat had definitely been the original Thunderprow after the first refit, and indeed it was still definitely the only Thunderprow after the second refit. And the third minor refit could hardly have affected its authenticity. Was he seriously suggesting that pulling out the last original nail had suddenly ceased to make it the famous boat? At the most, all they had done was make a second ‘also original’ Thunderprow. Anyway, if there was really one original Thunderprow it was not an earthly one, but a mental idea, in the mind of the designer perhaps. Sorites thought this was absurd, and insisted that the museum ship be dismantled and each bit burnt in turn, and the nails melted down.

This was done, but it didn’t seem to improve Thunderprow’s performance on the seas, and for years afterwards people muttered that the Captain had burnt the only Greek warship blessed with invincibility by the gods.

Which of the three ships was the original ‘Thunderprow’?

[**sursa:** *101 Philosophy Problems*]

pt. discutie: Cazul discutat de obicei de catre filosofi e cel al corabiei lui Tezeu. Vezi, de pilda:

<http://www.logicalparadoxes.info/theseus-ship/>

http://www.scientificblogging.com/geeks039_guide_world_domination/cool_thought_experiments_ii_ship_theseus

Lumpl si Goliath

Maria primeste cadou o bucata de lut care poate fi modelata si nu trebuie sa fie arsa intr-un cuptor pentru a se intari. Bucata de lut o incanta atat de mult incat ii pune un nume – Lumpl. Dupa o vreme, Maria se hotaraste sa modeleze o statuie din bucata de lut. Zis si facut. Statuia primeste si ea un nume – Goliath.

Sunt Lumpl si Goliath doua obiecte diferite, sau unul si acelasi obiect?

(sursa de inspiratie: Allan Gibbard, “Contingent Identity”, *Journal of Philosophical Logic* 4 (1975), pp. 187-221)

Orice lucru trebuie sa fie doua lucruri

Aceasta potrivit urmatorului rationament:

(1) Pentru a vorbi despre o asemanare, trebuie sa vorbesti despre cel putin doua lucruri (doua sau mai multe lucruri pot semana intre ele, mai mult sau mai putin).

Pe de alta parte, stim ca:

(2) Orice lucru e identic cu sine.

Si:

(3) Lucrurile identice sunt asemanatoare (fiindca identitatea e o relatie “mai tare” decat asemanarea).

Din (2) si (3) decurge:

(4) Orice lucru seamana cu el insusi.

Iar din (4) si (1) reiese ca:

(5) *Orice lucru trebuie sa fie cel putin doua lucruri.*

Ce este in neregula cu rationamentul de mai sus?

Indispositional problems

Steve has a very pleasant character, always ready to help others, and never in too much of a hurry to stop and have a friendly chat. So when his old school friend Martin went to see him in his greengrocer’s shop, he got a nasty surprise. ‘Hello, Steve! Remember me?’ says Martin.

‘Wait your turn, I’ll deal with you in a minute,’ says Steve rudely, turning his back on his old friend and fiddling with the fly-catching machine.

‘Uh, Steve, it’s me, Martin!’ says the same, after a few minutes. At this Steve turns around and with a muttered oath tells Martin to take his custom elsewhere, in no uncertain terms.

A distressed Martin makes some enquiries of the neighbouring shopkeepers—perhaps it is something he has done? No, no, the shopkeepers say, the greengrocer is notorious for always being bad-tempered and throwing people out of his shop. In fact, the only people who still go there are those who actually like to have an argument, and even then they may not get served.

‘That’s very odd,’ says Martin, ‘he always used to be so friendly. It was a fundamental part of his nature.’ Doesn’t Steve have a friendly disposition any more, he enquires? The other shopkeepers think not. After all, Steve reliably behaves in anything but a friendly way. And Martin is inclined to think his old friend has undergone some sort of change since they first knew each other. In fact, the next day, he learns from the florist that Steve had gone to a shopkeepers’ assertiveness course, and had been instructed to always ‘adopt an aggressive note when dealing with

people' in order to avoid being taken advantage of. The florist, who had taken the same course, says it took them a very long time to get the hang of this, but now he, like Steve, routinely says certain 'assertive' things to anyone he meets, not just customers, to overcome his friendly but weak nature which people might otherwise try to take advantage of.

Does Steve have a friendly disposition, or not?

Still indisposed

Martin thinks the florist is wrong to say that Steve still has a friendly nature, underneath his unfriendly behaviour. After all, he has chosen to be unfriendly. But then, later on, he discovers from the chemist that Steve has also been taking spooky hormones to make himself more aggressive. The chemist says it's a great shame, really, because he used to have such a nice manner, and now he's really a bit of a monster. However, now Martin thinks his old friend may still be basically a good sort—but his nature has been chemically interfered with. He goes back to see Steve to try to persuade him to stop taking the drugs, but Steve throws a basket of rotten fruit over him for his trouble, wrecking his new suit. Then Steve looks a bit guilty. 'Sorry, Martin,' he says. 'I'm afraid business is going just terribly at the moment and I'm mortgaged to the hilt—I'm not really myself today!'

Should Martin forgive him? Or is it now, as he threatens, a matter for the police to decide?

[sursa: *101 Philosophy Problems*]

Curajosul ofiter

Sa presupunem ca criteriul in functie de care spunem ca o persoana si-a pastrat identitatea ar fi capacitatea de a-si aminti (o mare parte din) faptele sale din trecut. Iar acum sa ne gandim la un general batran. Acesta a fost decorat, pe vremea cand era un tanar ofiter, pentru faptele sale de vitejie in lupta. Iar cand era elev la scoala primara a fost pedepsit fizic pentru o fapta nesabuita.

Tanarul ofiter isi amintea de pedeapsa fizica de pe vremea scolii si de majoritatea faptelor sale de atunci. Batranul general isi aminteste de faptele sale de vitejie de pe vremea cand era un tanar ofiter, dar nu-si mai aminteste de intamplarile de pe vremea cand era elev la scoala primara.

Potrivit criteriul nostru, ar trebui sa spunem ca batranul general nu mai este acelasi cu elevul de la scoala primara. Dar intrucat identitatea este o relatie tranzitiva (daca $A = B$ si $B = C$, atunci $A = C$), iar batranul general este acelasi cu tanarul ofiter, care, la randul sau, este identic cu elevul, ar trebui sa spunem ca batranul general este acelasi cu elevul. Totusi, nu se poate ca ambele afirmatii sa fie adevarate. Este batranul general identic cu elevul sau nu? In plus, este ceva in neregula cu criteriul nostru pentru a stabili identitatea unei persoane?

(sursa: Thomas Reid, *Essays on the Intellectual Powers of Man*, 1785, Essay Three: Of Memory, Chapter 6: Of Mr. Locke's Account Of Our Personal Identity)

Teleportorul defect

Sa presupunem ca traim intr-o lume in care a fost inventata teleportarea. Oamenii o folosesc in mod curent pentru a se deplasa. Mecanismul este urmatorul: corpul omenesc este scanat pana la nivel subatomic, informatia e trimisa la destinatie, iar acolo corpul persoanei care “se teleporteaza” este reconstituit (la nivel subatomic toti suntem constituiti din acelasi tip de elemente, asa ca nu e important sa fie folosite aceleasi subparticule din care era constituit corpul meu la plecare).

Desi nu ai utilizat pana acum teleportarea ca mijloc de transport, toti prietenii tai te asigura ca nu ai de ce sa iti faci griji.

Dupa ce intri in cabina de teleportare, astepti un timp, insa nu se intampla nimic. Usa se deschide si tehnicianul te anunta ca teleportorul a avut o mica defectiune – informatia a fost transmisa la destinatie, iar corpul tau a fost reconstituit acolo, dar nu a fost inca distrus aici. “Va asigur ca astfel de defectiuni sunt foarte rare!” - spune tehnicianul, dupa care adauga: “Situatia e totusi usor de remediat. In camera alaturata vi se va face o injectie letala, iar copia dumneavoastra, care a ajuns deja la destinatie, va fi instiintata de acest incident.”

Aceasta propunere ti se pare, probabil, inacceptabila. Dar in acest caz te poti gandi la o continuare paralela a povestirii. In aceasta varianta, dupa ce iesi din teleportor descoperi ca ai ajuns la destinatie. Un tehnician te anunta ca la punctul de plecare corpul tau nu a fost distrus, din cauza unei defectiuni a teleportorului, asa ca tu esti acum doar o “copie” inutila. Ti se propune, bineinteles, sa accepti injectia letala. “Totul este spre binele dumneavoastra!” - spune tehnicianul (un alt tehnician, de data asta). E limpede, insa, ca prin “dumneavoastra” se refera la corpul tau care nu a fost distrus la punctul de plecare.

Poti stabili care dintre cele doua persoane esti tu? Iar in cazul in care nu poti face asta, ai mai spune ca ai supravietuit accidentului de teleportare?

(dupa o idee din: Derek Parfit, *Reasons and Persons*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1984)

pt. discutie: vezi si <http://forums.philosophyforums.com/threads/teleporter-thought-experiment-30492.html>