

Chapter 1 : Destiny, Freedom and Responsibility

Racial Profiling and Use of Force in Police Stops: How Local Events Trigger Periods of Increased Discrimination
Legewie Democracy of Credit: Ownership and the Politics of Credit Access in Late Twentieth-Century America.

Share Rakurai, Helyna, and Arashi, still carry the now unconscious Tsubaki, ran frantically through the streets, pursued by several soldiers, all rushing forward, swords at the ready. Arashi had placed a makeshift tourniquet around her waist to stop the bleeding. Occasionally, her eyes flickered open for the briefest of seconds before she slipped back into unconsciousness. And everybody always said that they had the power of ice within them, yet nobody had ever seen them use it. Most nowadays just thought it was a rumour spread as a scare tactic. As the foursome veered round yet another street, they found themselves in a small plaza; a few benches were littered around the place, and a medium size, delicately crafted water fountain was situated in the middle, a pool under it to catch the water and a few stairs that led down to the rest of the plaza, but the water had long since turned to ice, spoiling the view. Then again, everything else was covered in a thin layer of snow, despite the sunny sky, so what difference did it make, really? Suddenly they looked around them, as soldiers cut off every exit point. The group nucleated together, pointing their weapons with steadfast courage except Arashi who had no free hands. Rakurai scanned their surroundings, searching for a way out of their desperate scenario. The two pushed their entire body weights against their blades, each trying to force the other over. Suddenly, Shinkaiyami stopped struggling, and Mizu stumbled forward, still pushing. Shinkaiyami swatted the hunter away with a strong backhand punch. Makoto put away her spectacles and rushed forth, flinging her matenbou at Shinkaiyami, who deflected it with the flat of his blade. Makoto used those few precious moments to send a wave of whitish fire at the shadow. He slowly moved his hand horizontally across the air as the fire came into contact with him, and it was extinguished. However, as the flames dissipated, a huge black blur stuck him in the face, sending him reeling. Altair took this chance- he grabbed his green, frayed cloak and flung it across his body like a vampire, disappearing in a black haze, appearing behind Shinkaiyami and slashing at him continuously and fervently with a pair of balisong-style butterfly knives. Makoto proceeded to unleash a sting of kick and punches, while Skylar joined in, slashing at the entity with her Hidden Ones. The three of them pulled away as Gigas surged forward and swung his Dancing Hellfire at the enemy. Nina then took her share of the action, sending a huge amorphous ball of white light hurtling toward it. When it made contact, the shadow yelled out with annoyance and surprise, forced off his feet and sent skidding into a black heap upon the floor some metres away within the almost Plaza-wide "cage". As the smoke cleared, he rose to his feet almost gracefully, now floating a few centimetre off of the ground. He began to laugh, and a thousand tormented souls seemed to join in, a choir of creepy cackling. Mephiles theme vs Shinkaiyami Shadow Form "How quaint. But did you not think that I am more powerful than this? Or did you simply refuse to countenance the thought? He hunched over, roaring with strain and defiance. His body began to "materialize", looking more solid. It was still pitch black, but it had a leathery gleam to it and a silver trim, and it was covered in nasty spikes of various lengths, jutting out at different angles, some hooked, some straight. His mouth if he even had one was covered by a black mask that pulsed a little when he spoke. His sword had grown longer, from one metre to about three, and it was also silver, although the hilt was black, and a long clawlike spike curled upward to where the hilt ended and the blade began, a little like the Lost Black Katana, and it seemed to hum enticingly every time it moved even slightly, as if singing some kind of song; like the Eager Cleaver, but not as loud or harsh. Slivers of wispy shadow slithered at his feet, as he took baby steps forward. Nina turned to Makoto, opening a portal behind her. "Our allies are in peril," she said flatly. Makoto ran through without delay, the doorway shutting behind her. Shinkaiyami growled again, and a pair of black, hellish wings emerged from his back. They were tattered and worn looking, with holes in the webbing bone showing in some places. He huffed triumphantly before swooping at the party once more, his blade poised like a spear, ready to spill blood. She held a matenbou behind her. She quickly raised her arm above her head, and with a grunt she thrust it down to touch the ground. In the same instant, stalagmites of solid earth protruded aggressively from the ground around her and the others, sending all the soldiers flying into walls, statues,

windows, etc. When the ground stelled again she pulled herself upright and sighed with satisfaction. There were chunks of stone and earth littered around the place, along with either dead of unconscious soldiers, but apart from that, silence. Makoto turned around to face them, smiling thinly. And we need your help," Makoto answered. As she finished her sentence, a loud cry echoed ahead. This city has been derelict for nine years now. You tell me where my people are right now, goddammit! This time, nobody dared to try and calm him down. They are not dead, not yet. Kasai rebelled against our great cause, so when we finally subjugated them, we placed every occupant of this city under our supervision in the new capital of this land-Yukikaze, the City of Ice. Now they serve the cause they once opposed.

Chapter 2 : Freedom vs. Fate - philosophical essay

Note: Citations are based on reference standards. However, formatting rules can vary widely between applications and fields of interest or study. The specific requirements or preferences of your reviewing publisher, classroom teacher, institution or organization should be applied.

Here were two boys with good intellect, one eighteen and one nineteen. They had all the prospects that life could hold out for any of the young; one a graduate of Chicago and another of Ann Arbor; one who had passed his examination for the Harvard Law School and was about to take a trip in Europe,--another who had passed at Ann Arbor, the youngest in his class, with three thousand dollars in the bank. Boys who never knew what it was to want a dollar; boys who could reach any position that was to boys of that kind to reach; boys of distinguished and honorable families, families of wealth and position, with all the world before them. And they gave it all up for nothing, for nothing! They took a little companion of one of them, on a crowded street, and killed him, for nothing, and sacrificed everything that could be of value in human life upon the crazy scheme of a couple of immature lads. Now, your Honor, you have been a boy; I have been a boy. And we have known other boys. The best way to understand somebody else is to put yourself in his place. Is it within the realm of your imagination that a boy who was right, with all the prospects of life before him, who could choose what he wanted, without the slightest reason in the world would lure a young companion to his death, and take his place in the shadow of the gallows? No one who has the process of reasoning could doubt that a boy who would do that is not right. How insane they are I care not, whether medically or legally. They did not reason; they could not reason; they committed the most foolish, most unprovoked, most purposeless, most causeless act that any two boys ever committed, and they put themselves where the rope is dangling above their heads Why did they kill little Bobby Franks? Not for money, not for spite; not for hate. They killed him as they might kill a spider or a fly, for the experience. They killed him because they were made that way. Because somewhere in the infinite processes that go to the making up of the boy or the man something slipped, and those unfortunate lads sit here hated, despised, outcasts, with the community shouting for their blood. I know, Your Honor, that every atom of life in all this universe is bound up together. I know that a pebble cannot be thrown into the ocean without disturbing every drop of water in the sea. I know that every life is inextricably mixed and woven with every other life. I know that every influence, conscious and unconscious, acts and reacts on every living organism, and that no one can fix the blame. I know that all life is a series of infinite chances, which sometimes result one way and sometimes another.

Chapter 3 : What is fatalism? What is determinism?

Comment: Ex library, Hardcover copy is in good, solid, condition, DJ has some wear/tearing, unmarked text, a good ricedaydvl.com take great pride in accurately describing the condition of our books, ship within 48 hours and offer a % money back guarantee.

The view that every event has a cause and that everything in the universe is absolutely dependent on and governed by causal laws. Determinism is related to fatalism, since determinists believe that all events, including human actions, are caused by something else. Determinism is typically thought to be incompatible with free will. The freedom of choice or self-determination that human beings possess; those who believe in free will believe that, given any situation, a person could have done other than what he did. Philosophers have argued that free will is incompatible with determinism and fatalism. The view that there are events that do not have any cause; many proponents of free will believe that acts of choice are independent of any physiological or psychological cause. Theological fatalism or theological determinism is an attempt to demonstrate a logical contradiction between an omniscient God and free will, where free will is defined as the ability to choose between alternatives. Since God is omniscient, God has infallible foreknowledge. If God has infallible foreknowledge that tomorrow you will engage in an event mow the lawn, then you must invariably engage in that event mowing the lawn. Therefore, according to theological fatalism, free will is not possible, since you have no alternative except to participate in the event mow the lawn. If you do not mow the lawn, then God is not omniscient. Here is an opposing argument to theological fatalism: Since God is omniscient, He is also infallible. If God has infallible foreknowledge that tomorrow you will mow the lawn, then you will freely choose to do so, not out of obligation or lack of choice. You still have free will to mow the lawn or not mow it; God merely knows your choice before you make it. You are not obliged to mow the lawn tomorrow any more than you are to play tennis or bake a cake. If you were going to change your mind, God would have seen that also, so you still have free will in all matters. Also, you will still make the same choices exercising your free will, even if God chose not to see the future. There is a vast difference between fatalism, chance or fortune, and predestination. Fatalism teaches that there is a blind, impersonal force over which no one has control—“not even God”—and that events are swept along by this blind, purposeless power. In a world ruled by chance, God can foresee what will happen, but that is all. Everything depends on mere luck. Predestination teaches that God neither does nor permits anything except what serves His purpose Psalm It is true that events are certain, but only so because of the sovereign God who fulfills His own decrees. Rather, they understand that a wise, holy, good, and sovereign God has control of every detail of life Matthew But God is sovereign, and He cannot deny Himself.

Chapter 4 : Read Download Force And Freedom Reflections On History PDF – PDF Download

Michele J. Dykhuus; Force, Fate, and Freedom: On Historical racedaydvl.com Reinhard Bendix. University of California Press. pp. \$, Social Forces, Volume We use cookies to enhance your experience on our website.

The key issue - do humans have any degree of free will - is a very involved one. To elucidate its many convolutions one must deal with philosophical and scientific investigations especially in physics, neurology and biology, but also with far-reaching cultural and religious beliefs and behaviour. To illustrate this with brief examples: In physics there is the issue of whether experimental and theoretical physics allow of uncaused events - and if so, how and to what extent. In neurology, the issue is influenced by the increasingly sophisticated study of neural connections and the neurological nature of consciousness and its inevitable role in any freedom of the human will. From such widespread and hugely varied beginnings, differing theologies have developed, each with their doctrine for or against human freedom. The term is imprecise and so can have many different meanings. As preliminaries for discussing the nature of freedom and trying to decide what is true or false about the subject, we may try to make it clearer by asking 'freedom from what?' It may also be worth remembering that the interpretations and standpoints involved are important really only because of the various consequences they have for our lives, thought and activities, such as what kind of society and culture they are likely to support. Grayling has written that we require a clearer conception of free will: However, one cannot make the assumption that all individuals are equally free to choose. Firstly, people in different cultures and different socio-economic classes are subject to different degrees of restraint or freedom to act. Likewise, individuals are not all equally able to exercise free will, as their abilities depend on such factors as maturity, health condition, physical limitations, social restraints, intelligence and the level of their knowledge. This aspect of freedom of the will - 'seemingly such an evident fact' - is mostly overlooked in the concentration on the more technical philosophical or theological issue whether human can have any free will at all. There may be reasons why such a debate is not raised or is unpopular, since it conflicts with the widely cherished generalised belief about the supposed freedom and equality of all persons. On the one hand it is patently evident that everyone does not have the same degree of personal freedom - that is, the ability and means to do whatever they choose - because all freedom or choice is limited by the alternatives on hand. For example, an infant is less free than an adult, a person serving a prison sentence is less free than a normal citizen, a person with broad knowledge and long experience is usually aware of more realistic possibilities and alternatives than a person deprived of education and opportunities for wide experience. The limitations on freedom can also be congenital, as in those born with symptoms of genetic mental retardation. The significance of the above consideration is that it opens for the possibility of degrees of human freedom of will in a way which even tends to challenge the basic assumption of free will as a universal human capacity, or at least some of the implications drawn from it not least in religion, morals and the law. It has been proposed in some religions and by esoteric schools that the degree of free will anyone has depends upon unusual achievements such as yoga, tantra and other practices. The pseudo-philosopher Gurdjieff was a proponent of such a theory. This idea also forms the basis of most Hindu and Buddhist religion. The difficulty with this is that, as a hypothesis, it is far beyond any normal means of investigation or testing. At the other pole are the extreme doctrines of total fatalism or unalterable causal determinism. It is interesting to note that the fatalistic pole is occupied both by many religious fundamentalists and many natural or physical scientists. The other extreme is hardly populated, except for some philosophers of the existentialist variety, such as Jean-Paul Sartre. Most thinkers in the social, historical and political sciences are found well away from the poles, as are those who contribute to some form of ordinary common sense, especially in modern and more Westernised cultures. The most serious challenge to the possibility of human free will comes from speculations around the philosophy of science. Since science aims to trace the cause of every possible event or phenomenon, it is always close to absolutising the assumption that there is no freedom in that everything that happens in any shape or form must inevitably be caused by directly preceding events. This leaves no room for human freedom whatever. Therefore this issue is dealt with first of all, before the many theological speculations that also

would deny any kind of freedom. Since the theological speculations all depend ultimately on belief or non-belief in a God and a doctrine surrounding this i. In short, no belief in any omnipotent creator is presumed here so that the issue can be examined better on its merits independently of doctrine. Yet how can an act of genuinely free will be caused? Likewise, how can any chance event occur, i. When confronted with these dilemmas, natural scientists twist and turn with arguments that almost always amount to denial of the phenomena of free will and chance. However, many sciences operate with a multiplicity of causes, due to the complex interactive and many-faceted structure of matter, mind and society. Jung with his empirical materials to support his theory of synchronicity. Be this as it may, the issue alone opens a major field of discussion about the interpretations of events and, where even what little serious empirical research available is inconclusive. Great Western thinkers have almost always pursued the goal of discovering order in life and the cosmos, whether by religious, philosophical or scientific means. Superstitious as they may seem to the casual observer, such systems of belief contributed to a kind of ordering of ideas and of social relations. The nature of certain regular physical events were examined and described, which led to ideas about underlying structures or laws of nature that determined the ordering of events in time and space. The ultimate origin, meaning and purpose of the cosmos and all its events has been sought by metaphysicians and theologians, artists and mystics, of many cultures. The ideal is all-embracing explanation and is set against the apparent chance happenings of the world and the fearful notion of ultimate chaos. Seeking solutions and explanations of the conflicts of human life and society led thinkers to the conception of an ethical order. This had already arisen in India centuries before with the concept of karma or the universal law of action and reaction in all things, including human actions. The Jews and the Greeks both adopted such conceptions of an ethical order operating on human destiny, which became a cornerstone of Christian and European thought. This fatalism will be looked at from various angles in the following pages. Nations or races seek freedom from external forces, whether military , economic or otherwise and they desire the freedom to exercise socio-economic and political justice. That such freedoms can and do exist is a historical and social fact. Social freedom is also for the good of all society, being the rights a person should have so as to be able do his duty as a member of society. It is not a right or an open license to do whatever one wants; that is anarchy. Whatever denies human beings the minimum of means of doing those duties is a compulsion from which they must seek freedom. Some examples of compulsion are the suppression of the right of religious belief or worship and the denial of the general opportunity of caring for others through work and of not being an undue burden oneself. Some people use their freedom to act well, some to err. The will is what enables us to choose a course of action and decide to follow it, after having arrived at a judgement of how to act in the given circumstances. The freedom to discriminate morally or not do so is a human faculty which other living beings do not have, nor do they suffer as we must from the necessity of having to choose. To discriminate and make efforts to do good, not bad, required a measure of individual freedom, even though it is always bounded by limiting circumstances. There could be no such thing as responsibility and no philosophy other than fatalism could be true. To hold anyone responsible for their conscious acts such as in law would be a gross injustice if they had no freedom to do otherwise. This belief is based on the assumption that the causal connections of all events through time are inevitable, therefore predetermined from the start of the universe, so that there can be no change from the set pattern of developing events. This is scientific determinism at its ultimate. It is ideologically rooted in the nineteenth century mechanistic and mainly static view of events, rather than a dynamic or multi-dimensional perspective. The image of puppets on a string in a shifting shadow drama has been used by fundamentalist religionists to describe our predicament. At the same time we are exhorted to try to play our parts well! Whether science will eventually attain to a full explanation of the conversion of energy in the human organism or not remains to be seen. The advances of science is becoming so impressive in numerous previously-impenetrable areas genetics, astrophysics, micro-physics, nano-technology that it would be foolish to deny that the sciences may never understand the entire connection between consciousness and the body as exemplified, say, in the will to act and the physical movement. Science aims at the explanation, through tangible tests of some sort, of the cause of each event it investigates. It then seeks to generalize about events to find and demonstrate regular orders i. In our day, however, the empirical scientist still tends to accept the

assumption of a non-purposive universe. This is a belief, not a fact, of course and - like all beliefs - it is backed by various arguments and demonstrations, none of which are - or can ever be - conclusive proofs. Probably a majority of biologists, being mainstream Darwinists, still reject the notion of cosmic purpose of any sort from Monod, Dobzhansky etc. However, the paradoxical consequences of the deterministic position that is, its lack of logical consistency across the whole field of events - have caused some biologists to look towards goal-fulfillment teleological explanation to account for evolution. Explanation is thus a mere description of a series of events observed always to be regularly connected to one another. Once consequence of the prime importance of the temporal connection between two events is that explanations are driven to micro-temporal events hence also often at the ultimate microscopic level. This makes it more and more difficult to establish causal connections at the level of normal, humanly-experienced events. However significant statistical connections between events may prove to be, they do not locate or explain the causal connections. There is another sense which the idea of cause usually implies which is left unexplained. The time-honoured notion of a cause, however, originally meant that there was some power, some purposeful principle or an operative Will operating on events or itself somehow inherent in events. Knowing that power, how and why it operates as it does to create and maintain order and causality in nature - rather than the reverse - would amount to explaining events fully. Both philosophers and scientists agree that such a cause is not observable by use of any of the five senses or their combinations. The end result is that one observes that B follows A, but one does not claim it must so do, or that a connecting factor between events is understood. Scientific empiricism serves to summarise and generalize the information gathered from a plethora of different individual descriptions. Scientific experiment is no more or less than a method of discovering which descriptions or generalised descriptions known as hypotheses are based on accurate observations. If the observations are lacking, the hierarchy of descriptions from hypotheses to theories are thrown into doubt and require to be modified or rejected, according to the seriousness of their lack of accuracy etc. This is the essence and the extent of all scientific theory and method, however intricate, however far-reaching its observations in time and space. All this is long-established and unproblematical doctrine in the history and philosophy of science. This is the whole of it; science does not really explain but rather shows us how to observe and manipulate the environment more accurately and thus effectively. There are also anomalies that arise when trying to apply the idea of cause as it was traditionally defined, as Prof. Joad pointed out long ago, "Under the influence of the theory of relativity, twentieth-century physics tends to account for the movements of an entity X solely in terms of happenings in the immediate vicinity of X. Now the so-called law of cause and effect constitutes a particular case of force operating from over a distance, and the law is, therefore, affected by the abandonment of the general conception of which it is a special case. All magnetism is field effect, with the magnetic influence of the sun and earth as impressive instances. In summary, the basic idea of causation obviously cannot be rejected, for there is no adequate replacement for this practically unavoidable way of thought. Kant even saw the idea of causality as one of the few fundamental functions inherent to the human mind at the deepest level. In a profound sense, though, science can even be said not to be able to explain how any event really occurs. An example helps to illustrate this: The bio-chemical construction and functions of enzymes do not help to explain their existence, but only which conditions are observed as accompanying their production. Nor does any such analytic observation help explain their immediate purpose i. Like all physical science, bio-chemistry is devoid of any idea of purpose in nature.

Chapter 5 : Force, Fate, and Freedom: On Historical Sociology by Reinhard Bendix -

University of California Press, Hardback.. 8vo grey cloth with black lettering. Near fine hardback (as new but for ownership sig.) in VG+ dustwrapper (light edgewear and sunned).

Destiny, Freedom and Responsibility The idea of destiny and necessity. Everything in the world is conditioned and takes place according to necessity. When we consider not merely objective events that occur in the world but also conscious human activity, the problem of necessity reveals itself in a new aspect: The thinkers of the ancient world pondered the question of who governed the universe— the gods or destiny? Was the world ruled by reason or by blind necessity? According to Heraclitus, everything depended on destiny, and destiny meant necessity. The essence of destiny was reason, which guided everything. At first destiny was regarded not as a universal abstract necessity but as the fate of individual mortals. Everyone had his own particular fate. Necessity was thus broken down into a large number of fatal forces, sometimes embodied in various creatures such as the oracle, the sorceress, the magician, and so on. Sometimes these forces of destiny came into conflict with each other. Everything in the world is predestined and no one is responsible for what happens. Fatalism has a crushing effect on the individual. In human nature he sees a repulsive sameness, in human relations an irresistible force that belongs to everything in general and to no one in particular. The individual is merely driftwood on the waves. It is ridiculous to fight against the relentless law of fate. At best one may discover what it is, but even then one can only obey. Destiny leads the person who follows voluntarily, and those who resist are dragged by force. Freedom, according to the fatalist, is no more than the will of the horse, whose harness allows it to move only in one direction and in the framework of the shafts. Fatalism links up with religion, which asserts divine predestination. Both fatalism and religion grant human beings only a predestined role along with the illusion that they are acting independently. In any event the fatalist sees only a manifestation of necessity. Absolute surrender is what is expected of every individual in the face of imminent death. It is also held by some philosophers who, as materialists, are opposed to religion and idealism, but believe that everything that happens in the world is predetermined by the "iron chain of cause and effect". Spinoza, for instance, maintained that people were mistaken in believing themselves free because they were only aware of their actions but did not know what causes determined them. In contrast to religious fatalism, Holbach developed the conception of materialistic fatalism. All events were predetermined, not by the divine will but by the relentless sequence of cause and effect, a chain from which not a single link could be eliminated. Necessity commanded not only the physical world but also the world of the mind, wherein consequently everything was also subordinate to fate. Although this mechanistic conception differs from the religious in that it makes its appeal to the natural and not to the supernatural, the two coincide in their general principle. In both philosophies man is doomed to obedience, in one case, to the will of God, in the other, to the immutable laws of nature. Primitive society presupposes the complete identity of freedom and non-freedom for its members, none of whom are yet capable of separating their inner being from that of the tribe. Human actions are thought of as the expression of the will of supernatural forces, as the inevitable blind and capricious power of destiny, which man must obey just as he obeys the life cycle of his organism blood circulation, breathing, etc. As classes and states arise, the concept of freedom gradually becomes contrasted to necessity. Fate did not come to a person from outside but unfolded like a scroll out of his very essence. It was the expression of his character. No matter how tragic their fate, people could not, in principle, desire another because this would mean becoming someone else. The characters in Greek tragedy are carved out of marble, as it were. For example, in the works of Aeschylus all the actions of Oedipus are programmed by fate long before his birth. Even the gods themselves obey fate. According to legend; the Pythian of Delphi proclaimed that even the gods could not avoid what was preordained by fate. No one knew the intentions of fate except the three fateful sisters, Clotho, Lachesis and Atropos. Clotho held the distaff of inevitability on which the thread of life was spun. Lachesis turned the spindle and decided the actions and events of life. Atropos held the scissors to cut the thread of life. Although fate was thought of as something unknowable and absolutely mysterious, people sought to discern its intentions by turning to the oracles. It was believed that fate could not

be understood by means of causal explanation and could reveal its secrets only to the unconscious. The divinity, according to Plato, made prophecy the province of the irrational principle in human nature. The voice of fate could be heard in thunder and lightning, in the flight of birds and the rustle of leaves. Later fate came to be identified with coincidence, chance, something that could not be controlled. A person expected to receive not what was assigned to him by the objective logic of events, but what came his way in the course of the game. Circumstances could make a beggar into a king, or a king into a beggar. The destiny of whole nations was sometimes dependent on petty court intrigues. Later fate came to be seen as an all-embracing and inavertible determinacy, alienated from human life and assuming its own continuity and necessity—“destiny. Man was thus divided, as it were, into what he was in himself and what he was fated to be. The resulting conflict permeated the whole history of humankind. The Christian world-view condemns fatalism. It presupposes faith in divine providence, which leaves room for free expression of the individual will. Confronted by divine omnipotence, fate has to retreat from the sphere of mythology and philosophical disputes to the world of ordinary everyday notions. The religiously oriented conscience, dominated by fear of divine retribution, is opposed to the concept of fate. Everything of importance in human life must therefore proceed outside its influence. However, the idea of fate does not disappear. This form of belief in fate assumes that a person is born under a certain star and thus receives a certain programme in life, including even his personal qualities. With the spread of the idea of historical progress and hope of the revolutionary transformation of social life, the concept of fate was defeated in its main citadel, a defeat that is expressed in both philosophical writings and belles lettres. But the principles of the largely irrational life of bourgeois society continue to foster the idea of fate, particularly in social relations. Many bourgeois political leaders, including Napoleon, the "man of destiny", believed that politics were pure fate, understood as the play of chance defying reason. Goethe referred to a mysterious force that everyone felt but which no philosopher had the power to explain. By studying the symbols of astrology Goethe tried to get back to the ancient conception of fate as something immanent in all living things, the irrational life programme. Spengler thought the idea of fate implied active rejection of individual conscience and good will and scorned all belief in human free will. Fate was the equivalent of such concepts as "life", "development", and "time". The idea of fate thus became symbolic of the pessimistic demand for activity at all costs. Though such activity was bound to be futile, people had to do something all the same. By one-sidedly stressing the role of heredity, the fatalist can maintain that everything we are is predetermined in the Inseminated ovum from which the organism develops, that the conditions of our life play hardly any role or perhaps none at all. From this fatalistic principle several practical conclusions are drawn. One can do nothing about inherited proclivities and diseases, because no one can change his ancestors. This gloomy view of the world found its ultimate expression in the ideology of fascism, which exploited the idea of fate as a weapon of arch-reactionary propaganda. In recent years numerous works interpreting the problem of fate in various ways have appeared in the West. The neo-Thomists combine the idea of fate with that of god. Interpreting fate as a manifestation of an infinitely remote and mystically frightening divine will, the neo-Thomists urge us to submit to fate. In their view a person is in the power of supernatural forces that render him helpless. At times of happiness and strength, hope or inward contentment he feels he is achieving success, but this is really an illusion. Basically the essence of life lies in obedience, awareness of the futility and hopelessness of existence. In scientific, realistically oriented thinking the idea of fate has no categorical meaning. The word is often used to denote an unfavourable or favourable set of circumstances beyond human control and planning. The word "fate" is also used among people who have no faith in any kind of destiny. In the ordinary consciousness it serves to express the idea of necessity, chance or a combination of the two. It is used, for example, when we are talking of the law-governed result of development of certain events which are truly inevitable, although there is nothing mystical about this outcome. By fate we may also mean a certain programme of behaviour determined by heredity, and by the features of temperament and character wisdom or stupidity, restraint or hot-headedness acquired during life. In folk wisdom this is expressed in the saying: The problem of freedom. Stressing the complexity of the problem of freedom, Hegel wrote: There is nothing higher or more significant in any system of philosophical world-view or in the actual stream of human life. It encompasses the meaning of history and stands as the true

criterion of social progress. The sacred word "freedom" has resounded throughout the centuries on the lips of the oppressed and is the guiding star of their social endeavours. Guided by a profound social awareness, their hearts yearn for freedom in the name of the happiness of the poor and oppressed. But this contradiction takes place in the framework of a unity—the unity of will and the real conditions for the manifestation of its freedom. Is a human being free in his choice of action or are his actions preordained by forces beyond his control and opposed to his will? If we say that man is free, how can we reconcile our answer with our acknowledgement of objective necessity? If we say he is not free, does this mean that people are only a means of realising the laws of social development? According to Kant, if human acts of will are empirically conditioned and necessary, no human being can be held responsible for them.

Chapter 6 : - Force, Fate, and Freedom: On Historical Society by Reinhard Bendix

"In Force, Fate, and Freedom the distinguished sociologist Reinhard Bendix presents an eloquent and trenchant argument for an approach to the study of social and political change that is comparative and structural at the same time.

Stace Most people born in the twentieth century were raised with a conflicting set of beliefs concerning the issue of freedom. On the one hand people have been taught or encouraged to believe that they are responsible for their actions and that they are capable of choosing from amongst the options that are presented to them. Yet there is in the language that is used and in the ideas people claim to hold as true another view entirely, namely that there are forces or a force over which humans have no control and that determines what occurs. How can this be that people are free to choose their own paths through life and yet all has been set out by the forces deities? This issue deals with that conflict. Are humans free to make decisions concerning their behavior or not? If humans are not free then what becomes of the notion of responsibility and accountability? What is to be done with those humans who commit crimes if they did so due to factors over which they had no control? Are you one of those people who claim to believe in FATE? Do you think that all things occur as they were meant to occur? Do you believe that "What will be will be"? If you do and you think that you are FREE to make decisions and that the future is undetermined you are a believer in contradictory ideas. The idea of a Fate or Destiny rests on the belief in the absence of proof that is clearly convincing that there is some power or agency that does determine the sets of experiences to be encountered by humans as well as their ultimate demise in both time and manner. Does infallible foreknowledge of a human act by a deity or the "fates" take away Free Will? People that can consistently maintain both Free Will and infallible foreknowledge are called compatibilists. They have a very difficult time providing evidence and reasoning to support their position. People that prove that only one of them can be true are called incompatibilists. Here are attempts to explain and argue for each of these views. Merriam-Webster Dictionary gives us the following: Middle English, from Middle French or Latin; Middle French, from Latin *fatum*, literally, what has been spoken, from neuter of *fatus*, past participle of *fari* to speak 1: You are standing or sitting in some location L. C has determined that at time T you will be in location F and event E that you are hit by a meteorite and die. But you can make a decision to remain where you are now at L when time T comes and avoid being hit. But you do not know the future and so when T comes around you have made decisions that place you at F and you get hit and die. Were you free to decide to remain at L or to go to some other location O when time T came? People are brought up to believe that they are so free but if there is a F that has determined that you are to be at F at T and get hit then you do not have such freedom to make the decision to be at O, act on it and to be at O and not die. If it is your fate to be at F at T and have E occur then you have been determined by C to make the decisions that put you at F at T. You have no choice to decide to do anything but to be at F at T. But are we still free? Well not quite because when we act such as to make decisions to go to O we do not feel as if we are being forced to go to F. We make decisions throughout our daily life and it appears as if they are free and not forced and that our bodies are not being forced into physical places by physical agents. So if there is FATE and FATE determines what happens to us it is not through a series of physical agents acting like thugs and forcing us to do things. No we realize our predetermined FATE by actions that appear to be our own choosing. If there is FATE it would be FATE that acts through us and gives us desires and aims and values and goals and they cause our decisions and they lead to our experiences and to our choices that bring us to F at T to have E. In this case C made you move to F at T. Could you have decided to go to O and not to F at time T? But if there is FATE then when you make a decision in your daily life to do anything such as go to O you would be forced to be at F by some agencies or agents that put you at F. Is this what daily life feels like? Are we regularly deciding to do one thing or go to one place only to be forced to another? If there is FATE then it determines everything that happens and the events that lead up to the "Big Events" that are so memorable and the benchmarks of our lives. If there is FATE then it determines everything that happens whether large or small events because they all contribute to the production of the memorable and the benchmarks of our lives. If there is such a FATE operative we would experience a near constant subversion of our free will choices and

the events we do experience will seem forced against our wills. This is not our experience on a minute by minute or hour by hour basis! There is an agent that knows the future and has infallible foreknowledge of all future events. This agent knows all that has ever happened and that will ever happen. Again we have event E where you get hit by a meteorite at F at T. Now the agent C knows that at F at T there will be E. This knowledge is about the future and it is absolutely certain. It is infallible foreknowledge. Do you arrive at F at T for E freely or not? If C knows D the determined event in the future such as E then you can not do anything that would be counter to the infallible knowledge of C that D occurs at T. So, yesterday C infallibly believed D. As there is no convincing proof such an agency exists we will examine another sense in which freedom or free will is challenged. Are humans free to determine each and every one of their own actions or is there some force, agency, or process that determines it as a result of prior experiences and there really is no free will? Consider some simple definitions for the basic positions:

Chapter 7 : Volumes , History and Theory

Force, Fate, and Freedom serves as an introduction to historical sociology, as well as a critical analysis of the belief in economic and political progress through social knowledge. Reinhard Bendix offers a development of the historicist approach to social change first championed by Max Weber, and presents an overview of the foundations of.

Chapter 8 : QUOTES BY REINHARD BENDIX | A-Z Quotes

Freedom, fate, cause and choice examined from a philosophical viewpoint, with a critical examination of theological and 'karmic' theory on these concepts.

Chapter 9 : Force, Fate, and Freedom: On Historical Society: Reinhard Bendix: racedaydvl.com: Books

Force, Fate, and Freedom serves as an introduction to historical sociology, as well as a critical analysis of the belief in economic and political progress through social knowledge.