

The Time Traveler – Another case of Flawed Fatalism

Today we look a bit deeper into the case of the time traveler that I made up yesterday. This is somewhat of a rehash but a bit of a deeper explanation on why Fatalism is Fatally Flawed. We first must establish a few things.

Firstly the timeline that we are currently in is 'the' future. According to Fatalism it is the set of events that is already going to happen and thusly is unavoidable. Now I know some of you might be saying "but the mere knowledge of the set of events in the future immediately changes them" but we'll save the millions of obvious problems with Fatalism and deal with this one ;).

Now secondly we take into considering the individual who is at the end of time (well close to the end) and has all the information of history leading up to that point as well as the availability of time travel. He's a smart fellow indeed, for those of you that think it would be a lady you can replace the male tones in this story with female, heck I think I will too. Guys are too busy killing one another to use time travel, unless it was for more killing ;).

So this time traveler decides that she really likes President Kennedy, she has always been upset that he was killed off and decides that she is going to back in time the day before the event (any point can be used I'm just using day before for simplicity) and tells him that if he goes he will be killed and explains her time traveling tricks. Kennedy just happens to be a big fan of this sort of thing and decides to trust her and does not go on the motorcade and likewise he survives, paradox's aside of how this might effect the future (you can change the story to put the women born before Kennedy's shooting to fix any issues of birth) we now have an entirely different future than "the Fatalist Future" however you'll find that this in no way negates fatalism.

Because Fatalism does not entail that *the* future is unavoidable, it entails that a future is unavoidable. Which frankly is hardly a revelation, because if this ultimate form of

freedom (changing history itself) does not get broken under the tenets of Fatalism than I can see in no way how Fatalism really entails anything other than stating the painfully obvious nature of history. It happened and thusly it has happened, yes...hard to argue with that. Circular reasoning masked in a blanket of shiny terminology is still circular reasoning, and likewise Fatalism is Fatally Flawed because no amount of altering the past, present, or future would ever cause it to be untrue which means that there is no set pattern of events that must happen in order for it to happen. It only requires that a set of patterns happen, which is inevitable since it's sort of a necessity for time and space.

So that's it for today, just felt I should get this little bit out because it's what I'll be discussing in my class tomorrow to hopefully put the final nail in the coffin of this (to me) moronic metaphysical concept, I'm starting to wonder what the rules are for making a popular metaphysical view. "Take a completely logical point, attach a bunch of wildly unrelated or miscoded points, and slap on a grandiose conclusion."

Penguin, Rico. "The Time Traveller- Another Case of Flawed Fatalism." Rico Penguin. 24 Feb. 2009. Web. 14 Feb. 2016

Overview of ^{presentation} Metaphysics }
Plato - Allegory
+ question
Speed dating
Buddha's Eight-
fold path
Sate - Being +
Nothingness