

# Can Determinism Be Reconciled With Epicureanism? (Admin Edit - No, But Let's Talk About Why Not)

Post by “Pacatus” of February 24, 2024 at 3:41 PM

From the review cited by [Kalosyni](#) in post #50:

“To be clear, Mitchell does not believe our choices are absolutely free from any prior causes. We are all constrained by our genes, our histories, our psychological traits, and our developed characters. Instead of radical metaphysical freedom, Mitchell persuasively develops a more modest conception of free will that entails the evolved ability to make real choices in the service of our goals—that is, to act for our own reasons.”

Thus, Mitchell is not advocating for so-called “libertarian free will.”

From the review cited by [Don](#) in post #60:

“Organisms are not passively driven by outside signals, they interpret them, they are *“meeting the world halfway, as an active partner in a dance that lasts a lifetime”* (p. 217). This is the kind of academic poetry that blows my mind.” **Mine too!** 😊

“Ultimately, he thinks the question of free will is a red herring and takes a pragmatic view: *‘If free will is the capacity for conscious, rational control of our actions, then I am happy in saying we have it’* ... Rather than all-or-none, we have degrees of freedom, and not all people are equal in that regard.”

Thus, we can recognize mitigating circumstances with regard to personal and ethical responsibility -- without denying responsibility altogether.