In Book II, Chapter III of *Physics*, Aristotle discusses factors he finds necessary to explain the existence of the natural body.\(^1\) He poses a series of questions that he feels must be answered in order to create this explanation. He says it is not possible to say what a thing is, without first knowing “why” it is. Asking why is similar to asking “what brought this thing into being?” When Aristotle asks why a thing exists, he means to ask what factors are responsible, i.e., what factors account for the existence of the natural body? He wants to find out what questions must be asked to understand the “why” of a given event.

Aristotle develops four questions he feels should be asked in order to explain the existence of the natural body, and with each question he gives an associated cause. 1) Out of what has something come? The “out of what” is known as the *material cause*. 2) What is that thing? What the thing is meant to be is known as the *formal cause*. 3) By what means, or agent, is that thing produced? This agent is known as the *efficient cause*, e.g., a mother is the efficient cause of her daughter. 4) For what end or purpose is that thing happening? (For the sake of what is it happening?) The purpose or end state is known as the *final cause*, e.g., a man reads for the sake of gaining knowledge. Knowledge is the final cause of his reading. It should be noted, however, that the Greek word translated as ‘cause’ (*aition*) actually means “responsible,” but we will use the English term ‘cause’ instead.

Aristotle says that all of the four causes are related to one another and it is impossible to separate them in the natural world. However, he also wonders if there is also a fifth cause, namely chance, which acts on the world. In order to further investigate this, he first gives definitions of chance as well as luck. I will suggest that chance is not a cause, but rather a met
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phenomenon, and that there is no such thing as luck. My case will follow Aristotle’s definitions of chance and luck and their relationship with the natural world.

Chance is defined as a sort of occurrence in the natural world which could have been caused for a purpose, but instead is caused coincidentally. Chance is something applicable to situations involving animals or inanimate objects. An example of a chance event would be the following situation. Imagine a man is running down an alley in New York City after he just shot and killed another man. He runs past a building which happens to have construction work being done on the roof. A bundle of steel beams happens to fall from a crane on the roof and onto the unfortunate man, killing him. Completely by chance, the murderer is brought to justice.

Aristotle emphasizes that the key factor that distinguishes chance from luck is whether or not human intentions are involved. Since nature cannot be said to have intentions, but only tendencies and processes, nature cannot experience luck. Aristotle says that chance is the interruption of a natural process which produces an unusual result. For example, mutations and abnormalities in nature are a result of chance. If a frog is born with two heads (completely naturally, without any human intervention involved), the natural chain of causation is disrupted. As seen in this example, chance events occur without any purpose in themselves. Chance is seen as an event which happens to redirect things from reaching their typical end, bringing them to some other end.

Luck is similar to chance, because both phenomena occur with some sort of an end, only they arrive at that end coincidentally. Aristotle says that the only thing distinguishing luck from chance is that luck occurs exclusively among things which can think or decide to do something. Luck requires the presence of human intent. Essentially, luck is chance which occurs to humans, as Aristotle thinks that humans are the only things possessing true thought or decision making powers. An example of an event involving luck would be the following situation. A man goes to the market to purchase groceries for the week; the purpose of his trip is to buy food. While shopping, he happens to run into an old colleague of his who
owes him a sum of money. His colleague ends up paying him the money owed, and by luck the debt is repaid. The man is happy that the debt is repaid, however that was not the purpose of his trip to the grocery store. Also, it is likely that the colleague did not intend to repay the debt while on his trip to the store, but completely by chance the paths of the man and his colleague happen to cross, and the result of this crossing is having the debt repaid.

I believe that a “lucky” event is no more than a chance event which produces a favorable outcome. Conversely, “unlucky” events are merely chance events which produce an unfavorable outcome. Nevertheless, having produced a favorable outcome or not, it remains true that both of the events occur randomly. I believe that it is not human intentions which distinguish chance from luck, but rather whether or not the outcome of the event is a favorable one. We have already seen that the outcomes of both chance events and lucky events do not depend on what our intention for the situation might be. The outcomes of both events happen coincidentally regardless of how we intended the situation to occur. Aristotle says that events involving luck can only occur to humans because human intentions are involved. I think that because human intentions do not play a part on the outcome of the actual event, luck should not be regarded any differently from chance. The only difference is that humans are able to decide whether or not an event’s outcome is a favorable or unfavorable one.
It was once true that people tended to address societal problems with purely religious explanations. Poverty, family strife, and suffering were blamed on sin and the Fall of Man. The Enlightenment, with its emphasis on human reason and progress, ended this trend. Some believe, however, that placing the emphasis for change in society on rational, social responses to issues has separated humanity from its necessary spiritual and psychological responses. Carl Jung, in *Man and His Symbols*, states that “modern man does not understand how much his ‘rationalism’ has put him at the mercy of the psychic ‘underworld’”.¹ Joseph Campbell expresses a similar sentiment in his *Myths to Live By*: “Those who think ... that they know how the universe could have been better than it is, how it would have been had they created it, without pain, without sorrow, without time, without life, are unfit for illumination.”² Both authors, however, are critical of modern religion and its role in the spiritual well-being of humanity. Campbell, who was influenced by Jung’s view on dreams, myths, and symbols, presents a sharp critique of Christianity’s response to the modern society’s identity crisis. A closer look at Jung and Campbell’s writings, however, makes it evident that a redeemed vision of Christianity and a new outlook on the struggle for peace and social justice can bridge the gap between spiritual and sociological methods for interacting with the changing world.

Carl Jung, like his mentor Sigmund Freud, emphasized dream interpretation, although his approach was more existential than reductive. The analytical approach to therapy which he conceived covers the totality of the human psyche, but the “major approach to the unconscious is through dream interpretation.”³ Jung approached dreams as messages from his patient’s unconscious, messages which had to be interpreted in
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the context of the whole individual. The unconscious as perceived by Jung is two-fold, consisting of the “personal unconscious,” which “contains personal contents belonging to the individual himself which can and properly should be made conscious,” and the “collective unconscious,” which is “composed of transpersonal, universal contents which cannot be assimilated by the ego.” This collective unconscious contains symbols that are common throughout a particular culture and often cross-culturally. Jung called these collectively available symbols archetypes.

Jung’s archetypes are probably one of the most revolutionary of his ideas about the human psyche. As mentioned before, Jung felt that not only was there a personal unconscious which contains aspects of a person’s personality hidden from their conscious mind, but also a collective unconscious, which is “universal, supra-personal, and non-individual.” This collective unconscious links humans with each other and with the deepest mists of the past. It manifests itself in dreams in the form of “archetypal images,” which are “to the psyche what the instinct is to the body.” According to Jung, such archetypal images take the form of mythological symbols which also appear in cultures around the world. Thus, in order for the therapist to be helpful to a patient, the therapist must first “acquire a wider knowledge of [the] origins and significance . . . [of] ancient myths and the stories that appear in the dreams of the modern patient,” as pointed out by Joseph L. Henderson in Man and His Symbols. Joseph Campbell certainly took this advice to heart, focusing his study on myths both ancient and modern.

In Campbell’s view, an appropriate mythology allows an individual to live an adjusted, affirming life in whatever conditions one lives in. Campbell sees mythology as the most important “differentiating feature . . . separating human from
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animal psychology.” Therefore, modern humans need mythology as much as ancient civilizations. Campbell blames many of the world’s problems on the human inability to reconcile myths with modern society:

With our old mythologically founded taboos unsettled by our own modern sciences, there is everywhere in the civilized world a rapidly rising incidence of vice and crime, mental disorders, suicides and dope addictions, shattered homes, impudent children, violence, murder, and despair.\(^9\)

Jung corroborates this statement, referring to the world as “disassociated like a neurotic.”\(^{10}\) If the social problems of the world are inherently rooted in psychological/spiritual disassociation from the collective unconscious, then they should be solved with individual psychotherapy. It is on this dissociation that Campbell bases his two primary critiques. He criticizes Christianity for its lack of adaptability to modern realities, and so too the struggle for social change as a denial of life’s inherent suffering. A close analysis of his statements in the context of his and Jung’s larger work, however, shows some basic flaws in Campbell’s argument which can be expanded into a redeeming image of Christianity, peace, and social justice.

Campbell’s extensive critique of Christianity is based on three main points: first, its inability to adapt to modern realities; second, its shortcomings when compared to Eastern mythology such as Hinduism and Buddhism; and third, its connection with peace and social struggle, which will be examined extensively. In short, Campbell sees Christianity as having a faulty view of the past, an impotent role in the present, and an unrealistic view of the future. In Campbell’s view, the basic teachings of Christianity are irreconcilable with science and any modern quest for truth. He describes an amusing episode of a child explaining to his mother that the
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Christian creation story is incorrect based on scientific evidence. He goes on to point out several examples of Biblical “history” which have been proven historically inaccurate, from the flood to the appearance of life on the planet to the plagues in Egypt. Campbell has similar criticisms of the literal interpretations of such Christian miracles as Jesus’ resurrection and Ascension. With its historical background in question, he finds Christianity lacking, especially when compared to what he sees as the more adaptable religions of the East.

Campbell is very impressed with the philosophy and religion of the East. He refers to it as “the great East,” and compares the ideas of Buddhism and the identity of Self with God with what he sees as the exclusive, externally based spiritual ideas of Christianity. The religions of the East offer a perfect example of Campbell’s ideal mythology: life-affirming, beautiful, and, because of their purely symbolic nature, adaptable to modern times. He refers to the *Bhagavad-Gita*, one of the most important texts of Hinduism, as a “song . . . of that spirit immortal that never was born, never dies, but lives in all things,” and states that this is a “universal song that is sung not in Indian art alone but in Far Eastern life as well.” The Judeo-Christian Testament is, by comparison, “one of the most brutal war mythologies of all time.” Christianity, meanwhile, can be reduced to “the crumbling medieval architecture of . . . [the] Church.” In addition to this dichotomy, Campbell looks at both religions through the lens of war and peace and finds Christianity lacking.

Campbell divides all mythologies into two categories, mythologies of war and peace. His analysis centers on what he sees as the horrible beauty of the former versus the naivety or hypocrisy of the latter. Simply put, mythologies of war accept the cruel facts of life and thus help people survive; mythologies
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of peace, however, deny such facts and thus lead to denial of the dark side of human nature in their followers.\(^\text{17}\) He classifies Christianity as a mythology of peace that is interpreted ineffectively as a mythology of war in order to protect it; thus, Christianity, according to Campbell, is either not fit for survival or inherently hypocritical.\(^\text{18}\) This analysis is rooted in Campbell’s deeper belief about the reality of life. His affinity with Eastern religion is evident in his feeling that all life is suffering, and that suffering should not be fought against but affirmed. Anyone struggling for positive change is, in his view, missing the point: “All societies are evil, sorrowful, and inequitable; and so they always will be. So if you really want to help this world, what you will have to teach is how to live in it.”\(^\text{19}\) In this manner Campbell refutes Christianity and the struggle for peace and social justice in one fell swoop. He then moves merrily along his way after attacking the world’s largest religion and the movement for a more equitable world that so many people have found so meaningful. Of course, all of this is done in the name of the health of the human psyche.

Campbell is an excellent storyteller and a distinguished scholar, and thus his arguments deserve to be seriously and critically examined. His most persuasive arguments are those against a literalist view of the Bible and Christianity, a well-supported and verified viewpoint. However, Campbell makes the mistake of identifying Christian literalists with all Christians, an unsupported generalization. Although all Christians adhere to some form of literalism, e.g., the divinity of Christ, the importance of Hebrew Testament history receives varying degrees of emphasis in different churches. In fact, if a true Christian is one who takes into the essence of his or her life the teachings of Jesus Christ’s life, death, and resurrection, it is obvious that Christianity is in fact a rebellion against a dogmatic and overly literal view of religion. Campbell does seem to appreciate the sayings of Jesus, but these sayings should also be a core part of a healthy Christianity.\(^\text{20}\)
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Campbell’s point is that the historical foundations of mythology are much less important than their symbolic meanings; however, when he makes this point about Hinduism, he is quick to offer a redeeming story from Hindu myth, something he very rarely does for Christianity.\(^{21}\)

In comparing Christianity to Eastern mythology, Campbell is often guilty of comparing the worst aspects of the former to the most beautiful, serene aspects of the latter. Certainly Christianity has its dark side. Nobody could or should deny the horrors committed in the name of Christianity during the Crusades, the Inquisition, and the conquest of the Americas, just to name a few cases. Yet in the name of the beautiful ideal of duty found in the East, some of the worst class warfare in the existence of humanity has been carried out. It may certainly be true that all life is suffering; however, a Hindu born into the highest priest sect will certainly experience a much smaller share of that suffering than one born into the Untouchable non-caste, with no hope of advancement. The Untouchable has sewer cleaning or hide tanning to look forward to for the rest of one’s painfully short life. Campbell criticizes the inability of Western religion to create an identity with God in the Self, but his examples of those who have suffered for such a belief include Jesus, whose life and teaching are the very basis of Christianity.\(^{22}\) Thus, Campbell’s critique of Christianity in comparison with Eastern mythology is a contradictory one.

Every mythology, when put into the hands of fault-filled man, is prone to misuse. Kevin Brien expresses this in his dialogue “To Believe? - Or Not to Believe?” Commenting on Erich Fromm’s classification of religions as either authoritarian or humanistic in nature, Brien identifies the Christianity of Christ as “the theistic religion that comes closest to completely realizing the ideal of humanistic religion” and the Buddhism of Buddha as “the non-theistic religion that comes closest to doing so.”\(^{23}\) All religions, according to Brien’s interpretation of Fromm, have had both authoritarian and humanistic aspects
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throughout their history. In fact, the best aspect of religion across the board is not, as Campbell proposes, its ability to affirm suffering, but its “living heart” of love, something which is equally accessible in all religions, including the Christianity which Campbell so strongly critiques.\(^{24}\) Campbell addresses the mythology of love, but fails to see the connection between it and the mythology of peace, a gap that must be bridged if the spiritual importance of the struggle for social change is to be understood.

In addition to the past and present, it is important to address Campbell’s critique of the Christian view of the future, which is inextricably linked to his negative view of the struggle for social change and peace in the modern world. Campbell ridicules people who want to change the world before discovering their own place in it: “Let me first correct society, then get around to myself,” is how he classifies the beliefs of many people in the modern world.\(^{25}\) However, this classification ignores the struggles of many who have managed both to achieve individual spirituality and outward change - Martin Luther King, Jr., Mahatma Gandhi, Mother Teresa, Harriet Tubman, and the Christ and Buddha figures of mythology, just to name a few. A story of Gandhi related by teacher and writer Colman McCarthy serves to illustrate this point:

A story is told of a mother who walked from a distant village to visit Gandhi in his ashram. She brought her little boy. “He won’t stop eating sugar,” she told Gandhi. “It’s bad for his health but he won’t listen. But he’ll listen to you, Gandhi, you’re his hero. Please tell him to stop.” Gandhi looked at the boy, pondered, and told the mother to come back in one week. Slightly irritated - it was mid-summer and the village was far away - she left. The next week she came back with her child. Gandhi patted him on the head and told him to stop eating sugar, that it’s bad for one’s health. The mother thanked Gandhi profusely.

\(^{24}\) Brien, 31.
\(^{25}\) Campbell, 104.
Walking to the gate of the ashram, she turned to ask Gandhi why he didn’t say that the week before. “Mother, until one week ago I was eating sugar.”

Those figures who portray the highest aspirations of the movement for peace and social justice would firmly agree with Campbell that one should not try to change the world without first changing oneself. This is hardly the same as Campbell’s statement: “if you really want to help the world, what you will have to teach is how to live in it.”

Much more accurate would be Daisaku Ikeda’s statement that “legal and structural reforms must be supported by a corresponding revolution in consciousness - the development of the kind of universal humanity that transcends differences from within.”

It is important to learn to live in the world, while not, however, forgetting that much can be done to ease the suffering of others. Campbell brushes aside slavery, Jim Crow, and institutionalized caste brutality as the same sort of inevitable suffering that is present in nature, but it is not. It is suffering of a much different, human kind, and it can and should be changed.

What of war then? It is true, to an extent, that “killing is the precondition of all living whatsoever,” in the sense that life feeds on life and returns to life in death. Yet it is hardly this sublime, natural sort of killing which occurs in Israel-Palestine or on city streets from Fallujah to New York City. In Campbell’s own words, “it is a basic idea of practically every war mythology that the enemy is a monster and that in killing him one is protecting the only truly valuable order of human life on earth, which is that, of course, of one’s own people.”

Yet this is a tribal ideal that has become a neurotic obsession in modern warfare. The war epics to which Campbell refers are relics of tribes inevitably fighting over limited resources. They
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are not written about artificial nations created to horde resources and elevated to what Paul Tillich refers to as an idolatrous extreme.\textsuperscript{31} The purpose of a mythology of peace is to move past this tribally divided way of looking at the world, and this is a two part struggle, both inward and outward. Jung’s statement, mentioned earlier, that the “world is, so to speak, disassociated like a neurotic” indicates that both the Self as an individual and the world as a whole are in need of healing. Campbell accuses the world of ignoring the Self, but one must be careful not to fall into the trap of ignoring the world.

A person who wants to follow this path, then, is faced with a difficult task. How does one reconcile Jung and Campbell’s idea - that one must be more introverted and self-reflecting to learn how to deal with the world - with the ideal of extroverted, positive change? The answer is that the means and the ends must be made one. Any process of individuation must be achieved in such a way that is conducive to a positive, building interaction with the outer world. The reader of Jung and Campbell need not go far afield to find examples of such a simultaneously inward and outward change. This dual journey is present in the four stages of the animus analyzed by Jung’s student M.L. von Franz in \textit{Man and His Symbols}, which progresses from the “wholly physical man” to “wise guide to spiritual truth,” an identity “often projected onto Gandhi” and thus tied closely to the bridge between individuation and peaceful struggle.\textsuperscript{32} This same progression is described by Søren Kierkegaard in his four stages of human experience, from the aesthetic to the ethical (the stage which Campbell criticizes) through to Religion A and B, in which ethics are not left behind but made part of a more inwardly searching spiritual journey.\textsuperscript{33} And this same dual journey is identified by Campbell, although not identified with peace and social justice, in his essay on the mythology of love.

\textsuperscript{31} Brien, 25.
\textsuperscript{33} Matthew McNaught, \textit{“Précis of Stages on Life’s Way (Kierkegaard),”} classroom handout.
Campbell sums up the idea of the mythology of love in, surprisingly, a Christian teaching: “Love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you.”

Perhaps his most compelling example of the power of love is in his study of Arthurian myth. His story of Parzival and the Muslim knight first fighting and then sitting down to reconcile their differences, discovering that they are brothers, is to him a symbol of the healing of the Self and the recognition of the God Within. It can also be seen, however, as a symbol for the sort of non-violent interfaith healing that is so desperately needed in areas like Jerusalem and Kashmir. It is not surprising that love, the heart of religion and of peace, is the bridge over the gap between the search for individual meaning and the struggle for outward change.

If one returns to Jung, one finds yet more examples of the importance of the dual journey. The theory of “synchronicity,” for example, expressed a “postulated acausal connecting principle . . . indicating that under certain circumstances events in the outer world coincided meaningfully with inner psychic states.” Jung is referring to the odd ability of dreams to, in a way, predict the future; however, synchronicity is yet another facet of a journey both inward to the Self and outward to the Other. The importance of synchronicity to the peace and social justice movement is addressed in an article by Leonard Felder in Tikkan Magazine entitled “Prayer as Rebellion”: “Prayer is not a passive activity, but rather a way to stir things up and get things rolling. I think of Rabbi Abraham Heschel marching with Martin Luther King, Jr. and saying that they were ‘praying with their feet.’” Thus prayer, an introspective activity, is utilized effectively for positive, outward results, an example both of synchronicity and of the dual journey.

Certainly it is unlikely that anyone will achieve the ideal world conceived of by the struggle for peace and social justice. Campbell admonishes his readers to remember the words of the
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Bhagavad-Gita: “Wretched are those who work for results.”

It is not the end result that is important, but rather the struggle itself. Rev. King is not remembered because he achieved his Dream, but because he began the long journey towards it, a journey that a new generation of activists is called upon to continue. It is both an inward and an outward journey, and neither aspect of it should be marginalized or ignored. According to Rabbi Michael Lerner, one of the founders of the Tikkun Community, “we reject all attempts at a spiritual politics that talks about ‘values’ while ignoring the material well-being of the human race . . . but we have also rejected the notion of a Maslow-based hierarchy of needs . . . and we call this framework a politics of meaning or an Emancipatory Spirituality.”

Perhaps one of the most poetic expressions of this idea of achieving both internal, spiritual healing and external, material healing comes from the Hindu mythology that Campbell champions so firmly. In verses 9-11 of the Isha Upanishad, the speaker states:

In dark night live those for whom
The world without alone is real
Darker still, for whom the world within
Alone is real. The first leads to a life
Of action, the second to a life of meditation.
But those who combine action with meditation
Cross the sea of death through action
And enter into immortality
Through the practice of meditation
So have we heard from the wise.

These are hardly the words of a mythology dedicated only to acceptance of outward suffering, rather they recognize the importance of a dual journey, inward and outward.

There are many ways to embark on this dual journey, and Campbell - whether he realizes it or not - achieves one such
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way. The power of story, art, and music to create both internal and external change can never be underestimated. Campbell is at his best as a storyteller, and although he might focus on the inner importance of myths, these same myths have much meaning for the external world. Campbell, Jung, King, Lerner, Teresa are healers in a world in need of much healing. There is much work to be done, both in the Self and outside the Self. It is a never-ending struggle that must be continued until the Self and the Other are One, like Parzival and his brother, and the Dream is achieved. Whether the end result is possible is irrelevant to the larger importance of the journey.
Continuity of Consciousness: Locke on the Self
Timothy Huston

John Locke has been a major influence on both philosophical thought and political theory. One of his more controversial and influential philosophical positions concerns his theory of personal identity. It concerns the problem of which factors makes a person the same person over time. For Locke, continuity of consciousness, enabled by memory, allows an individual to be the same person over time. Locke’s proposal was designed with an agenda in mind. Locke wanted a concept of personal identity which could be reconciled with his views on personal responsibility in the case of legal accountability and concerning his Christian belief in a bodily resurrection. Locke’s writings are clever and well-crafted, but at the same time they run into serious difficulties. A contemporary of Locke, Thomas Reid, is among his more notable critics. Reid’s objections are extremely well-founded and intelligent. I will show that, by modifying Locke’s theory to answer Reid’s criticisms, a plausible version of Locke’s theory can be salvaged.

John Locke’s Christian beliefs brought him to the conclusion that the physical body was not what made someone a person, because the body ceases existing at death. However, Locke still did not believe that the mind or immaterial soul were all that personal identity involved. For Locke, personal identity is twofold in that one must not only be the same person, one must be actively aware of having the same identity. This may seem like circular reasoning, but Locke is presenting a strong argument for personal identity through continuity of consciousness. Continuity of consciousness functions through memory; it is the memory that one is the same self as one has always been.

Locke’s theory is also designed to account for his beliefs involving legal accountability. As a founder of classic liberal thought, he knew that a man could not be held legally accountable for something that he did not do. Locke mentions
that people sometimes have lapses in memory and hence are literally not themselves in certain situations. Locke states that the legal system compensates for this:

But if it be possible for the same man to have distinct incommunicable consciousness at different times, it is past doubt the same man would at different times make different persons; which, we see, is the sense of mankind in the solemnst declaration of their opinions, human laws not punishing the mad man for the sober man’s actions, nor the sober man for what the mad man did,—thereby making them two persons: which is somewhat explained by our way of speaking in English when we say such one is “not himself,” or is “besides himself;” in which phrases it is insinuated, as f’ those who now, or tat least first used them, thought the self was changed; the selfsame person was no longer in that man.¹

It seems then that Locke has presented an idea of personal identity which encompasses both Christian beliefs and notions of legal responsibility. Memory of one’s own actions is the measure of responsibility in a court of law and at the resurrection. Despite this, his theory is not without its critics.

The most famous critique of Locke’s theory comes from Thomas Reid. Reid levels several devastating criticisms at Locke. The first objection deals with the transfer of consciousness. If, as Locke proposes, consciousness can be transferred from being to being, duplicating a chain of memories could produce multiple instances of the same self. Reid finds this contradicts the notion of what personal identity is. In addition, Reid believes that Locke’s language confuses consciousness with memory, as exemplified in Locke’s discussion of transferring many persons into one biological organism. Reid objects on legal grounds as well; memory loss alone does not justify innocence. The fact that an individual

does not remember committing a crime does not free him from legal responsibility. Reid would argue that we do, in fact, punish the sober man for the actions of the mad man or the drunk man. Reid’s most telling criticism is his famous brave officer objection:

Suppose a brave officer to have been flogged when a boy at school for robbing an orchard, to have taken a standard from the enemy in first campaign, and to have been made a general in advanced life; suppose, also, which must be admitted to be possible, that, when he took the standard, he was conscious of having been flogged at school, and that, when made a general, he was conscious of his taking the standard, but had absolutely lost the consciousness of his flogging. These things being supposed, it follows, from Mr. Locke’s doctrine, that he was flogged at school is the same person who took the standard, and that he who took the standard is the same person who was made a general. Whence it follows, if there by any truth in logic, that the general is the same person with him who was flogged at school. But the general’s consciousness does not reach so far back as his flogging; therefore, according to Mr. Locke’s doctrine, he is not the person who was flogged. Therefore the general is, and at the same time is not, the same person with him who was flogged at school.\(^2\)

According to Locke’s theory the old man is not the same person as the child. Even though his physical body is the same, his identity is not the same if continuity is limited to dependence on memory. Reid suggests that there are other ways to maintain the continuity of an individual. Memory for Reid is only an indicator of identity, it cannot constitute identity.

We must now ask if Reid’s objections are sound. Reid’s objection to Locke’s claim that more than one person could be

placed in an organism might be misguided. Locke does not really mean that consciousness can be separated from a mind or a body. He uses this example only to prove that there is no necessary connection, a point that is necessary to reconcile personal identity with Christianity. I would argue that consciousness is tied to thinking and thinking is done by the mind, so perhaps continuity of consciousness is dependent upon continuity of mind. Reid shows a fatal flaw in Locke’s theory through the brave officer story. The personal identity of the general and the child would be different under Locke’s proposal. Obviously, using memory alone to show continuity is inconclusive. This does not mean that the idea of continuity is completely hopeless. I believe there is something solid about knowing one is the same self over time.

Locke’s idea of continuity of consciousness can be reconstructed into a theory which works. Reid rejects the idea of consciousness as independent of a mind. However some people believe that consciousness, mind, and body are independent, but that they all act on each other through our perceptions of each of them. As far as legal ramifications go, Locke is more correct than Reid. Despite the importance of legal responsibility, being in a severely altered state in most modern societies can relieve someone from legal responsibility, or at least lessen the criminal responsibility. Reid may have feared that Locke’s theory would destroy the idea of personal responsibility and accountability. The main issue to be addressed when trying to salvage Locke’s theory is the problem of the brave officer. Continuity might be better replaced by a linkage of consciousness and memory, but where continuity of consciousness does not only depend on memory.

I believe Locke’s view of continuity is salvageable. A linkage of consciousness and memory can refute the brave officer example. The general remembers his middle years in the service, the middle-aged service man remembers his childhood, but the general does not remember his childhood. Despite this, there is a connection between the general and the child through the shared connection of his officer days. They are all part of his continuous stream of consciousness. This linkage of consciousness is based upon Locke’s idea, but
replaces continuity of memory with linkage involving a continuous stream of consciousness.

Locke’s work on personal identity was a breakthrough for the subject. Locke created a unique theory that attempts to satisfy all angles of his belief structure, without sounding crowded or nonsensical. The limitations of Locke’s theory revolved around lapses in memory and what Reid calls confounding the evidence of personal identity with personal identity. I believe that Reid’s criticisms for the most part are well-founded. In fact his criticism, that continuity confounds the evidence with what is trying to be proved, is the main strike against Locke’s proposal and my version. I have shown that, with the proper changes, a version of Locke’s theory can be salvaged. I believe that a link of consciousness and memory through one’s life establishes personal identity and avoids complications such as the brave officer problem. This link of mental continuity allows consciousness and memory to connect people to past events and without a complete dependence on memory.
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