

## Luck

Why would anyone write about luck? My answer to that question is that the reason why anyone would write about luck is not the same as the reason why someone would write about luck. If I were someone rather than anyone then there would be a judgement about this writing depending upon how you viewed my situation. If I were very rich and I wrote about luck you might draw certain conclusions, if I were disabled you might draw different conclusions, and if I were famous you might draw different conclusions.

Firstly, my esteemed and reliable friend mentioned to me many years ago while he was studying philosophy that luck is a valid philosophical subject to be considered. This immediately elevated luck as a phenomena as something more than superstitious post hoc characterisation of an un-forecast event / experience. I am also writing about luck for a number of additional but less deep reasons. Recently I have cursed my luck. At other times I have felt fantastic because of it. I have known the word for as long as I can remember, and I feel as though the whole concept of it was instantly familiar when I first heard the word in context, because I can't remember being taught what luck meant.

Luck has now become increasingly central to my well-being, and increasingly common in my thoughts. This is partly a result of my striving to improve the quality of my being, my character and my life. This is not a self-centred goal because I believe that such self-improvement will primarily benefit those people I call friends who I spend time with. My ongoing efforts at improving myself involve reducing deception and hypocrisy. It seemed intuitive to me that I had to start with elimination of self-deception and hypocrisy before I could improve my moral character. In my striving to eliminate both self-deception and hypocrisy I continuously require myself to be and to remain accountable and responsible for my actions. But frequently I feel I am unable to be held accountable and the reason seems to have something to do with what we call luck.

There are certain keywords involved in my pursuit of improvement (not really self-improvement but improving myself for others to be around) and these words include fault, reason, achievement, earn, and deserve. When something goes well for me, or right for me, I wonder did I really achieve that? Did I earn it? Can I actually claim it with integrity? I have little difficulty in seeing the merit of other peoples achievements, but I do not find it easy to honestly assess my own.

Any concerted effort to eliminate self-deception quickly gets bogged down in an essentially dualist dilemma. Dualism is the branch of philosophy summarised by famous doctrine of Rene Descarts in the maxim "Cogito Ergo Sum" – "I think therefore I am". It relates to the fact that no knowledge can be guaranteed. The only thing that we can be certain of is our existence that is verified by the fact that we are aware of our own thoughts.

If I wish to eliminate self-deception then I am on a philosophical quest, firstly for the self (who am I) then for the deception. Luck is at the center of some critical issues for a self aware and reasoning social animal. These issues are central to philosophy of all kinds and flavours, but luck rarely if ever is accounted for. There must be some reason or something about luck that makes it a word that rarely occupies philosophical space, yet it seems fundamental to every theory and tenet of philosophy.

It is crucial to distinguish between the definition of luck, the meaning of luck and the implications of luck. The definition describes what luck is. The meaning of luck is concerned with the existence of luck because its existence mandates certain other things to be true. This has implications in the real world. My personal musing focuses on whether luck is something subjective and interpreted, in which case it is up to every individual to decide whether they are lucky or not, or whether luck is a real noumenal 'entity', like a force, like gravity.

If luck is like a force much like light or gravity, then this has profound ramifications. It means that luck is available, as well as unavoidable. It would also seem that luck is widely misunderstood, or poorly understood, or both. It also seems from the lack of discussion about the nature of luck that most people feel that it is beyond our control. This would only be true if it were a real objective thing (force), since if luck is subjective, then it is necessarily entirely within our control.

Luck has great impact in some lives and some impact on all lives. The question of whether luck is an entity or whether it is subjective therefore impacts everyone. I should state at the outset that I personally believe that it is both, and I also believe that I can prove this assertion to be true. This may seem obvious to you, but recognition of luck being a noumenal entity is very rare in modern society, and the impact is profound for each individual who can accept this as a fact.

Another important preliminary question is directed towards you, the reader. Is your mind made up about luck? Have you already decided that luck does or does not exist, and in what form? There are some immediate implications that

arise from the belief that luck does or does not exist. If it does not exist, then what is it that so many people talk about and notice, and describe as luck? Conversely, if it does exist, then how can it be selectively acquired or controlled? And if it can't be accessed or controlled, then what is it?

If your mind is made up, then mine is not. If I can establish that luck is an entity as well as a subjective interpretation, then I believe that it would be possible to view your own life from a potentially new perspective. It seems to me that so little is known about luck, that once you get a deeper understanding of it, it is like some sort of revelation.

In order to elucidate and share this revelation, I shall first discuss how we consider and conceptualise luck in modern Western society. Then I shall qualify the definition of luck, so we are considering the same thing. Then I shall demonstrate how luck is both subjective and objective, qualitative and quantitative. By this time, I intend to have made you less certain of what luck actually is. Finally I shall allude to the ramifications and impact that this knowledge has on our individual lives. I expect that when seen in context, your views of luck and your life will change, to some degree at least.

## **Luck In Modernity**

It seems generally that people are reluctant to invest much reliance on luck. Western society has modelled its education system on premises of thought and logic established by Aristotle, Socrates and Plato, who Edward DeBono sarcastically calls the 'Gang Of Three'. They assert the qualities of deductive and inductive reasoning, the foundations of the scientific method and, this approach to thinking and conceptualisation precludes the notion of luck being anything other than a statistical perspective upon the outcome of historical events. In the West, luck seems superstitious.

In modern society, there is an intrinsic aversion to unpredictability in preference for known outcomes. Luck is what we work so meticulously and diligently to avoid in preference for 'stability', 'peace of mind' and 'security'. This is probably due to the natural predisposition for reliability and certainty of results and outcomes, especially for important matters. Luck and uncertainty do not even have an easy place in casinos, where the punter is always focused on how to beat the game and have a (certain or reliable) win. They certainly do not figure luck in the calculation of a dividend.

The popularity of science over all other systems of thought is a direct result of, and evidence of our strong disposition for predictable outcomes and results. These days we rely on science rather than astrology to explain our circumstances, our personalities, or the possibilities of tomorrow. The fact is that we now commonly attribute 'progress' to the impact of education and science, and as noted earlier, in the West education is based in the scientific approach to reasoning so they are one and the same.

According to Scruton in his book "An Intelligent Persons Guide To Philosophy" there is an awareness at least within philosophy circles that the scientific method has limitations. To quote him, "First, that the search for causes involves a search for laws; secondly, that laws are statements of probability; thirdly, that laws themselves are explained thru wider and more general laws; fourthly, that however far we investigate the cause of something, we can always go further; and finally, that the further we go, the more remote we find ourselves in the world of observation." (Scruton 2002).

The critical parts of these statements are that laws are statements of probability, and our increasing remoteness in a world of observation. The very fact that science is based on laws of probability goes some way in accounting for the fact that luck continues to exist in the modern vocabulary. The fact that we base our learning and reasoning on observation has curious implications for the existence of luck. Luck is difficult to experiment with because it cannot be isolated from other random events that can measurably occur.

It seems that there is less and less room for luck in contemporary living. So many people prefer to live in circumstances of dependability, reliability, accountability, and certainty, it is as if this represented the only approach to life that is available, and that any deviation from such an 'optimal' lifestyle would be backward and superstitious. This imposes a significant framework around the philosophical concepts of determination and pre-destination, which will be discussed later.

It is obviously true that the pursuit of individual happiness remains predominant in our individual lives. It is generally so important that people expend large amounts of effort and skill in attempts to ensure the certainty of the attainment of happiness, and conversely spend the same effort in eliminating adverse luck and chance. Happiness is definitely something that you would want to be reliable and reasonably certain (but is it ever?). This seems both natural and logical, but 'natural' and 'logical' are both conclusions stemming from deductive reasoning. It would be equally valid to

conclude that attempts to exclude luck and chance from our attainment of happiness or satisfaction are instead facile and futile, because no one can ever establish that they *have* excluded luck and chance from their pursuits.

It is questionable if there are many mature age people who would not say that one of the single most determinant factors in the path of their life has been chance or luck (good or bad). Given the truth of this, the considerable time and effort invested into avoiding chance and luck seems wasted, and only the effort put into minimising the effects of it appear justified. How then do we use our education and 'intelligence' to improve our mental lives, since it we have established that our attempts to increase certainty and reliability are wasted, and this evidentially so.

And how does our predisposition towards these two states affect our thinking, behaviour, and therefore ultimately our wellbeing?

The previous few paragraphs suggest two things as having a basis in fact. The first is the during the information age we tend to act as if we believe that we have mostly or at least tried earnestly to eliminate luck from the prosperity of our lives, when in fact, all we effectively achieve is the mitigation of the outcomes of luck. The second fact is that despite our science, logic and deductive reasoning, the element of luck expressed as uncertainty figures to be a driving factor in contemporary lives. No one really argues that they have arrived at their current circumstances purely and entirely as a result of their planning and design.

It is plausible and actually probable that for each individual life, luck is having the same degree of impact now as it did one hundred and probably one thousand years ago. Yet these days we do not fully acknowledge that fact that luck has a bearing on every single outcome we achieve. The closest recognition I have personally been exposed to is the guaranteed imperfection of decision making. The question is whether we are deluded about the role of luck in our achievements, or simply silent and reticent, perhaps as a result of some noble goal or egotistical thirst for recognition and self-actualisation.

It is possible that the only difference between the information age and previous ages is the importance and acknowledgement of the role we ascribe to the intervention of luck in determining our lives. Each and every culture has its own approach to understanding and to reconciling luck in daily life, but the trend in the West has certainly been towards the elimination of luck from the fortunes of individual lives and the goals and achievements we desire to shape our (modern) society.

Religious people have recently (perhaps always in different terms) sterilised luck on the basis of Intelligent Design. Over the past one hundred and fifty years science and deductive reasoning have also attempted to sideline luck. The complete failure to achieve this goal is perhaps in part due to our inability to identify luck and define what luck is, in addition to a number of other less important factors. If we can not know what luck is, it will be very hard to reduce it, or have any other impact upon it. Furthermore, it prevents measurement, and therefore conclusions based on analysis.

## **The Definition of Luck**

Luck is often considered to be the occurrence of an event that (seemingly) has no causal factor. It is an event of chance. Luck can also be considered to be the outcome of an unlikely event. Alternatively some might say that luck is perhaps an act of god (stated from their personal individual autonomy). Some authors describe it in circumstantial terms, like the discovery of a brand new treatment that leads to rapid recovery from serious illness, or the spilling of a drink onto a stranger's coat that led to a conversation that made a dream come true. In each of these examples, luck is viewed differently. It is obviously mandatory to define luck before I discuss it otherwise we can not share its meaning.

In the previous chapter I established that as a result of our modern approaches to reasoning, we have come to disregard and divest ourselves of luck in contemporary life. Given this, the one place that is certain to have a skewed, biased, incomplete and incorrect definition of luck is a modern dictionary. Could a compendium of definitions developed by a school of thought that denies luck have a useful comprehensive definition for it and the correctly ascribe meaning to the word?

The Third Edition of the Macquarie Concise Dictionary defines luck as "That which happens to a person ... as if by chance, in the course of events...Considered as the result of chance". This definition is hardly surprising, given the association of the word chance with the discipline of statistics. The same book describes chance as "the absence of any known reason why an event should turn out one way rather than another, spoken of as if it were a real agency...probability...accidentally..."

This definition based on the word 'chance' which is based on 'reason' support my earlier propositions about the role of deductive reasoning in consideration of luck, namely that luck and reason are so incompatible that one can only exist

in the absence of the other. And it is true, luck can only exist in the absence of science and science can only exist in the absence of luck. Science cannot work with luck. In modern terms, luck is neither real, nor possible unless reason cannot account for an event. To effectively understand luck then you must use an alternative approach to thinking, one that is not based on deductive scientific reasoning.

Notice in the Macquarie dictionary definition that luck is stated as only being possible in a post-hoc sense (it is the "result" of chance). This implies that the cause of luck is known – it is a chance event. Observations suggest that the cause of luck is definitely not known, and that a chance event is not the cause but a facilitator otherwise all chance events would yield luck. Furthermore, chance is stated as being "as if it were a real agency". This means that it is as if luck possessed or was an inherent harnessing of some external and phenomenological power.

I will demonstrate that luck is a phenomenon. A phenomenon is something "perceived by the senses ... with the real object apprehended by the intellect" (Speake 1979). Phenomena include things like telepathy so I approach thinking about luck in the same way I approach thinking about telepathy, and scientific thought is insufficient and generally unaccommodating, though not in purity.

In contemporary culture we don't and can't believe that things can exist or happen without a reason (determination, causality ect). Everything has an explanation and every thing is the result of *a priori* premises. According to the Macquarie definition, you cannot say something was lucky before the event, because luck can only exist where there is no detectable reason and before an event

- Luck can only exist after an event, that has no apparent or measurable, observable reason

Another defining thing about luck is that it requires consciousness and intellect, and therefore is part of the faculty of reason in a *post hoc* (after the fact) sense. An instance of luck is dependant upon a cognitive effort whereby alternative outcomes to a particular event are forecast. These predictable alternatives are then evaluated by comparison with the actual outcome, and only if there is a difference can a pivotal event begin to be deemed possibly lucky or unlucky.

- Luck requires cognition and reasoning

This comparison-followed-by-a-judgement is not just a pre-requisite of luck it defines luck in a new way. The important aspect is a chain of cognitive events that rely on temporal evaluation. An event itself is not lucky or unlucky, we must decide that it has all the characteristics that would make it so. And this judgement cannot be made until the event is compared to our imaginary possible and probable alternate outcomes that result from what we know of the initiating circumstances. If we could have predicted or forecast it, this event would not be the result of luck, or a lucky outcome. Finally, when compared to our forecasts, this event must have been significantly inferior or superior for the event to be unlucky or lucky respectively.

- Luck requires probabilistic forecasting and is the result of a judgement

One of the attributes of luck is its temporal dependency. One definition above mandated a set of *a priori* factors to be able to precipitate an instance of luck, since existence alone cannot be said to be lucky or unlucky. The second definition required comparison of possible alternative outcomes before an event could a *post hoc* be declared lucky. Furthermore, one of the qualities of luck is time dependant because the degree of luck in an event can be measured by the duration or magnitude of the effect (the result or outcome assessed).

- Luck is time dependant

In summary of the dot points I begin to define luck as having certain pre-requisites, including "a temporal phenomenon resulting from cognition, reasoning and judgement, that can only exist in the absence of reason".

This is an example of luck 'being' defined from a purely subjective point of view. But there is more to luck that cannot be defined because we do not yet understand it sufficiently to decompose it into definitional constructs. By this I mean that our understanding of luck might be similar to our understanding of gravity. We have never trapped any, we have never really measured a unit of it, we do not know what it is comprised of, we do not actually know what it is, but it is undeniably real for us and we collectively (in English at least) agree that can occur, at least for some people.

Every single person knows what it is in an imprecise or vague way, but no one seems to know exactly what it is, definitively. Everyone experiences some of it, or a lot of it but no one has yet come up with a unit of measurement. It is omnipresent and pervasive, and has to be by nature and necessity, unavoidable. The effects of it are easy to see and the results of it can be and are usually easy to measure. These are the characteristics of something that is not yet understood by modern scientific treatise. Once we thought that the universe was comprised of ether that was the

necessary medium of propagation for light and sound. For some time we did not know why an apple falls to the ground, and now we know we cannot prove it. We still do not understand how or why waves can act like particles, and particles can act like waves. And our endeavours for knowledge, technology and achievement, especially in science, intrinsically rely on the elimination of its effect.

We are confronted with something that we can occasionally see the impact of, but we are unable to explain it away for dismissal. However, if we extrapolate existing scientific theories we can prove that there is something available without effort, and it requires explanation and account. The stumbling block of our attempts is probably our methodology and the logic underpinning semantic and syllogistic reasoning.

It is as if something were 'being-in-space' in a time before the principles of mathematics and geometry were fully established, so the opportunity to share its manifestations in pragmatic discourse were thereby unavailable. The reality was reliant on tools and designations to be developed. As long as we attempt to understand luck using deductive reasoning and the scientific method, it will mostly elude us. We need an unfamiliar, creative, innovative approach to our manner of comprehension in order to begin to decompose and account for observations deemed to be luck. To facilitate this mandates the use of syllogism and further deconstructive reasoning to emphasise the fact that there is in fact and certainty something in existence to be understood, the epistemology of luck.

### **Does Luck Exist?**

The matter of existence in philosophy is a complex issue based in logic that includes the key concepts of phenomena and noumena. Phenomenon is "any object or occurrence perceived by the senses" in contrast to noumenon, which is the "thing in itself" "that are the external source of experience that are not themselves knowable and can only be inferred from the experience of phenomena" (Speake 1979).

The issue at hand here is whether luck exists outside the world of our perception. If it does, then luck is an entity as well as a subjective measure. For an example of whether luck exists outside phenomena one can ask whether it is lucky (or unlucky) that conditions prevailed as they did on Earth that gave rise to current circumstances, state, and includes (the miracle of) modern humans?

This entails a degree of abstraction because it includes objective consideration and self-assessment for an individual who belongs to a group that that individual belongs to. The question could be simplified, distilled and more easily managed if it were re-stated as "was I (were you) lucky (or unlucky) to be born?" This question encapsulates the *sine quo non* about the nature of luck, especially considering that life is not something we choose for ourselves but something that is either thrust upon us or simply that we encounter (in continually differing terms). Philosophers generally consider this to underline the *absurdity* of life, namely, that we must 'endure' something that we did not necessarily choose. We are also unable to choose the elemental thread that founds consciousness, 'being' the basis of our contemplation.

Whether or not you "were lucky to be born", is the point being pursued, and is ideally the single unit being ascertained, namely the 'existence' of (such) luck as an externality and or subjectivity. This can additionally become intertwined with an 'issue' or 'aspect' of life, when you ask whether "a person can be born lucky?". Quoting Scruton again "if we hold someone responsible for a state of affairs we do not necessarily imply that their actions caused it, or that someone is responsible for everything they deliberately do. The word 'cause' links an event to a person. Responsibility is not about the actions of the person but the person themselves. Relations of responsibility unlike causal relations are negotiable. You can reduce or increase your accountability or responsibility by reasoned dialog." (Scruton 2002)

What he is saying is that in events that result from human activity, no one is fully accountable for everything they intend to do. There is or seems to be an unavoidable and permanent element(s) of randomness, chance or luck, inescapable in possibility within the results of all of our actions. But the degree to which any outcome is not of our doing is variable by the extent that we can argue it. It is agreed by all that luck exists in potentially everything that involves us, and we are not held accountable because we are not responsible for any outcome that is the result of luck.

The answers to whether luck exists or not occupy a spectrum. Someone like Dr Spock off Star Trek would claim that there is no such thing as luck, that there is only the differing probability of events occurring. All of the outcomes are theoretically foreseeable if we choose to consider any situation fully enough. If every possibility is theoretically predictable then this gives immutable credibility to Determinism. If luck were subjective then it would exist, so the view that there is no such thing as luck means that luck could, and could only, if it existed, only be a noumenal entity.

The other end of the spectra on whether luck exists says that luck determines everything and that nothing has a cause. This implies that luck is entirely phenomenal because of the relationship between randomness (or perceived non-

mathematical chaos) and cause. The science of chaos shows us that truly random activity can contain sensitive dependence on initial conditions – specific and limited causal factors. Therefore luck must come not from such randomness stemming from extrapolation, but therefore from subjective interpretation. This means that luck is all that exists, because everything for a conscious creature as us is entirely phenomenal and reducible to a state that pre-exists anything that we have ‘meritoriously’ developed.

Both these arguments can be proven to be possible in theory only. To begin with, it is not humanly possible to be able to predict all the possible outcomes of any activity, and it is extremely costly to try and predict most of the outcomes. There is therefore necessarily subjective interpretation of unforeseen outcomes, and this must be (is) what we can only call luck, or some term semantically or equivalent or some agent constructively equivalent. Secondly, science through the application of experimentation and theory and prediction, so forthrightly, assertively, and inflexibly suggests that the material world exists in an absolutely noumenal sense, that only philosophers would be inclined to bother arguing otherwise (against what might actually be ideological anyway in first principles). Either way, luck exists for both and all, and this justifies this effort.

But the question remains, and it is regarding the ‘nature’ of luck. Is it like unquantified misunderstood electromagnetic radiation possibly subject to quantum like effects that help disguise its true form, or is it purely something of our perception, a subjective way of accounting for things we have trouble accounting for otherwise. The common example is color. If luck is not purely and totally perceptual and subjective, then some of it must therefore be noumenal, objective, quantitative and material.

The bridge between the perceptual concept of luck and the material nature of it can be considered from a few conventional different perspectives. In terms of physics, we can use relativity and what is colloquially called the fabric of space-time. We appreciate that time has its own peculiar properties, as well as its uniform and well known ones, that enable it to pass perceptively more or less slowly, or more or less rapidly, depending on some situational and circumstantial mathematically describable characteristics. This is in spite of the fact that time is generally regarded as being linear and quite absolute. Furthermore, summarily, we tend to accept that there is a strong relationship between light and time, or at least entropy and time, and this is inherent in the currently popular view called the Big Bang Theory. That is not to say that time did not exist prior to the Big Bang, but that ‘our’ time could not have existed before the big bang, since ‘our’ universe did not exist.

According to Einstein, anomalies can occur in time as a result of the velocity of movement having particular direction and frames of reference if this velocity exceeds a critical threshold which happens to be the speed of light. If any such anomaly occurs in time, we are faced with the situation of lagging behind what is occurring, or conversely getting in front of what is about to occur, both disturbing causality, and both deriving from a frame-of-reference issue.

If we lag behind, we are faced with a pre-destined future that is available for certain, reliable and essentially guaranteed predictability, because it is actually occurring, event after event, externally, ahead of us. Any person travelling without the same lag (the frame of reference) would be able to accurately predict our future. If we accelerate ahead in time, then we must necessarily be able to look back and see what is about to happen, with ostensibly the same result. In either situation, luck is extinguished between frames of reference by the relativistic discrepancies, and delimited by the value of the time lag anomaly that comprised the initial premise of this assessment.

Luck can also be extinguished by design and responsibility. From a religious perspective, the known universe is by design, and all events are the responsibility and result of divine will, so there can be little room for luck, other than to be disparaging. That is not to say that religious people do not believe luck exists. In fact, it so definitely exists that it is subject to the will of God, which can supersede luck and impose order and meaning where luck would normally be held as the cause. If God is not responsible for absolutely everything, and not everything is by omnipotent design and unfolding according to plan, then only luck could be posited as the only thing that could fill the void (again avoiding disparagement or defamation).

But on both counts, science and religion, the fabric of space-time is agreed to exist, and exist in an external sense to us. Critically, there is a temptation to contemplate and at least not ignore the ineffable possibility that we are at a particular and certain temporal point, and that the point that lies ahead is in fact knowable by virtue of its externality, but not by us.

If the point that lies ahead is knowable, then what is going to happen to us is theoretically and measurably knowable also. This being the case, it is pre-written whether what is coming up is beneficial or otherwise, as is our interpretation of it. Under these circumstances it becomes a matter of apparent fate and fortune, despite our personal subjective interpretation, and our fate will be available to be judged by others, possibly with great accord, as having been lucky or unlucky, and this in contrast to our own characterisation of it, maybe in contradiction to consensus. In such a case, luck

is relegated in isolation as being a “thing-in-itself” and the “external source of experience”, due to the dissent about its affect and effect, but which is not itself knowable for the same reason.

### Characteristics of Luck

Not-surprisingly science is the only thing that science will accept to establish truth or the existence of a fact is scientific proof (?). I personally feel that that this demonstrates science is somewhat either ideological, self-ignorant and inflexible like religion. Proof theorems are based on deductive reasoning, extrapolated and induced, yet luck exists by default in the void of reason, so science cannot be used to prove luck exists because a proof theorem is thereby impossible.

If luck is assumed to be (on occasion) the result of chance, and chance has no real agency, then luck is something that must be powerless. Luck cannot be a force since it exhibits none of the essential attributes of one. Also, luck is not a topic that in my very limited exposure, is explicitly or specifically dealt with commonly in either philosophy or psychology, so luck would seem to not be a mental phenomenon.

Luck is sometimes discussed in the field of statistics where it may be said to be a *post hoc* way of explaining probabilistic or non-probabilistic outliers and is accounted for in essence by degrees of freedom and estimates of the standard error. If something had a very low probability of occurring, so low that it was not even considered likely, then the limited occurrence of such a particular event might be considered luck, it being held *a-priori* be escape forecast of its likelihood, being usually unforeseeable and potentially unexplainable. In this sense, luck is closely associated with lack of detectable causality transferring into reasonable forecast ability. This ties in well with the dictionary definition but contradicts an inescapable requirement violating it *a priori*.

In continuing to look at what are not characteristics of luck, we can examine the inverse of luck - reliability tending to certainty. Luck does not arise from reliability or certainty, yet luck co-exists with reliability and certainty up to a particular theoretical point of guarantee, this being outside of nature. Since luck cannot determine a given circumstance without impacting reliability or certainty, and since a circumstance must be the result of either these two states, it follows that luck must have properties in common with these two states that makes it indistinguishable under known conditions, otherwise it could not be used as a substitute having a value is equal to the value of their absence. We cannot have a gap in the event horizon, so luck as uncertainty *must* fill the void, having mostly the same if not comprehensively identical characteristics as these two descriptions of certain necessary states.

If luck is essentially the same as something that certainly exists so it has a state of certainty, then we should be able to use a point estimate by way of an example to yield knowledge and understanding of what luck is (like) and what its attributes and features are.

This is similar to the north and south poles of a magnet. They are essentially the same, with nearly if not identical characteristics, attributes and even properties, but they are conceptually and effectively opposite (in nature). Another example that is however opposite in scale, are the fields of science and religion. They both claim to be facilities offering a worthwhile account for everything (at least as a minimum for everything in existence), in addition to the provision of some certainty, reliability or dependability, accountability, utility so on (leading to improvement and benefit resulting from the exclusion or minimisation of luck). In their absence, luck pretty much prevails. They must be similar things by these properties, and both must be very good (utility perfect) substitutes for luck. And when considered semantically or anecdotally, this seems to be upheld. They all (science, religion and luck) account for what happened (happens) in our existence, and they are all interchangeable and proportionately to complete our understanding punctuated by knowledge gaps. (Some might say chaos prevails in the absence of reliability etc, so in the next chapter the relationship between the field of chaos, including its account for randomness and perturbation).

Another fact about luck that distinguishes it from mere probability, it's capricious propensity do a back-flip from 'unlucky' to into 'lucky', and *vice-versa*. It is once again it is the disintegration in time and effect, the lack of context and meaning that precipitates an event to be described in terms of luck. It is idiosyncratic of luck to change as it often can or does.

When someone misses a plane that gets high-jacked, or gets stuck at a red light when the car in front gets hit by a truck, or when someone finds money then loses it all buying lottery tickets that win nothing, the unstable, reversible, non-transducible or simply unenduring quality of luck becomes apparent. Carl Jung (in Anderson 1999) adds to this suggested divergence from statistical understanding when he stated “It is generally believed that numbers were invented or thought out by man, and are therefore nothing but concepts of quantities, containing nothing that was not put into them by intellect. But it is equally possible that numbers were found or discovered, they might easily be endowed with qualities that have still to be discovered.”

Another digression from statistics that represents an encompassing and generally agreeable understanding of what luck manifestly is, can be found through the analysis of the temporal properties and amorphous virtue(s) of luck. It is uncommon for people to be able to narrowly define or specifically identify ahead of time, what a lucky or unlucky outcome might constitute for a given particular set of circumstances or situation; people are limited by the available parameters of their consideration. This leads to inescapable inability to sensibly identify clear and robust, or reasonably singular descriptions of what a lucky or unlucky result, outcome, apparition or eventuation would be; since it would have to be outside likely or unlikely and foreseeable, yet still remain remotely probable. Luck seems to reside in events that are somewhere beyond imagination, for once we can imagine it we can assign some sort of intuitive probability to it, even if it is a baseless and unreliable judgement or forecast.

I should probably point out the ontological detail of the meaning of luck with reference to it being unforeseeable and beyond the imagination. Any person who plays the lotteries will contest that their winning, which is certainly attributed to luck, is not at all beyond their imagination. In fact the premise of my argument is that *winning* is beyond their imagination, whereas spending the loot is not.

My view is that lottery players can only imagine the payoff, and subsequently spending it. They can only imagine from a point beyond where the last number is called that makes them a winner. They more likely tend to and can only imagine forward from a point where they would jump up and down in their lounge room if they win. Furthermore, they usually only imagine how they would spend the money, that in fact occurs after the verification of their ticket, the drive home, the waiting for the deposit of funds and so on. They do not imagine the interconnectedness between what happened before they decided a particular number was lucky, what happened before the event that led them to buy a ticket, or what happened in the room where the numbers were drawn before the numbers were put into the barrel. What lottery players imagine is probabilities and material possibilities, not their luck

Continuing my argument against luck being a *post hoc* description of statistical probability, and extending the synchronicity point of view, there is a philosophical consideration describing the nature of luck that must be mentioned. The argument that luck is probabilistic must be epistemologically examined (in such a way as to reveal the reliability of the knowledge).

If the universe is indeed described adequately by immutable laws that can be reduced reliably to numerical expressions, and that can then be manipulated to arrive for example at the grammar of statistics, then a fact of this reasoning is as follows. Amongst the logic of designations that are utilised to yield these laws and describe nature, one must accept that there is a potentially remote but certain though incalculable probability that the universe is in fact absolutely ordered. The word ordered here imbues a wide meaning that can include *determined, predestined, fatalistic* or for existentialists, 'chosen without choice'. As a tautology, if probability entirely governs, then one cannot ignore the probability (confidence interval) that probability does not in fact govern after all, and that something unaccountable (non-standard error or point outlier) in fact governs.

There must exist by the rules of probability the likelihood that probability is not entirely or absolutely correct (as the manner to account for all things happening). One must acknowledge that the knowledge that leads us to believe that probability does not incorporate luck, either as a confidence interval or standard error, is in fact insufficient or incomplete, and that the real attribute of the state of luck is real and as yet unknown or unrealised.

The laws of probability dictate that if we decide luck is only probability otherwise considered and stated, then either the initial premise of probability describing luck is faulty, or that it somewhat masks to mislead away from the real and actual governing force that luck actually is. And finally, if knowledge of probability allows us to describe luck, then what accounts for the occurrence in probability of an outlier, that is, an extremely unlikely and remote event? After all, probability is the structured and formalised description of chance events, but an event that has no chance will still be measured by probability because it *can possibly happen*, it is just so extremely remote that there seems no chance. If you know everything that can happen, then you know anything can happen.

In Ken Anderson's book "The Coincidence File: Synchronicity, Morphic Resonance or Pure or Chance" (1999) luck is looked at in different terms. He talks about the coincidence and accumulation of chance events as a demonstration of synchronicity, which is evidence of an interconnected and woven cosmos. He describes story after story of people telling how chance events were significant for them and how these events changed their lives in unexpected and beneficial ways. He states "To dismiss coincidence as merely chance... is to ignore the real problem of randomness, to appeal inappropriately to probability theory, and to discount the idea of a purposeful universe." This statement implies many things. They include the notion that luck always has a causal factor, though it may be unseen or unknowable; that luck may be some kind of message or (re)direction from greater higher forces, and that luck and randomness may



be interrelated or inversely related. It is interesting to note the reference to the “real problem of randomness”. The approach of philosophy to the concept of randomness will be addressed in the following section on pre-determination.

Therefore, luck requires expanded by an accumulating number of conditions that are required for luck to exist. It can only exist within a framework characterised by the non-existence of more common things such as agency, predictability, reason, reliability and certainty.

---

## **The Meaning Of Luck**

A classic philosophical question that encompasses the states of experience and existence is ‘if a tree falls in a forest and no one is there to hear it, does it make a sound?’ If someone wins a lottery, but they remain unaware of the win, is it luck? Luck is dependant upon both experience and cognition. Before a judgement can take place about an event with respect to luck, the event must be perceived and contextually evaluated. A determination of luck is thereby proof of the capability to perceive luck, as well as knowing how to define it. Luck is like a reflection in a mirror. It confirms existence perception and cognition. Luck enables one to confirm certain aspects of consciousness, so luck becomes involved with the philosophical issues of phenomena and dualism (I think therefore I am).

One of the important aspects of “The Coincidence File” is that lucky (and therefore unlucky) events are considered as being in a serial and synchronous manner. Having said this, luck can be viewed as an event in isolation, where the causal factor is not apparent, or not yet apparent. It is the desolation of meaning, the lack of context of the event that leads us to consider it luck.

The existence of luck is in conflict with a philosophical concept known as determination. The doctrine of Determinism is concerned with causality. The fundamental thing about causality is that it leads to inevitability. Since everything has a cause, then the outcome is inevitable. It is really about freedom of will for individuals. Can we really exercise free will and make choices that determine our future or are our choices the result of a set of circumstances that leave us only capable of making a particular decision without any real freedom. In the absence of free will, then one thing leads to another, and in such a situation you can make your own luck.

If this is true then there are significant implications for luck. If everything has a causal factor, then luck can only be something of perception, because there is no such thing a truly random event. It would also mean that luck would indicate a limitation of our understanding since whatever we might consider to be luck is in fact causally explainable, however we are unable to provide the explanation. Most importantly, it implies that does not really exist because everything is determined as a result of something else, which in turn implies that all things are theoretically predictable. It was not luck then that led to this situation but something else. Under Fatalism, luck undergoes a definitional change and becomes available as destiny or fate.

When applied dogmatically, Fatalism can mean that there is no luck only destiny or fate, and the world is beyond our control because the future is pre-destined. Anything that we might otherwise conclude was luck is in fact an event where the causal factor has been obscured from our perception. And the idea of us ‘making our own luck’ becomes impossible, because we are no longer free agents. This is an arguable interpretation of Fatalism that is primarily focused on causal events for current realities.

If Fatalism is not dogmatically applied, then luck can exist. All it requires is a situation where we do not know the full context of an isolated event, even though we believe it could be causally explained. But we would not describe all situations with unknown causes as lucky or unlucky. For us to decide that an occurrence is luck, the (potential) significance of the outcome must be important, dramatic, and lead to a different set of circumstances. Put another way, an event won't be considered to be luck unless it changes or could have changed an outcome in a significant way. For example, finding twenty cents is not considered to be very lucky, but finding twenty dollars is. It is the significance of the outcome more than the likelihood that warrants the perception of luck.

From the perspective of Fatalism, an important event leading to significant change, in the absence of contextual and causal information, would not be considered to be luck, but would in fact be a sign (herald) of a change in destiny, fate and future. The meaning of luck under Fatalism is not to mark an unexplained event that led to change, because no events are unexplained. Luck under Fatalism means that a particular set of circumstances have led to a dramatic change in a persons future, and a particular event (lucky / unlucky) is a sign the marks the point at which the path to the future was significantly altered. A chance event may turn out to be the causal factor of something significant yet to happen. In effect, the event deemed to be lucky, is actually a marker for a change of destiny.

For me, the doctrine of Determinism has implications for the existence of luck the result from an unlikely corroboration with physics and Einstein's special theory of relativity. The 'Twins Paradox' is a situation (summarily) where two people are together in one place at the same time. One of them takes off in a rocket and travels at near the speed of light in one direction, then turns around and returns at the same speed to meet with the person who remained where they were. When they meet again, the twin who travelled is younger than the one who remained still. This is not the paradox *per se* but is an anomaly due to an effect called Time Dilation.

Another one of Einstein's thought experiments concerned the absoluteness of the speed of light. In a graphic explanation of the effect of the speed of light being an absolute maximal velocity, he described a situation where a person travelling at the speed of light was travelling directly away from a clock face. If the clock was showing midday, then the time on the face of the clock, the hands, would never progress because the person observing it was travelling at the speed of light and so would only ever see the same clock face. The progress forward in time of the hands moving and the time changing would exist only in vision of the clock face that was behind the person travelling at the speed of light.

A personal (part) conclusion is based on the intersection between Determinism and physics. This is that if luck does exist as a real noumenal entity rather than a phenomenon, then if one were subject to time dilation or time anomalies, it would theoretically be possible to 'see' your own luck before it happened because it would have known causal factors. Your luck could be identified by the net change of your circumstances after the luck event. Most importantly, this alludes to the possibility of discovering whether luck is a subjective interpretation of the outcome of an event, or whether luck is a noumenal 'force' that impacts everything in its field.

If luck is subjective, then your interpretation of the change you saw coming would change also, and be neutralised. It would probably be diminished because you could foresee the probability of the event rendering it as likely. Alternatively, if luck is a true 'force', then you would be equally moved whether you could foresee the luck event or not, because it is the event and not the interpretation that is leading to your response. Imagine that due to a time dilation you could see yourself about to get hit by a truck and injured seriously. No amount of future outcomes would be able to change your disappointment resulting from the event.

If randomness does not truly exist, then everything must be the result of probability. Luck would then be the measurable characteristic of outliers, highly improbable events, even though their possibility is predictable in an arena containing randomness. The implication of this is that not only *can* you 'make your own luck', but also that you can do so with accuracy, by focusing on achieving extremely unlikely outcomes.

Chaos theory comprehensively describes the interplay between Determinism and randomness. It proves that a system can evolve from a set of initial conditions (called sensitive dependence) into a state where the system becomes chaotic and detail of its future state cannot be known. This bridges the Determinist idea of causality with a physical and mathematical fact of unpredictability and unknowable results. Accordingly, an event of luck will be a signpost of a significant new future that cannot necessarily be predicted and cannot be interpolated.

Religious people may generally see things in a greater context, subject to higher purpose, making them less inclined to be interpreting things as luck since they are mindful of overriding spiritual order. But occasionally for these people a consecutive run of negative events not only leaves them less than happy, but questioning or testing 'their faith'. Both Anderson and religious people have awareness of something other than determinism, reductionism and rationalism in life. For them this knowledge leads to new philosophy that will account for something much bigger going on than we are able to or are required to understand.

It is noteworthy here that "The Coincidence File" (Anderson 1999) recommends keeping a diary of chance events so that they can be seen in context after they have acquired meaning, and so that they can be identified as being a causal factor rather than having a causal factor. My point as an addendum to this idea is that if a prerequisite of luck is that it is the occurrence of an event that was beyond imagination, then a diary would provide evidence not only of the fact that it wasn't imagined, but that it could not possibly have been imagined given your antecedent circumstances. I would further suggest that a diary of coincidences, synchronicity and unlikely events would provide evidence of the magnitude and degree or dimension that an event was beyond your imagination.

If simply reading Anderson's book by itself does not leave you with a practical understanding of how to cement some happiness or durable satisfaction, then start keeping a diary of the unusual and chance occurrences in your life. (Note: I am not suggesting a daily journal of what goes on in your life, but an intermittent but structured set of notes about the

irregularities and preconditions of irregularities in your life. You could also keep a record of things that make you happy or satisfied, why they made you happy, how much satisfaction they provided, it's durability etc).

=====

So this document may provide an agreeable roadmap to a more detailed appreciation of luck. The next step might be to look at reliability and certainty. I am hoping that in the basis of the previous definitional discussion, reliability seems more closely related to luck than certainty seems inversely related. I hope to have steered away from an untenable purely probabilistic statistical view of luck, and introduced some features of luck that elucidate a realisation that using probability to describe luck is like using paint to describe a car. Probability in the light of Determinism and Relativity merely details some features of luck and goes nowhere close to describing the essence or the utility or properties of luck. This is because it can be seen that (probability) luck may in fact be integrated into the fabric of space time as true randomness and non-linearity (which does not theoretically exist in probability), or (probability) luck may be neutralised by Determinism, causality, and endless repetition.

This is though the tip of the luck iceberg. There are concepts underpinning hypotheses and theorems from religion, philosophy and science that have an even more clear and significant impact on detailed understanding of luck. I refer to the theories of Predestination, Fatalism and Existentialism. When these are factored in, luck takes on a very different significance and meaning, and the impact in our lives is amplified dramatically because it directly relates to our nature of freedom and freewill.

Fatalism generally has a religious focus and relates to the interplay and dynamics of the relationship between decision making in humans and the fact that God has a role, guiding and overseeing as each of us play our part, and we are unable to become, not would we want to try to become, independent of his work that includes the transformation of our lives enveloped with his decisions. The importance of this relationship between our freedom and His work is congruent with the importance of a deeper though increasingly personified anthropomorphic understanding of luck.

Before going further it is necessary to define Fatalism. Fatalism is a proposition come theory whereby events are sequentially set out in a fixed and unchangeable order into the future, and so said to be determined by 'fate'. Fatalism is a belief that leads to passive acceptance of outcomes and events, And pertain to having an external 'locus of control'. It is held that individuals cannot do anything to effect changes in future outcomes, because events are held rigidly by something over which individuals have no control." (Scott 2001).

For Christians and in considering predestination, if the role of God's work in our lives is over-emphasised, then we relinquish the gift of free-will that can tend towards Fatalism, failing to take adequate responsibility for autonomy and our personal efforts and decisions. Conversely, if human decision making is over-emphasised, then Gods work is diminished and it is possible to lose sight of our dependence upon God. There is thereby a crucial balance between Gods path for us collectively and individually and our freedom to choose our own path.

None of this style of predestination allows for an interjection of luck. If luck can intervene on predestination then God must also be a subject of luck, lest someone boldly assert his will incorporating it into his own work. Luck would be detuning his efforts of our guidance and potentially interfering with the fidelity to follow guidance, and make appropriate decisions and choices, because whenever he may act in the transformation of our lives, his acts would be potentially diminished or otherwise altered by an event of luck, overriding his will and resulting in something different for us.

It should be evident that certain features of luck can be distinguished from the powers that drive Predestination. It would be unwise and easy to get lost in religious conjecture and vexation on delineating such differences. Central to Christian beliefs are concepts such as the freedom of Gods own and also what we utilise to undertake sin. But if we do sin, it is conventional and necessarily practical that it is held to properly result from our enactment of our freewill. Also, can God ever have bad luck?

A continuation of thought on whether or how God may conceive of luck is beyond reasonable and useful limits and rights, but sufficiently the point is been made that incomprehensible elevation of authority and power does not relinquish conceptually subjection to forces and events beyond control making for unmanageable residuals. If God avoids such externalities, then Fatalism seems the 'natural' candidate accounting for the trajectory of things at all levels. It is probably in fact utterly un-knowable and beyond contemplation for any small creature of design such as a human to be able to approach the formalities of omnipotence. So impertinence is wondering if evil is not 'bad luck' (notwithstanding it being presided over by the devil aka the d'evil).

Herein is a quintessential identifiable characteristic of luck. It predominates as an origin of control when nothing or no-one (including God and Evil) maintains control. It is similar to the mathematics of chaos insofar as luck may be considered to be an element of the discernable order of a system, when there is a lack of governable features delivering a systems (state of) order. Luck is possibly an organisation of binds and circumstances prevailing in the absence of anything else. In other words, whenever we see only inexplicability, luck is probably involved. When an event or outcome completely defies our ability to understand and explain how it came to be as it is, we can involve luck. Luck is the factor that is used to describe one or more forces that we do not have working knowledge of and or the capability to influence predictably.

If this is true, then there are ramifications for the centrality of Determinism and Predestination counter-balanced by the possibility of Fatalism. Determinism says that a situation is never out of control, that it is always a result of known antecedent causal factor so it is definitively controlled by causation. Predestination says that control of the situation is a dynamic of our conscious human freedom under Gods care and guidance in the presence of evil. These two doctrines all imply to a greater extent that luck is alien to us and existence. But Fatalism being more stringent states that gaining control is futile though possible since all events, including the future are "fixed and inflexibly determined by something beyond control" (Scott 2001).

Fatalism consists of two constructs: 1) the belief that events are results, and 2) the belief that they are beyond influence or alteration in any way. Fatalism can be either positive or negative, depending on how you feel about being subject to a situation where nothing is within your control, limiting your ability to have any sort of impact leading to changes that could determine life's course. However, there is an important principle that Fatalism extinguishes permanently, namely freewill.

So what about reliability? Reliability is usually defined as trustworthiness, something you can depend on. In a material world reliability relates to a quality of something meaning that it won't break down. If you place too much emphasis on material possessions for satisfaction after happiness, then you will be in for some disappointment because most will fail at some point in the future. A reliable personal alternative is to hope for a long (healthy) life span SO AVOIDING expiration of warranties. Reliability in a personal sense is connected with dependability, predictability and responsibility. If someone is reliable then they are to an extent predictable, but in a good and beneficial sense.

Reliability would seem to be somewhat contrary to the involvement of luck. Most people would not want to rely on luck, especially for something that was important. Yet it is arguable it is impossible to avoid luck entering any equation, so how best to manage it. And if we *can* manage it at all, then we might be also able to control it to some small degree. If you believe that luck is only an issue of probability, then luck can be managed by mitigation, which we all do quite effectively through insurance policies for example. Except for the fact that you probably rely on 'bad luck' (rather than predictable failure or negligence) to unfortunately make good value of insurance money spent on managing degrees of luck. It is possible to partially rely on portions of luck expecting that at least one or some lucky event(s) will 'happen' in your life.

=====

- What else do you rely on – people, technology, safety, reality
- You can rely on time
- Do you rely on the reliability of something?
- If something is reliable, then its not certain

There is no doubt that we live in a results driven society. Business runs off the bottom line and it is obviously unacceptable for a business to proceed in an uncertain way towards uncertain results. But in reality, how certain are the outcomes that are pursued, and how uncertain are the results achieved? If they become too certain, then it is usually a sign of corrupt practices or anti-competitive (illegal) behaviour

- Obvious relationship with reliability. If something is certain, then it is reliable
- What things are actually certain = the same things we rely on

So luck is both reliable and certain, because it will happen regardless of what you deem luck to be. Isn't it true to say that you can be certain that you will have some luck in the future, and that if it is certain then it can be relied upon.

---

In predestination the future is fixed, so no matter what you do now, the future will be the same. Determinism says that you have no choice over what you do now because it is the inevitable result of a prior causal event. Predestination

says that you can do whatever you choose right now, but it will make no difference to the future which will work out the same no matter what you do now.

. There is often an implication stemming from Fatalism that I would like to focus on, and that is what I shall call pre-determination. This word appears occasionally without precise meaning but I shall use it here to mean a situation where the future is mapped out, or set out. This ties in with the concept of fate which is the acceptance that some events are inevitable and unavoidable and can not be escaped.

Something I consistently wonder about is the extent to which any event is inevitable. Fatalism may be a belief that we can do nothing to change our destiny, because our future is inevitably determined by fate. It is the matter of destiny that I wonder about so deeply. The existence of destiny seems to be the one factor that entirely contradicts the possibility of luck.

Destiny and fate imply the inevitability of the future, and that nothing can change the course of events. This possibility neutralises luck because if the future is certain, even if it is unknown, then it is merely being played out and not created. All of the definitions or understanding of luck assembled so far relies on the fact that the future is created. Luck can only exist under dynamic conditions because it is the order that takes place when everything is beyond control. If the future is set, then everything is under control and there can be no true luck.

---

---

#### Predisposition = attributions and locus

---

---

The answer to these problems lies in how luck collinearly relates in application to these three things – reliability, certainty and predisposition, though it seems paradoxical and ironical that it should do so. Reliability, certainty and predisposition are obviously *attributes* of states that we would want to apply to our life circumstances, but you probably wouldn't want to leave your happiness up to luck. Thereby, before we can make a decision about how to make our foremost natural predisposition be one of happiness, and then ensure that it is both a reliable and certain predisposition, that this predisposition is a reliable and certain path to happiness, and that happiness will result in a reliable and certain way, I shall have to firstly describe some details about luck. Then I shall look into reliability, certainty and the common contemporary predisposition to these *attributes* of states.

Nothing is quite as happiness inducing as feeling lucky. It makes us feel as though the world is smiling upon us. Luck of course is not always good. Bad luck helps make us happy though, by allowing us to mitigate our errors of judgement.

In this chapter the following things should have been established

- Luck is not probability. It can be, but it can also be (summarise each paragraph)
- Reliability and certainty are something that we rely on
- Certainty is not certain
- We rely on things that are certain, but things that are certain are not so reliable
- Our reliance on certainty is largely a product of our attributions and locus
- If you want to have more luck, you can. You can rely on and be certain of luck, if you have the right attributions and locus. Recommended.

=====

One of the factors that distinguishes our intellect from lower animals is the ability to plan.

FROM The coincidence File: Synchronicity, Morphic Resonance or Pure Chance  
BY Ken Anderson 1999. Blandford. ISBN 0-7137-2749-7  
Cassell pic, Wellington House, 125 Starnd, London, WC2R OBB

This book provides the theoretical background for understanding the nature of coincidences and synchronicity. It provides evidence of a threaded cosmos by detailing some very persuasive stories of chance, luck, intuition, foretelling and unlikelihood.

How we perceive things. Must build awareness, not natural.

Is ancient understanding wrong? Spirituality. The probability that there is meaning and interconnectedness in the universe.

Inner Vs outer.

Ego can interfere with interpretation. Prevents us from being objective. Argues that we can't believe in synchronicity because we are not important enough for the world to arrange itself around me.

Sidelined by science. Capacity for self-delusion.

Probability is another language used to describe the reality of the physical world.

Carl Jung, religious people

Can build awareness of meaning, and meaningful co-incidences.

I feel that failure to have a considered, structured and formalised approach to happiness is to leave it luck.

=====

Riddles OF Existence : A Guided Tour of Metaphysics

Earl Connee & Theodore Sider 2005

Oxford University Press

ISBN 0-19-928226-9

- Open possibilities worry us – unsettled, up-in-the-air
- If fated looks bad, we resign ourselves to it, if it looks good, we are glad.
- Metaphysical fatalism = all of reality and existence is fated. Not “everything happens for a reason”. Is about impersonal necessity not reason or purpose. Does not imply effort is futile. We do not know what is going to happen. Does not tell us to be fatalistic and regard the future with resignation or submission. No particular attitude is automatically justified. Fatalism is not about being deterministic or causal, Their view is that everything in the past, present and future has always been fixed and settled, whether or not it was causally determined. = “There are no open possibilities at all at any time.”

Scruton, R., . (2002). An Intelligent Person's Guide To Philosophy. London, Duckbacks of Duckworth Media Group.

Speake, J., Ed. (1979). A Dictionary of Philosophy. London, Pan Books Ltd.