

# CAUSE

Authored by  
**mohammad looti**

October 29, 2025

## RECOMMENDED CITATION

mohammad looti (2025). *CAUSE*. PSYCHOLOGICAL SCALES. Retrieved from <https://scales.arabpsychology.com/?p=64803>

## CAUSE

**Primary Disciplinary Field(s):** Philosophy (Metaphysics, Epistemology), Physics, Logic, Statistics

### 1. Core Definition and Scope

The concept of **cause** fundamentally refers to an entity, event, or state of affairs that contributes to the production of another entity, event, or state of affairs, known as the **effect**. In rational philosophy, a cause is often characterized as a necessary antecedent required for the subsequent event to come into being. This relationship, termed **causality**, is arguably the most essential organizing principle used by human cognition and empirical science to understand the structure and predictability of the world. While simple definitions suggest a clear sequential chain--an event producing an effect as a consequence--the determination of what constitutes a genuine causal link versus mere correlation has historically constituted one of the most profound problems in metaphysics and the philosophy of science.

In the scientific context, identifying a cause typically involves isolating a variable (or set of variables) such that manipulating the cause leads predictably to a change in the effect, holding all other relevant factors constant. This rigorous approach seeks to establish conditions that are either **necessary** (the effect cannot occur without the cause) or **sufficient** (the cause guarantees the effect will occur). The complexity arises because most real-world phenomena are the result of multiple interacting causes, leading to the development of sophisticated models, such as John Stuart Mill's methods of inductive inference, designed to distinguish true causal relationships from accidental coincidences.

### 2. Philosophical Roots: Aristotle's Four Causes

The earliest comprehensive framework for understanding causality was developed by the Greek philosopher Aristotle (384 BC-322 BC). Aristotle recognized that the simple identification of an initiator was insufficient to fully explain why something exists or changes. His concept of *aitia* (often translated as "explanation" or "reason why") grouped causes into four distinct categories, providing a multi-layered explanatory scheme for understanding both physical objects and processes.

Aristotle's framework remained the dominant mode of causal explanation throughout the Hellenistic, Roman, and Medieval periods. It provided a powerful tool, particularly through the use of the **Final Cause**, for theological and teleological explanations of the natural world, focusing not just on how things happen, but why they happen and what their ultimate purpose is. The shift away from this model, particularly the rejection of teleology in the 17th-century Scientific Revolution, was a pivotal moment in the history of thought, elevating the **Efficient Cause** to the singular status of "cause" in modern scientific inquiry.

The Four Causes are defined as follows:

**The Material Cause (*causa materialis*):** This refers to the substance or raw components from which a thing is made. For example, the material cause of a statue is the bronze or marble used by the sculptor. This cause answers the question: "Out of what is it made?"

**The Formal Cause (*causa formalis*):** This refers to the structure, blueprint, essence, or defining characteristics of the thing. It is the form or pattern that the matter embodies. The formal cause of a statue is the specific shape and design imparted by the sculptor. This answers the question: "What is its shape or definition?"

**The Efficient Cause (*causa efficiens*):** This is the agent or process that brings the thing into being or initiates the change. This is the understanding of cause most closely aligned with modern scientific usage. The efficient cause of a statue is the action of the sculptor shaping the material. This answers the question: "By what agency was it brought about?"

**The Final Cause (*causa finalis*):** This refers to the purpose, end, or *telos* for which the thing exists. It explains the ultimate goal or function. The final cause of a statue might be to honor a hero or to serve as decoration. This answers the question: "For what purpose does it exist?"

### 3. The Efficient Cause in Modern Scientific Methodology

Following the enlightenment, particularly with the rise of mechanical philosophy championed by figures like René Descartes and Isaac Newton, the concept of cause was largely restricted to the **Efficient Cause**. Modern science seeks to understand the mechanisms by which one event necessarily produces another, focusing on localized, reproducible, and non-teleological interactions. This transition marked the foundation for empirical methodology, where causality is inferred primarily through controlled experimentation and observation of consistent spatial and temporal conjunction.

The methodological search for efficient causes relies heavily on establishing criteria for causal inference. Philosophers of science, notably John Stuart Mill, formalized key methods for isolating causal variables. Mill's methods, including the Method of Agreement (where the cause is the single factor common across varied instances of the effect) and the Method of Difference (where the effect occurs only when the cause is present), established the basis for experimental design across various disciplines, ensuring that observed correlations are not spurious. The identification of cause requires demonstrating not just that X precedes Y, but that X is necessary or sufficient, or both, for Y to occur under specified conditions.

### 4. Epistemological Challenges: Humean Skepticism

The most enduring epistemological challenge to the certainty of causation was articulated by the Scottish philosopher David Hume in the 18th century. Hume argued that while we observe spatial

contiguity (objects are near each other), temporal priority (the cause precedes the effect), and **constant conjunction** (the cause and effect repeatedly occur together), we never actually observe a necessary connection linking the two events. Hume contended that the belief in a necessary causal link is not derived from experience or logic, but rather from a psychological habit or expectation formed by the mind after repeated observation.

Hume's analysis fundamentally undermines the rational certainty of efficient causation. If necessity is merely an illusion projected by the observing mind, then all claims about future causality--the bedrock of scientific prediction--rest upon the unjustified assumption that the future will resemble the past (the problem of induction). According to Hume, we can only confirm that "A has always followed B," not that "A must follow B." This skepticism forced subsequent philosophers, most notably Immanuel Kant, to rethink whether causality is an objective feature of the world or a fundamental, pre-existing category of human understanding (an *a priori* structure) necessary for experiencing the world coherently.

## 5. Contemporary Interpretations: Probabilistic and Counterfactual Causality

In response to Humean skepticism and the inherent complexity of non-deterministic systems (like quantum mechanics and complex social phenomena), modern philosophy and statistics have developed alternative models of causation that move beyond simple necessary and sufficient conditions. Two prominent models are probabilistic causality and counterfactual causality.

**Probabilistic Causality** posits that a cause is defined as an event that increases the probability of its effect occurring, relative to the probability of the effect occurring in the absence of the cause. This approach is particularly useful in fields like epidemiology and social sciences, where strict, deterministic links rarely exist. For example, smoking is considered a cause of lung cancer because it significantly raises the probability of the disease, even though not every smoker develops cancer, and some non-smokers do. This framework allows for the acknowledgment of background conditions and statistical relevance without demanding absolute necessity.

**Counterfactual Causality**, popularized by philosophers such as David Lewis, defines a cause C of an effect E by stating that if C had not occurred, E would not have occurred (or would have occurred differently). This model relies on modal logic--the concept of possible worlds--to evaluate this hypothetical condition. While providing a powerful intuitive understanding of causal dependence, counterfactual models face difficulties in dealing with scenarios involving causal overdetermination (where multiple causes are sufficient to produce the effect) or preemption (where one cause acts before another potential cause can take effect). J.L. Mackie's development of **INUS conditions** (Insufficient but Necessary part of a condition which is itself Unnecessary but Sufficient for the result) provides a more complex, realistic model blending necessary and sufficient components.

## 6. Causality in Specific Disciplines

The interpretation and application of causality vary significantly across specialized fields:

**Psychology:** In social psychology, **attribution theory** deals with how individuals infer causes for their own and others' behaviors, distinguishing between internal (dispositional) and external (situational) causes. Understanding these causal attributions is crucial for analyzing motivation, prejudice, and conflict resolution.

**Law:** Legal systems depend heavily on distinguishing between **proximate cause** (the direct, immediate cause that led to the injury) and **remote cause**. For legal liability to be established, the defendant's actions must not only be a cause-in-fact (using a counterfactual "but-for" test) but also the proximate cause, meaning the outcome was a foreseeable consequence of the action.

**Physics:** Physics generally adheres to deterministic causation, although relativity and quantum mechanics introduce complexities. The principle of **causal locality** (causes and effects must be spatially and temporally connected) is a fundamental constraint, often formalized by the idea that information cannot travel faster than the speed of light, ensuring that future events cannot influence past ones (ruling out retrocausality).

**Statistics and Data Science:** Causal inference is a distinct field focused on mathematically deriving causal claims from observational data, often using graphical models (such as Directed Acyclic Graphs or DAGs) developed by Judea Pearl to map relationships and control for confounding variables.

## 7. Debates Regarding Determinism and Free Will

The nature of causality leads directly into the metaphysical debate over **determinism**. If every event (E) is the inevitable effect of a preceding cause (C), and that cause (C) was itself the inevitable effect of an earlier cause (B), then the state of the universe at any point in time dictates all future states. Strict determinism holds that the universe is governed by unbreakable causal laws, suggesting that all events, including human actions and choices, were determined from the beginning of time.

This deterministic view clashes profoundly with the intuitive belief in **free will**--the idea that agents have genuine choice and moral responsibility for their actions. The resulting philosophical dilemma has several proposed solutions:

**Hard Determinism:** Affirms determinism and denies free will, viewing human choice as illusory.

**Libertarianism:** Affirms free will and denies that the deterministic causal chain applies to human decision-making, often positing a special form of agent causation outside the physical chain.

**Compatibilism:** Argues that determinism and free will are mutually compatible, often redefining free will not as the ability to choose outside of causation, but as the ability to act according to one's

desires or reasons, which are themselves causally determined.

The enduring complexity of the concept of cause ensures its continued prominence at the intersection of philosophy, physics, and ethics, perpetually challenging our understanding of necessity, time, and agency.

## 8. Further Reading

[Causality \(Wikipedia\)](#)

[Causation: Metaphysical Issues \(Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy\)](#)

[Aristotle's Four Causes \(Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy\)](#)

[Hume on Causation \(Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy\)](#)

ARABPSYCHOLOGY.COM