

Ernesto Graziani, Università di Macerata (e.graziani@unimc.it)

Philosophical Inquiries, IX, 2, pp. 53-66

This is a preprint version; please quote only from the published version:

<https://www.philing.it/index.php/philing/article/view/260/232>

Presentism and the Pain of the Past: A Reply to Orilia

Abstract: In a series of recent papers Francesco Orilia has presented an *argument for the moral desirability of presentism*. It goes, in brief, as follows: since the existence of painful events is morally undesirable, presentism, which denies that past painful events (tenselessly) exist, is morally more desirable than non-presentism, which instead affirms that past painful events (tenselessly) exist. An objection against this argument, which has already been taken into consideration by Orilia, is the *ugly history objection* or *radical objection*: what really matters in the moral appraisal of a world is the history of it, and since the presentist and the non-presentist versions of our world share the same ugly history, they are morally on a par. This paper aims at corroborating this objection and defending it from Orilia's criticisms. This will be done by bringing into play various thought experiments and a distinction between *relevance* (of an event or a fact about the occurrence of an event) to the moral evaluation of a world and *moral (and psychological) involvement* (in an event or in a fact about the occurrence of an event).

Keywords: Eternalism, Morality, Pain, Presentism, Time

1. Introduction

One of the liveliest areas in the current metaphysics of time is constituted by temporal ontology, the enquiry into the ontic status—i.e., the condition of existence/nonexistence, or reality/unreality—of the past and the future. A major option in temporal ontology is *presentism*: the thesis that, unlike the present, neither the past nor the future tenselessly exists. In opposition to presentism stand *pastism*, according to which, besides the present, there tenselessly exists the past but not the future, and *eternalism*, according to which there tenselessly exist both the past and the future: for convenience, we may group both pastism and eternalism under the term *non-presentism*.¹ An argument has been recently put forth by Francesco Orilia to the effect that presentism is more desirable, or valuable, than non-presentism from a moral point of view (references in the next section). Orilia's basic idea is that if non-presentism is true, all painful events of the past—from everyday annoyances, such as mosquito bites, up to the most horrific tragedies of human history, such as genocides—are tenselessly part of reality. This is not the case, however, if on the contrary presentism is true. So, under the plausible assumption that the lack of pain is morally more desirable than the presence of it, we should find more valuable the option that presentism is true and non-presentism false rather than vice-versa. My contribution in this paper is aimed at refuting Orilia's argument by corroborating an objection that Orilia has already taken into consideration in his works, but—I think—not given a satisfying reply: the *ugly history objection*, or *radical objection*, according to which all that really matters in attempting an appraisal of the moral

¹ As is well known, there is a debate about whether temporal ontology is a substantial field of enquiry and, if it is, how the competing views in it should be formulated. I share the widespread opinions that temporal ontology is indeed substantial and that an adequate formulation of the competing views in it requires the use of tenseless predication, i.e., a predication that fails to determine whether the attribute instantiation it expresses is past, present or future (or in time at all).

value of our world is its history, while the way this history is ontologically construed, i.e., whether presentistically or non-presentistically, is wholly irrelevant.

This paper is structured as follows. In §2, I shall present the argument for the moral desirability of presentism and report some relevant considerations of moral psychology made by its author: these are a corollary to the argument itself and concern an alleged appropriateness for non-presentists to be morally burdened by, and sorrowful for, past suffering (much) *more* than presentists are. In §3, I shall formulate, with some slight variations, the ugly history objection. In §4, I shall present the rejoinder offered by Orilia. In §5, I shall describe four thought experiments aimed at strengthening the ugly history objection. In §6, I shall show how the ugly history objection gives us a reason to think that, contrary to Orilia’s opinion, it is *not* appropriate for non-presentists to be morally burdened by, and sorrowful for, past suffering more than presentists are. Moreover, I shall sketch a justification wholly independent from temporal ontology (i.e., one where the ontic status of the past or future does not play any role) for the fact that in everyday life we are generally morally (and psychologically) involved in—and thus burdened by and sorrowful for—present suffering more than past suffering. I shall also suggest an explanation for the eventuality that the non-presentist view that past painful events tenselessly exist might remain somewhat unsettling even to those that are convinced by the ugly history objection and the considerations in its support made in this paper. In §7, I shall conclude by briefly summarising the results of this paper.

2. The argument for the moral desirability of presentism

The line of reasoning pursued by Orilia emerges in embryonic form already in Orilia 2012, §6.2.5; in Orilia 2016, §2, it becomes a full-fledged argument; this is presented again, with some improvements, in Orilia 2018a, §3, and 2018b, §2. In its latest version, the argument for the moral desirability of presentism is summarised as follows (Orilia 2018a, p. 151, and 2018b, pp. 133, 134; note that additions made between square brackets, here and in other quotes in the rest of this paper, are mine):

- (P1) Absence of pain is morally more valuable than presence of pain.
 - (P2) If there were past painful events, then: (i) they are [tenselessly] part of reality, if the world is non-presentist; (ii) they are not, if the world is presentist [footnote omitted].
 - (P3) There were painful events, actually extremely dreadful ones, such as those involved [in] the Holocaust.
- Hence,
- (C) A presentist world is morally more valuable than a non presentist world.

The argument is simple in its form and all of its premises appear to be true or highly plausible: (P1) is “very basic axiological principle, which [...] most of us are inclined to take for granted” (2018a, p. 150); (P2) plainly follows from the very definitions of presentism and non-presentism; (P3) is an empirical claim that is very hard to doubt of.

Orilia emphasises that if the Holocaust is tenselessly part of reality, as non-presentists maintain, then “all the intolerable pain, grief and injustice that came with it are [tenselessly] concretely *experienced* somewhere in spacetime” (2018b, p. 132; but see also 2018a, p. 151). “If we seriously concentrate on that”, Orilia maintains (2018b, p. 133), the belief that something as terrible as the Holocaust is tenselessly part of reality should involve for us a “great moral burden” and we should find the past sufferers involved in that terrific event as deserving “the same empathic sorrow reserved for the suffering around us in our current temporal location” (2018b, p. 133, and 2018a, p. 151). On the contrary, if our world is a presentist one, the Holocaust is tenselessly no part of it, and

consequently “the empathic sorrow appropriate in a non-presentist world is not called for” (2018b, p. 133, and 2018a, p. 151). We shall certainly feel sorry that the Holocaust took place, “[b]ut thinking that the Holocaust is [tenselessly] part of reality, as in a non-presentist world, is a much deeper burden” (2018b, p. 133, and 2018a, p. 151). Now, the great moral burden and sorrow that Orilia deems appropriate in a non-presentist universe never seems to have been expressed by non-presentists, and for Orilia the explanation for this lies simply in a “failure to seriously focus on them” (2018b, note 9 p. 133).²

Finally, Orilia also offers some prudent considerations about how the conclusion that presentism is morally desirable (more than non-presentism) might give a reason to embrace the belief that presentism is *true* (2016 §4, 2018a §7, 2018b §7)). Three relevant cases are mentioned: if one deems that the “theoretical” confrontation in temporal ontology, as it is at the current stage, is at standstill; if one thinks that values possess ontological efficacy; or if one believes that there is an omnipotent and benevolent God—in each of these cases one might be encouraged by the above-expounded argument to embrace presentism.³ Although interesting and definitely worth further development and scrutiny, I set aside these considerations and go back to the very argument for the moral desirability of presentism, for it faces a strong, and possibly fatal, criticism—one that, I think, also yields a justification for non-presentists *not* to feel morally burdened for, and sorrowful for, past suffering more than presentists are.

3. The ugly history objection

² The emphasis placed by Orilia on the concrete experience of pain might also lead to a revision of the argument itself. Let us see how. According to certain non-presentist A-theoretical ontologies, such as Smith 2002’s degree presentism (which, despite the name, is really a form of eternalism) and Forrest 2006’s form of “zombie” pastism, the events that were painful (as they were present) are tenselessly part of reality but are tenselessly not painful. Now, as Orilia admits, these doctrines are under this respect “on the same boat with presentism” (2018a, p. 158; see also 2018b, p. 141). So, we might group these options together with presentism under the label of *insentient past view*; analogously, we might designate B-theoretical eternalism, standard A-theoretical eternalism, and standard pastism collectively as the *sentient past view*. And we might convert Orilia’s argument for the moral desirability of presentism into an argument for the moral desirability of the insentient past view as a whole, and that by replacing (P2) with the following:

(P2’) If there were past painful events, then: (i) they are tenselessly painful, if the world is a sentient past world; (ii) they are not, if the world is an insentient past world.

However, Orilia argues, these options according to which there tenselessly exist such pain-free painful events “almost seem to embrace *contraddictiones ex vi terminorum*” (2018a, p. 158), thereby losing much of their appeal. Be as it may, for simplicity’s sake I shall put these options aside, leaving the interested reader the task of readapting the content of this contribution to those options.

³ Orilia refers to Leslie (2013) as an instance of the second and the third case. As an instance of the third case, it is also appropriate to mention Mullins (2014, §3), in which an argument somewhat similar to Orilia’s one is put forth within the (Christian) theological debate on time. More specifically, Mullins argues that, unlike presentism, eternalism is at odds with the Christian doctrine of God as an evil defeater for, if the universe is eternalist, although God will be able to avoid evil and suffering from a certain point in time onwards, He could not remove those evils and suffering that are embedded in the universe before that time and thus renew the creation in its entirety (which in the eternalist universe would include past, present, and future).

The *ugly history objection* (as it is called in Orilia 2016) attacks the enquiry carried out by Orilia at its very basis, which is why it is also named (in Orilia 2018a and 2018b) the *radical objection*.⁴ It goes as follows (note, however, that I present it with some slight adjustments). The argument for the moral desirability of presentism relies on a hidden assumption, i.e., that the moral value of a world depends *primarily* on what tenselessly exists in that world. Yet this assumption can be put into question, for it seems instead that the value of a world depends *uniquely* on what existed, exists now, or will exist in that world, i.e., *on its history*, irrespective of whether this history is metaphysically interpreted in a presentist or non-presentist manner. As a consequence, there is no difference in moral value between the presentist version of our world, where a terrific event such as the Holocaust does tenselessly not exist, and the non-presentist version of it, where it does tenselessly exist: in both of them, the Holocaust *did exist*; both of them share *the same morally ugly history*, i.e., the actual one, which unfortunately includes the Holocaust. So, the sought-after conclusion that presentism is morally more desirable than non-presentism does not follow.

4. Orilia's rejoinder

This objection, which—as anticipated—strikes me as very convincing, is not considered as a real threat by Orilia. Orilia acknowledges that the history of a world does have a weight in the moral evaluation of it. In fact, if we compare, for example, a world with the *actual* history—one, then, in which the Holocaust existed—and one with an history that is *less* ugly than the actual one—say, one in which the Holocaust never existed—we should undoubtedly deem the former one as far less valuable. But, according to Orilia, that history has a weight in the moral evaluation of a world does not implicate that the ontic status of the past has no weight at all. From a presentist point of view, he argues, the fact that certain painful events existed “cannot have the same relevance” (2018a, p. 157; see also 2019b, p. 140) in the evaluation of the world as the fact that certain other events exist now. “For example, it is bad now and forever that an innocent victim was tortured in a concentration camp [...]. Yet, the reality of someone’s being tortured *now*, with the excruciating pain of the victim going on *now*, is *worse*.” (2018a, p. 157; see also 2018b, p. 140). On the contrary, Orilia goes on, “in a non-presentist perspective, this can hardly be claimed” (2018a, p. 157; see also 2018b, p. 140). To show why it is so, Orilia brings into play an analogy between time and space that is often employed to give a vivid picture of the non-presentist understanding of the universe: just as objects that are here and objects that are somewhere else are equally real (they are just spatially distant from each other), so too events that are present and events that are past or future are (tenselessly) equally real (they are just temporally distant from each other). But then “the past torture is [tenselessly] as bad as the present one, just as a torture is bad whether it takes place on the far away planet or on the nearby Moon” (2018a, p. 157; see also 2018b, p. 140). In brief: when comparing within a presentist world the relevance of the fact that a painful event existed with the relevance of the fact a painful event presently exists, the ontic status of the past clearly does matter; and it clearly does matter also when comparing within a non-presentist world the relevance of past painful events with the relevance of present painful events. But if we grant all this, then the ontic status of the past must also matter when comparing the relevance of the presentist fact that a painful event existed with the relevance of the very past painful event that tenselessly exists within a non-presentist world, and thus the latter must be acknowledged as greater than the former.

Before proceeding, here is a brief explanatory note to integrate Orilia’s reasoning, which—I think—he would agree upon and which will be also useful in the remaining of this paper. On a very

⁴ This objection appears to me the strongest one among those addressed by Orilia; for this reason, it will be the only one that I shall take into consideration.

minimal reading, the locution “(the fact) that ...” may be taken to designate within a presentist framework a *present truth*, i.e., the being true of a chosen truth-bearer, e.g., a sentence or the propositions expressed by it. So, e.g., “(the fact) that an innocent victim was tortured in a concentration camp” may be understood as the “present truth of the proposition <an innocent victim was tortured in a concentration camp>”. Orilia’s view is thus that in the moral evaluation of the world a *truth* about a past painful event weighs in a *lesser* degree than the event itself the occurrence of which it expresses. We may say that the fact that a torture of an innocent torture existed “inherits” the negative moral value of the represented event, but only partially.

5. Historically and metaphysically different worlds

Although Orilia’s reply looks convincing at first glance, I think that it can be efficaciously resisted by bringing into play some thought experiments. One, which has already been taken into account and criticised by Orilia, is the following (2016, pp. 237, 238; 2018a, pp. 158, 159; 2018b, pp. 141-142).⁵ Instead of comparing two worlds that are different metaphysically (one is presentist, the other non-presentist) but not historically (they both have the same story, the actual one) or historically but not metaphysically, let us try to set a comparison between two worlds that are different *both metaphysically and historically*. In particular, let us consider a non-presentist world featuring the actual history and a presentist world with a counterfactually worsened history, i.e., whose history is different from the actual one and, in particular, in a pejorative direction: let us suppose that the history of this presentist world diverges from the actual one in that much that the Second World War lasted longer so as to allow, let us imagine, the Nazi regime to bring to a fulfilment their plan of total extermination of the European Jews. Let us now focus on the fact that in the (historically actual) non-presentist world there tenselessly exist an amount of sufferance that is immensely higher than the amount of sufferance that tenselessly exists in the (historically worsened) presentist world—namely, *all* the sufferance that is ever felt by all sentient beings in the history of the universe excluding the present instant. Vice versa, in the (historically worsened) presentist world there existed “just a little bit more” sufferance—if we are allowed to say so—compared to the amount of sufferance that tenselessly exists in the (historically actual) non-presentist world—namely, the sufferance felt by the people during the counterfactually prolonged Second World War and Holocaust. Let us now ask: which world is more valuable from a moral point of view? It seems that the non-presentist world is better, despite the fact that the amount of pain that tenselessly exists in it is far higher than the amount of pain that tenselessly exists in the presentist world. This shows that the moral evaluation of a world depends so much on its history that it is immaterial whether it is presentist or non-presentist.

Orilia is ready to grant that “[p]erhaps, the history of a world matters to a *very large* extent, an extent larger than we might have thought before this thought experiment” (2018a, p. 159; see also 2016, p. 238, and 2018b, p. 142). However, this thought experiment, according to Orilia, does not prove that the ontic status of the past has *absolutely no relevance* for, even if we grant that the non-presentist world pictured in it is morally superior to the historically worsened presentist world, “[i]t remains true that in a non-presentist world a past pain is as real as a present sorrow in Andromeda and thus (P1), weak as it may be for other purposes, is strong enough to back up the claim that our presentist world is better than our non-presentist world” (2018a, p. 159; see also 2016, p. 238, and 2018b, p. 142).

Orilia’s reply is correct. It is possible, however, to devise a new thought experiment, based on the previous one, capable of proving, through a finer comparison, the exclusive, or anyway

⁵ [FN TO BE ADDED]

preponderant, relevance of history. As follows. Instead of imagining an historically counterfactual presentist world with a past that is already modified in a certain way (e.g., by hypothesising, as done in the previous thought experiment, a Second World War and Holocaust sufficiently prolonged for the Nazis to complete their genocidal undertakings), let us consider the a *historically actual* presentist world, but let us ask ourselves *to what extent* we should counterfactually *worsen* the past history of it before the historically actual non-presentist world turns out to be *as valuable as*, and then *more valuable than*, the presentist one. This question is legitimate, since *if* the ontic status of the past has some relevance, then there must be some “threshold of admissible historical uglification” of the historically actual presentist world such that it matches, or compensate for, the additional (i.e., non-present) amount of sufferance that tenselessly exists in the historically actual non-presentist world. Now, a precise determination of this threshold will be very hard, perhaps impossible, to implement in practice, as well as somewhat morally disturbing: it seems in fact morally disturbing to maintain that, e.g., a three-months longer Second World War and Holocaust might represent a suitable threshold of historical uglification of the historically actual presentist world beyond which the non-presentist actual world becomes preferable. Perhaps, however, you do not need to engage in such bizarre and disturbing calculations: if you share with me the intuition that *any* historically worsening, as little as it might be, of the (historically actual) presentist world would render it less valuable than the (historically actual) eternalist world. And here is the point: if we are not willing to make any pejorative historical change in the presentist world, *as little as it might be*, then this unwillingness means that we believe that any sufferance, *as little as it might be*, when counterfactually added to the historically actual presentist world, makes it morally worse than the historically actual non-presentist world. But that entails that a presentist world and a non-presentist world that have the same history have *exactly the same moral value*, and thus that the ontic status of the past is wholly irrelevant.

Although I am quite confident that all, or most, readers of this paper will indeed share this my intuition, let us consider the position of someone who does not and thus believes that there is some non-zero amount of uglification of the presentist world that may indeed compensate for all the additional pain that tenselessly exists in the (historically actual) non-presentist world. So, what amount of uglification might constitute the appropriate threshold—the breaking of someone’s big toe while hitting a table leg? the torture of an innocent person? a three-months long mistreatment and killing of two hundred thousand Jews locked up in concentration camps? In answering this question, if at all possible, we should bear in mind that any *historical* worsening involves that some sentient being *suffers more often, longer or more intensely than it would otherwise*; and that, vice versa, in a non-presentist universe each sentient being does *not* suffer more often, longer or more intensely than it would in a presentist world featuring the same history. Now, I guess that the third instance of uglification mentioned already involves an amount of pain that exceeds the adequate threshold of uglification even according to a convinced sympathiser of the argument for the moral preferability of presentism. In other words, a presentist world in which two hundred thousand people are imprisoned in concentration camps, mistreated and killed until August 1945 is surely worse than an historically actual non-presentist world. However, it seems to me that this option (and *a fortiori* each of the other two) is still “too tenuous” to support the claim that the ontic status of the past has a *considerable* weight. Albeit *terrific from the historical point of view*, the amount of pain involved in the counterfactual three-months prolongation of the Second World War and the Holocaust is still “too little” *in comparison* with the immense additional amount of pain that tenselessly exists in the (historically actual) non-presentist world. But if this comparatively “little” amount of pain involved in the historical uglification of the presentist world does indeed compensate for *all* the additional pain that tenselessly exists in the (historically actual) non-presentist world, then history must have, in comparison with the ontic status of the past, an

enormous weight—or, inversely, the ontic status of the past must have, in comparison to history, a *very little* weight, close to zero. And *if* this is the case (which I think is not, for I believe that the ontic status of the past has no weight at all), then the argument for the moral preferability of presentism loses a lot of its attraction and as a consequence, contrary to Orilia’s hopes, will be incapable of really converting anyone to presentism.

It seems to me that the two thought experiments expounded manage to prove, in accordance with and in support of the ugly history objection, that the fact that a painful event existed in a presentist world weighs exactly (or almost) as much as the very event that tenselessly exists in a non-presentist world, and thus that the ontic status of the past has absolutely (or almost) no relevance to the moral evaluation of a world and that the history of it is all (or almost all) that really matters. However, as convincing as they may be, those thought experiments do not *directly* address Orilia’s reply to the ugly history objection: they do not explain where the weak point of Orilia’s reply lies but only try to outdo it in convincing power by appealing to comparisons *between worlds* both historically and metaphysically different. But Orilia’s reply, as seen in §4, also features two *intra-world* comparisons: one, within a presentist world, between the relevance of the fact that a painful event existed and relevance of the fact that a painful event exists now, and one, within a non-presentist world, between the relevance of a painful event that tenselessly exists in the past and the relevance of a painful event that exists now; and, admittedly, the claim that the ontic status of the past has no (or almost no) relevance appears indeed *harder* to accept in the case of these intra-world comparisons. So, although the previous thought experiments (and especially the second one) are, I think, convincing enough to conclude that the ontic status of the past is irrelevant (or almost so) and thus to confidently infer that there must be something wrong in Orilia’s reply, someone inversely might be induced to doubt of the efficacy of those thought experiments and of the ugly history objection itself. To dispel these doubts, I shall now address Orilia’s reply more directly and show that it fails to answer the ugly history objection. I shall do this by means of two further thought experiments that are analogous to the two previous ones.

Let us consider a presentist world and two painful events that are part of its history: one existed, and thus does tenselessly not exist, and the other exists now, and thus does tenselessly exist. Let us suppose that the past painful event is an excruciating torture of an innocent in concentration camp and the present one is a much less painful stubbing of a toe against a sofa. Let us now ask ourselves: what has a greater weight in the moral evaluation of the world—the fact that an excruciating torture of an innocent existed or the fact that the stubbing of a toe exists now? I think virtually everyone will choose the first option: although the torture does tenselessly not exist, the fact that it existed weighs *much more* than the fact that the stubbing of the toe exists now.

However, following Orilia’s reply to the first thought experiment, one might argue that the scenario just envisaged only shows that what happened, i.e., history, does matter in the moral evaluation of the world, but still does not show that it is all that matters and thus that the ontic status of the past is entirely irrelevant. Once again, however, we may modify the previous thought experiment to attain a finer comparison. Let us suppose that the two events in the presentist world are *equally painful* and ask ourselves *to what extent* the past event should be worsened (e.g., making it longer or increasing the intensity of the pain involved in it) in order for the fact that it existed may equal, and then surpass, in (negative) relevance the fact that the present painful event exists. If the answer is that no worsening is needed, then we think that the ontic status of the past is morally irrelevant: within a presentist world, the fact that a painful event existed weighs exactly as much as the fact that an equally painful event presently exists. At first glance, however, this result may appear more difficult to accept than the result of the previous thought experiment: the fact that an excruciating torture existed is of course more relevant than the fact that the stubbing of a toe presently exists; however, when comparing a present painful event or the fact that it exists now

with the fact a *slightly more* painful event existed, the latter might still seem to weigh *less* than the former, and we might think—in accordance with the line of reasoning pursued by Orilia—that this is owed to the different ontic status of the past and the present in a presentist world. I think, however, that it might be the case that we are confused in this evaluation, for we probably tend to conflate *relevance to the moral evaluation of the world* and *moral (and psychological) involvement*. Clearly, in our everyday life we are generally much more involved in the fact that a certain painful event exists now than by the fact that some painful event existed. But our being involved in a certain event or fact (the fact that certain event exists now or existed) more than another event or fact does not necessarily make the former more relevant than the latter in the moral evaluation of the world. After all, it is common experience that in certain circumstances even present events, albeit morally repugnant and having therefore an undeniable weight in the evaluation of the world, may involve us much less than other much less serious events. I think that by carefully distinguishing these two aspects, we should realise that the fact that a painful existed is just as relevant as the fact that an equally painful event exists now, though the former fact might involve us much less than the latter. And I think that Orilia’s replies to the ugly history objection and to the first thought experiment I have described above appear more convincing than they really are precisely because they take advantage of our tendency to mistakenly conflate relevance in the moral evaluation of a world and moral (and psychological) involvement.

6. Moral involvement and residual discomfort

As seen in §2, Orilia maintains that non-presentist should feel for past suffering the same amount of moral burden and sorrow they feel for present suffering, because they admit that the past is (tenselessly) as real as the present; and that, if they fail to feel in this way (as it indeed appears to be the case), it is because they fail to really concentrate on what their ontological stance involves from a moral point of view. However, it may well be the case that the relative lack of burden and sorrow by non-presentist is owed simply to the fact that they share the intuition underlying the ugly history objection—namely that it is history, and not the metaphysical interpretation of it, what really matters to the moral appraisal of a world. And since the ugly history objection is correct, then this observation represents not simply an explanation, but also a *justification*, for that relative lack of burden and sorrow by non-presentists: it is perfectly appropriate and rational for non-presentist *not* to be morally burdened by and a sorrowful for past suffering *more* than presentists are, and vice versa, it would be inappropriate and irrational for presentists to be morally burdened for and sorrowful for past suffering *less than* non-presentists are.

Most people, presumably including philosophers engaged in temporal ontology, appear however to feel a much lesser moral burden and sorrow for past sufferings than for present ones. If the ugly history objection—as I have tried to argue—stands, there must be some alternative explanation for this relative lack of moral burden and sorrow, and possibly a justification too, for it seems at a first glance appropriate and in line with common sense. Burden and sorrow for past painful events fall into our moral (and psychological) involvement in past events in general, which was mentioned in the previous section. Now, it seems to me that this involvement in an event or in the fact that an event existed fundamentally depends on how temporally distant that event is from present time or, in other terms (perhaps more adequate to a presentist view), on how much time has passed since that event at issue occurred. (Of course, other factors will influence our involvement: individual difference in sensitivity, the spatial distance from us, the nature of the painful event at issue—hence, the kind, the duration and the intensity of the pain it involves—, and the kind of knowledge we have of the event, since, e.g., direct experience is undoubtedly capable of eliciting a stronger involvement than indirect knowledge.) A component, or a consequence, of

this lesser involvement is a lower concentration on past painful events: in fact, if we are more concentrated on those events, as we sometimes happen to be, we feel a burden and sorrow for past suffering greater than the usual one. Up to this point we have a mere explanation of the relative lack of involvement in (and burden and sorrow for) past events. However, the lesser moral involvement is to a certain extent *justified* because of our nature and the circumstances in which we usually act. If we were involved in all painful events of past history as much as we are by present ones, we would presumably be overcome by sorrow in a way that would be psychologically unsustainable and, I presume, incapacitating. Moreover, since at each time we can only influence and bring about events that are *after* that time, it is just rational for us to be involved in events that existed presently or at least recently more than in events that existed a long time ago: the events of the present and recent past are generally the most important event we have to take notice of if we want to act efficaciously. So, it is *morally* useless and perhaps counterproductive being *too much* involved in past painful events and especially long-gone ones. (On the other hand, a total lack of involvement in past painful happenings would be of course not only morally unjustifiable but harmful as well.)

Despite all that has been said in this paper, the non-presentist picture of the world might remain somewhat discomfoting to some. A possible explanation of this circumstance might be the following: even if we perfectly understand that what non-presentists claim is *not* that past painful events *still* exist—but only that they tenselessly exist in the past—, we have perhaps the psychological tendency to “imagine” past events in non-presentist world as somehow *persisting into existence*, as though something that happened ten years ago were *still* into existence ten years later and *will exist forever*. So, when think of the victims of the Nazis in the concentration camps and we think that their pains tenselessly exist perhaps we feel as though *those pains* are still into existence and there will never be an end to them. Whether or not this explanation works, I think that, to contrast this residual unsettling appearance of non-presentism, we should concentrate on the idea that the *experience of pain* in a non-presentist world is exactly the same as in a presentist world, assuming they have the same history: each painful event is exactly of the same duration, kind, and intensity in both worlds.

7. Summary

The fact that a certain painful event existed in a presentist world is as relevant as the event itself that tenselessly exists in the past of a non-presentist world; and it is as relevant as an equally painful event that presently exists or the fact that it presently exists in a presentist or non-presentist world. This has been argued for, I believe convincingly, by means of four thought experiments and the introduction of a distinction between relevance (of an event or fact that an event existed or presently exists) to the moral evaluation of the world and our moral involvement (in the event or fact at issue). It has also been shown that the fact that our moral (and psychological) involvement is greater for present painful events than for past ones can be explained, and indeed justified, without appealing to considerations concerning the ontic status of the past. If all this is correct, then the ugly history objection stands: given the minimal axiological principle expressed by (P1), what really matters to the moral evaluation of a world is its history, not the metaphysical interpretation of it. A presentist version of our world is therefore as desirable as a non-presentist version of it.

References

- Forrest P. 2004 "The Real but Dead Past: A Reply to Braddon-Mitchell, *Analysis*, 64 (4), pp. 358-362.
- Leslie J. 2013 "A Proof of God's Reality". In: T. Goldschmidt (ed.), *The Puzzle of Existence. Why there is Something Rather than Nothing?* Routledge: London, pp. 128-143.
- Mullins R. T. 2014 "Four-Dimensionalism, Evil, and Christian Belief", *Philosophia Christi* 16 (1), pp. 117-137.
- Orilia F. 2012 *Filosofia del tempo: Il dibattito contemporaneo*. Carocci: Roma.
- Orilia F. 2016 "On the Existential Side of the Presentism-Eternalism Dispute", *Manuscrito* 39 (4), pp. 225-254.
- Orilia F. 2018a "The Moral Desirability of Presentism". In: Mirosław Szatkowski (ed.), *God, Time, Infinity*. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter, pp. 147-162.
- Orilia F. 2018b "Time, Modality and Moral Desirability", *Hermeneutica: Annuario di filosofia e teologia*, pp. 129-146.
- Smith Q. 2002 "Time and Degrees of Existence: A Theory of "Degree Presentism". In: Callender C. (ed.), *Time, Reality and Experience*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 119-136.