

Multicausality and the combinatorial puzzle

Svein Anders Noer Lie
University of Tromsø

On a relational view on dispositions, there is no room left for monocausality. Multicausality is inevitable. But what is multicausality? Is it causes (manifesting dispositions) giving their singular contributions to a joint effect, or is causality *relational* as such. This is an important question, in particular in biology, because we may view the 'singular contribution model' as a way to ontologically save monocausality (which over the years has become almost impossible to support in the science of biology). To say that causes are relational calls for a totally different ontology, and it may therefore contribute to a consistent paradigmatic shift that, in so many other ways, has matured within the science of biology.

The ontological disagreement underlying multicausality is what should be discussed, rather than portraying monocausality vs. multicausality as the decisive distinction. I.e. to discuss and to take a theory of causality embedded in the idea of counterfactual dependence as a serious option for the science of biology is to push "scholastic philosophy" onto science rather than asking philosophical questions emerging from science itself.

How we should ontologically explain and understand the relationality of causes is obviously a complex issue. I will here present a possible solution.