Free will: a philosophical inquiry.

Naser Friedman*

School of Civil & Environmental Engineering and Earth Sciences (SCEEES), Clemson University, USA

Introduction

The concept of free will has been a subject of intense debate in philosophy, religion, and science for centuries. It touches upon some of the most fundamental questions about human nature, ethics, and the universe. Free will refers to the idea that individuals have the capacity to make choices that are not determined by past events, biology, or fate. However, this seemingly simple notion opens a Pandora's box of questions: Is free will compatible with a deterministic universe? How does it relate to moral responsibility? Does free will even exist, or is it an illusion? [1].

Determinism posits that all events, including human actions, are the result of preceding causes. In other words, every decision we make is the inevitable outcome of past events combined with the laws of nature. This view is often aligned with a scientific understanding of the universe, where everything is governed by physical laws, from the motion of planets to the workings of the human brain [2].

One of the earliest forms of determinism came from the ancient Stoics, who believed that everything is preordained by a rational cosmic order. In modern times, scientific advances, particularly in neuroscience, have given rise to a mechanistic view of human behavior. Experiments, such as those by Benjamin Libet in the 1980s, seem to suggest that brain activity corresponding to a decision occurs before a person becomes conscious of making that decision. This has led some to argue that our sense of free will is merely a byproduct of brain processes outside our control [3].

In contrast to determinism, libertarianism argues that free will is real and incompatible with determinism. Libertarians claim that individuals have the capacity to act freely and make choices that are not determined by prior events or external forces. According to this view, people are "first causes" or "unmoved movers" in certain respects, capable of initiating new chains of events through their actions [4].

Philosophers like Immanuel Kant and more recently Robert Kane have defended this view, suggesting that human beings possess a unique moral agency. Kant, for instance, believed that free will was necessary for moral duty. Without it, concepts like moral obligation or ethical decision-making would be meaningless, as individuals could not be said to choose between right and wrong [5].

Libertarianism finds support in the common human experience of deliberation and choice. When faced with multiple options, people often weigh alternatives, consider consequences, and feel as though they have the power to choose differently. This sense of autonomy is central to our self-understanding as rational agents [6].

A third view, compatibilism, seeks to reconcile free will with determinism. Compatibilists argue that free will can exist even in a deterministic universe, as long as we understand free will in a certain way. According to this view, free will does not require the ability to do otherwise in an absolute sense, but rather the ability to act according to one's desires, motives, and rational deliberations without coercion [7].

David Hume, one of the earliest proponents of compatibilism, argued that as long as our actions are the result of our internal desires and are not externally compelled, we can be considered free, even if those desires themselves are determined by prior causes. This perspective shifts the focus from metaphysical freedom (the ability to do otherwise) to practical freedom (the ability to act on one's own volition) [8].

Compatibilism is attractive because it preserves the possibility of moral responsibility while acknowledging the scientific view of a deterministic universe. Under this framework, individuals can be held accountable for their actions because their choices reflect their character, desires, and rational thinking, even if those factors are shaped by prior causes [9].

However, some critics of compatibilism argue that it simply redefines free will in a way that sidesteps the deeper metaphysical questions. If our desires and motives are themselves determined, is it really fair to say we are free, or are we merely acting out a script written by the past? [10].

Conclusion

The debate over free will remains unresolved, in part because it touches on questions that are both deeply philosophical and scientific. Determinists emphasize the causal chains that bind us, libertarians insist on the autonomy of human agency, and compatibilists attempt to bridge the two by redefining what it means to be free.The existence (or non-existence) of free will has profound implications for moral responsibility, ethics, and the law. If we are not truly free, how should society deal with issues of punishment, reward, and justice? Conversely, if free will does exist, how does it fit within a world that seems governed by natural laws?

***Correspondence to:** Naser Friedman, School of Civil & Environmental Engineering and Earth Sciences (SCEEES), Clemson University, USA. E-mail: nsr@frdm.edu

***Received:** 25-Jun-2024, Manuscript No. AAJPC-24-148542; **Editor assigned:** 26- Jun -2024, PreQC No. AAJPC-24-148542 (PQ); **Reviewed:** 08- July-2024, QC No. AAJPC-24-148542;**Revised:** 15- July -2024, Manuscript No. AAJPC-24-148542; **Published:** 23- July -2024, DOI: 10.35841 /aajpc-9.4.242*

***Citation:** Friedman N: Free will: a philosophical inquiry.J Psychol Cognition. 2024;9(4):242*

References

1. Millett S, Tapper A. Benefits of collaborative philosophical inquiry in schools. Educational philosophy and theory. 2012 Jan ;44(5):546-67.
2. Kennedy D. The role of a facilitator in a community of philosophical inquiry. Metaphilosophy. 2004 Oct;35(5):744-65.
3. Topping KJ, Trickey S. Collaborative philosophical inquiry for schoolchildren: Cognitive gains at 2-year follow-up. British Journal of Educational Psychology. 2007 Dec;77(4):787-96.
4. Kennedy N, Kennedy D. Community of philosophical inquiry as a discursive structure, and its role in school curriculum design. Journal of Philosophy of Education. 2011 May;45(2):265-83.
5. Harris S. Free will. Continuum Companion to Hume, London, Continuum. 2012 Mar :214-26.
6. Libet B. Do we have free will?. Journal of consciousness studies. 1999 Aug ;6(8-9):47-57.
7. Watson G. Free action and free will. Mind. 1987 Apr ;96(382):145-72.
8. Wolf S. The importance of free will. Mind. 1981 Jul ;90(359):386-405.
9. Vihvelin K. Free will demystified: A dispositional account. Philosophical Topics. 2004 Apr 1;32(1/2):427-50.
10. Conway J, Kochen S. The strong free will theorem. Notices of the AMS. 2009 Feb;56(2):226-32.

Citation: *Friedman N: Free will: a philosophical inquiry.J Psychol Cognition. 2024;9(4):242*