**Definitions of Free Will**

Eddy Nahmias, Associate Professor in the Department of Philosophy and the Neuroscience Institute at Georgia State University, published August 13, 2012, Big Questions Online, https://www.bigquestionsonline.com/2012/08/13/does-contemporary-neuroscience-support-challenge-reality-free-will/

“We’ve seen that **people understand “free will” to mean different things** and that people think our having free will would require different things.  I think **the best way to define “free will” is** (roughly):  “**the set of powers or capacities for making choices and controlling actions that an agent needs to be morally responsible for her choices and actions.**”  I think **this definition accords with the way most people, and most philosophers, understand free will, and** I think **it is also theoretically useful.  That is, it provides a useful target for philosophical analysis**—what are those capacities and what would limit or eliminate them?—**and** then **for scientific study.**  Once we pick out the relevant capacities, we can study:  how they are instantiated in humans (if they are), to what degree humans (as a species) possess them, to what degree (individual) humans possess them and exercise them in particular actions, and what might help us develop these capacities.  **Free will, as defined here, seems to require that free actions can be influenced by rational deliberation and conscious choice.**  On the conceptual side, how should we understand these capacities and the type of causal influence they need to have for our actions to count as free and responsible?  On the scientific side, how do our brains implement these capacities and what prevents them from playing a causal role in action?”

Jonathan Schooler, Professor of Psychological and Brain Sciences at the University of California Santa Barbara, published August 12, 2013, Big Questions Online, Emphasis Added https://www.bigquestionsonline.com/2014/05/06/what-are-implications-free-will-debate-individuals-society/

“For myself, **the functionality of a belief in free will, both as revealed by research and through personal experience, contributes to its appeal.  Free will from my perspective is like sailing a ship; we are buffeted by innumerable forces out of our control and will inevitably get somewhere regardless of what we do. However, if we take the helm we are more likely to end up where we want to go.**”

Robert Kane, University Distinguished Teaching Professor at the University of Texas at Austin, *A Contemporary Introduction to Free Will*, Oxford University Press, 2005, p. 13.

“Putting these thoughts together, **compatibilists argue that to be free, as we ordinarily understand it, is (1) to have the *power* or *ability* to do what we want or desire to do, which in turn entails (2) an *absence of constraints* or impediments (such as physical restraints, coercion, and compulsion) preventing us from doing what we want.** Let us call a view that defines freedom in terms of 1 and 2 “classical compatibilism.” Most traditional compatibilists, such as Hobbes, Hume, and Mill, were classical compatibilists in this sense. **Hobbes stated the view succinctly, saying a man is free when he finds “no stop in doing what he has the will, desire, or inclination to do.”** And Hobbes noted that if this is what freedom means, then freedom is compatible with determinism. For, as he put it, there may be no constraints or impediments preventing persons from doing what they “will or desire to do,” even if it should turn out that what they will or desire was determined by their past.”

Robert Kane, University Distinguished Teaching Professor at the University of Texas at Austin, *A Contemporary Introduction to Free Will*, Oxford University Press, 2005, p. 6.

“**To see where the conflict lies between determinism and free will, consider again what free will requires. We believe we have free will when we view ourselves as agents capable of influencing the world in various ways.** Open alternatives, or alternative possibilities, seem to lie before us. **We reason** and deliberate among them **and choose. We feel (1) it is “up to us” what we choose and how we act; and this means we could have chosen or acted otherwise.** As Aristotle noted: when acting is “up to us.” so is not acting. **This “up-to-us-ness” also suggests that (2) the ultimate sources of our actions lie in us and not outside us in factors beyond our control. If free will implies these conditions, one can see why determinism would be a threat to free will.** If one or another form of determinism were true, **it seems that it would not be (1) “up to us” what we chose from an array of alternative possibilities, since only one alternative would be possible. And it seems that the (2) sources or origins of our actions would not be “in us” but in something else** (such as the decrees of fate, the foreordaining acts of God, or antecedent causes and laws of nature) outside and beyond our control.”

**Aff: Answer to Quantum Indeterminism**

George Musser, contributing editor at Scientific American, February 6, 2012, https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/quantum-physics-free-will/

“**I find the idea that indeterminism restores free will extremely unpersuasive. What difference does it make if** my **conscious choices were programmed in at the big bang or decided on the fly by random particle events? In either case,** you might worry that **your decisions are not your own. If anything, quantum indeterminism makes matters worse**, because within our decision-making process, we want determinism: your choices should flow from your needs and desires. **Also, at a deep level, quantum mechanics is not random at all. Schrödinger’s equation is completely deterministic and time-symmetric.** Carroll feels much the same:”

Tom Chivers, journalist, the Daily Telegraph, published October 12, 2010 <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/science/8058541/Neuroscience-free-will-and-determinism-Im-just-a-machine.html>

“**Some philosophers –** Robert **Kane, and, famously,** Karl **Popper and** John **Eccles – have held out hope that quantum indeterminacy**, the randomness at the level of the universe's finest grains, **could rescue true freedom.** Prof **Haggard is dismissive.** "No one wants to be told they're just a machine. But **there is simply nothing approaching convincing evidence for the quantum view. Popper and Eccles proposed that free will was due to quantum indeterminacy in the chemical messages that communicate between neurons. "But none of that happens at the quantum level. From a physics point of view, it's macro-level." Besides, quantum activity is purely random, and randomness gives you no more freedom than determinism does.**”

Robert Kane, University Distinguished Teaching Professor at the University of Texas at Austin, *A Contemporary Introduction to Free Will*, Oxford University Press, 2005, p. 8-9.

“One might think these indeterministic developments in modern physics would have disposed of philosophical worries about free will. Why be concerned that free will conflicts with determinism if determinism is not even true in the physical world? But the interesting fact is that **despite these developments in physics, worries about free will did not go away in the twentieth century.** Concerns about determinism of human behavior persist to this day, and debates about free will have become more heated than ever. Why is this so? **There are four reasons why indeterministic developments in modern physics have not disposed of traditional concerns about free will and determinism. First, the new quantum world of elementary particles is as mysterious as free will itself, and there is still much debate about how to interpret it.** Standard views of quantum physics hold that the behavior of elementary particles involves chance and is undetermined. But these **standard views have been challenged; and there exist alternative interpretations of quantum theory that are deterministic.** These alternative interpretations are the minority view among physicists at present, and they are controversial. But **they cannot be ruled out. There is also the possibility that quantum physics will one day be superseded by a more comprehensive theory that is deterministic. So the question of determinism in the physical world is not finally settled.** But it is true that modern physics does give us more reason to believe that indeterminism and chance might have a more significant role to play in the physical universe than did the classical physics of Newton and Laplace. So there may be room for free will in nature, but this is not guaranteed.”

Robert Kane, University Distinguished Teaching Professor at the University of Texas at Austin, *A Contemporary Introduction to Free Will*, Oxford University Press, 2005, p. 9.

“But there is a second problem. Suppose it were true that the behavior of elementary particles is not always determined? What would this have to do with *human behavior*? **Contemporary determinists often point out that, while quantum indeterminacy may be significant for elementary particles,** such as electrons and protons, **its indeterministic effects are** usually **insignificant in large physical systems, such as the human brain and body. Complex physical systems involving many particles and higher energies tend to be regular and predictable in their behavior, according to quantum physics itself.** Thus, modern determinists, such as Ted Honderich, argue that **we can continue to regard human behavior as determined “for all practical purposes” or “near-determined,”** whatever the truth may be about electrons and protons. And this is all that matters in free will debates.”

Robert Kane, University Distinguished Teaching Professor at the University of Texas at Austin, *A Contemporary Introduction to Free Will*, Oxford University Press, 2005, p. 9.

“A third point complicates matters even further. **Suppose for the sake of argument that quantum jumps or other undetermined events in the brain or body *do* sometimes have large-scale undetermined effects on human behavior.** How would this help free will? Suppose a choice was the result of a quantum jump or other undetermined event in a person’s brain. Would this be a *free* or responsible choice? **Such undetermined effects in the brain or body would happen by chance and would be unpredictable and uncontrollable, like the sudden occurrence of a thought or the jerking of an arm that one could not predict or control. Such an effect would be quite the opposite of what we take free and responsible actions to be.** A similar objection was made against the ancient Epicurean philosophers, who had argued that atoms must “swerve” in chance ways if there was to be room in nature for free will. How, asked the critics, would chance swerves of the atoms help to give us free will? **It seems that undetermined events happening in the brain or body would occur spontaneously and would be more of a nuisance, or a curse, like epilepsy, than an enhancement of our freedom.** If free will is not compatible with determinism, it does not appear to be compatible with indeterminism either, since indeterminism would seem to be mere chance.”

Robert Kane, University Distinguished Teaching Professor at the University of Texas at Austin, *A Contemporary Introduction to Free Will*, Oxford University Press, 2005, p. 9-10.

“To these considerations, we can add a fourth and final reason why indeterministic developments in modern physics have not disposes of worries about free will and determinism. **At the same time that determinism has been in retreat in the physical sciences in the past century, developments in sciences other than physics - in biology, biochemistry, and neuroscience, in psychiatry, psychology, and other social and behavioral sciences - have been moving in the opposite direction.** These other sciences have convinced many persons that more of their behavior than previously believed is determined by causes unknown to them and beyond their control.”

Robert Kane, University Distinguished Teaching Professor at the University of Texas at Austin, *A Contemporary Introduction to Free Will*, Oxford University Press, 2005, p. 43.

“Now **Kant** in fact **believed that all events occurring in space and time were determined**. Writing in the eighteenth century, Kant was convinced that the mechanistic physics of Newton provided a true explanation of the physical world and that this physics was determinist. But **we do not have to assume that science is deterministic, as Kant did, to arrive at a conclusion like his - that free choices cannot be explained by science. For *view from sciences perspective within space and time*, if free choices were *not* determined, then they would appear to be merely random events, such as quantum jumps in atoms. Either way - determined or random - they would not be free choices.** So, had Kant know modern physics, he might have responded this way: “Free choices can no more be explained by an indeterministic (quantum) physics than they can by a deterministic (Newtonian) physics. I may have been wrong about the truth of Newton’s physics. But I was not wrong in concluding that free choices are beyond scientific explanation.”

**Aff: Libet Experiments and Their Successors**

Stephen Cave, Ph.D Cambridge University, author, The Atlantic, published June 2016, http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2016/06/theres-no-such-thing-as-free-will/480750/

“**Many scientists say that the American physiologist Benjamin Libet demonstrated in the 1980s that we have no free will.** It was already known that **electrical activity builds up in a person’s brain before she, for example, moves her hand; Libet showed that this buildup occurs before the person consciously makes a decision to move. The** conscious **experience of deciding to act, which we** usually **associate with free will, appears to be an add-on**, a post hoc reconstruction of events that occurs *after* the brain has already set the act in motion.”

Tom Chivers, journalist, the Daily Telegraph, published October 12, 2010 http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/science/8058541/Neuroscience-free-will-and-determinism-Im-just-a-machine.html

“We're **in the Institute for Cognitive Neuroscience**, in Queen Square in London, the nerve centre – if you will – of British brain research. **Prof Haggard is demonstrating "transcranial magnetic stimulation", a technique that uses magnetic coils to affect one's brain, and then to control the body.** One of his research assistants, Christina Fuentes, is holding a loop-shaped paddle next to his head, moving it fractionally. "If we get it right, it might cause something." She presses a switch, and the coil activates with a click. Prof Haggard's hand twitches. "It's not me doing that," he assures me, "it's her." **The machinery can't force Prof Haggard to do anything really complicated** – "You can't make me sign my name," he says, almost ruefully – **but at one point, Christina is able to waggle his index finger slightly, like a schoolmaster. It's very fine control, a part of the brain specifically in command of a part of the body.** "There's quite a detailed map of the brain's wiring to the body that you can build," he tells me. I watch as Christina controls Prof Haggard's fingers like a marionette. **The mechanical nature of it is unsettling. A graph on a screen shows his muscle activity plotted by time; 20 milliseconds after she clicks the button, it depicts an elegant leap and drop, like a heartbeat on an ECG. That 20 milliseconds is how long it takes for the signal to travel down his nerves. "The conduction time would be less from my jaw muscles, more from my leg muscles," he says.** And as many of us will recognise, the process gets less effective as we age: "As I get older, the curve will move slowly to the right on the graph." **The idea that our bodies can be controlled by an outside force is a pretty astonishing one. "This is absolutely out of my control," insists Prof Haggard, as his muscles continue to move. "I'm not doing it, Christina is. I'm just a machine, and she is operating me."**”

Tom Chivers, journalist, the Daily Telegraph, published October 12, 2010 http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/science/8058541/Neuroscience-free-will-and-determinism-Im-just-a-machine.html

“What does this mean in terms of free will? "We don't have free will, in the spiritual sense. **What you're seeing is the last output stage of a machine. There are lots of things that happen before this stage – plans, goals, learning – and those are the reasons we do more interesting things than just waggle fingers. But there's no ghost in the machine.**" The conclusions are shocking: **if we are part of the universe, and obey its laws, it's hard to see where free will comes into it.** What we think of as freedom, he says, is a product of complexity. "An amoeba has one input, one output. If you touch it with one chemical, it engulfs it; with another, it recoils.”

Andrew Griffin, journalist, The Independent, published April 30, 2016 http://www.independent.co.uk/news/science/free-will-could-all-be-an-illusion-scientists-suggest-after-study-that-shows-choice-could-just-be-a7008181.html

“**The idea that human beings trick themselves into believing in free will was laid out** in a paper **by** psychologists Dan **Wegner and** Thalia **Wheatley nearly 20 years ago.** They proposed the feeling of wanting to do something was real, but there may be no connection between the feeling and actually doing it. **The new study builds on that work and says that the brain rewrites history when it makes its choices, changing our memories so that we believe we wanted to do something before it happened.** **In one** of the studies undertaken **by** Adam **Bear and** Paul **Bloom, of Yale** University, the **test subjects were shown five white circles on a computer monitor. They were told to choose one of the circles before one of them lit up red. The participants were then asked to describe whether they’d picked the correct circle, another one, or if they hadn’t had time to actually pick one.** Statistically, people should have picked the right circle about one out of every five times. But **they reported getting it right much more than 20 per cent of the time, going over 30 per cent if the circle turned red very quickly. The scientists suggest that the findings show that the test subjects’ minds were swapping around the order of events**, so that it appeared that they had chosen the right circle – even if they hadn’t actually had time to do so.”

**Aff: Lack of Agency**

Tom Chivers, journalist, the Daily Telegraph, published October 12, 2010 <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/science/8058541/Neuroscience-free-will-and-determinism-Im-just-a-machine.html>

“**Maybe**, I suggest, **we've over-defined free will. Perhaps it doesn't exist in the mystical breaking-the-laws-of-the-universe way, but there is a sense in which this "me", this brain and body, responds to the world, reacts to information, tries to shape its environment; takes decisions.** Can we not pull free will back to something more defensible? He taps his fingers. "Yes, **interacting intelligently with your environment might be enough. The philosophical definition of free will uses the phrase 'could have done otherwise'.** I picked up the blue cup; could I have picked up the white one? Given the initial conditions, the world as it was, could I have acted differently? "**As a neuroscientist, you've got to be a determinist. There are physical laws, which the electrical and chemical events in the brain obey. Under identical circumstances, you couldn't have done otherwise; there's no 'I' which can say 'I want to do otherwise'.** It's richness of the action that you do make, acting smart rather than acting dumb, which is free will."”

Jerry Coyne, Professor of Ecology and Evolution, University of Chicago, USA Today, published January 1, 2012, http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/news/opinion/forum/story/2012-01-01/free-will-science-religion/52317624/1

“Now there's no way to rewind the tape of our lives to see if we can really make different choices in completely identical circumstances. But two lines of **evidence suggest that** such **free will is an illusion.** The first is simple: **we are biological creatures, collections of molecules that must obey the laws of physics. All the success of science rests on the regularity of those laws, which determine the behavior of every molecule in the universe. Those molecules, of course, also make up your brain — the organ that does the "choosing." And the neurons and molecules in your brain are the product of both your genes and your environment, an environment including the other people we deal with.** Memories, for example, are nothing more than structural and chemical changes in your brain cells. **Everything that you think, say, or do, must come down to molecules and physics. True "free will," then, would require us to somehow step outside of our brain's structure and modify how it works. Science hasn't shown any way we can do this because "we" are simply constructs of our brain. We can't impose a nebulous "will" on the inputs to our brain that can affect its output of decisions and actions**, any more than a programmed computer can somehow reach inside itself and change its program.”

Jerry Coyne, Professor of Ecology and Evolution, University of Chicago, USA Today, published January 1, 2012, http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/news/opinion/forum/story/2012-01-01/free-will-science-religion/52317624/1

“And **that's what neurobiology is telling us: Our brains are simply meat computers that, like real computers, are programmed by our genes and experiences to convert an array of inputs into a predetermined output.** Recent experiments involving brain scans show that when a subject "decides" to push a button on the left or right side of a computer, the choice can be predicted by brain activity at least *seven seconds* before the subject is consciously aware of having made it. (These studies use crude imaging techniques based on blood flow, and I suspect that future understanding of the brain will allow us to predict many of our decisions far earlier than seven seconds in advance.) "Decisions" made like that aren't conscious ones. And **if our choices are unconscious, with some determined well before the moment we think we've made them, then we don't have free will in any meaningful sense.**”

**Aff: Answer to Free Won't**

Jerry Coyne, Professor of Ecology and Evolution, University of Chicago, USA Today, published January 1, 2012, http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/news/opinion/forum/story/2012-01-01/free-will-science-religion/52317624/1

“**Many scientists and philosophers now accept that our actions and thoughts are indeed determined by physical laws**, and in that sense we don't really choose freely, but philosophers have concocted ingenious rationalizations for why we nevertheless have free will of a sort. It's all based on redefining "free will" to mean something else. **Some philosophers claim that if we can change our actions in response to reason, then we've shown free will. But of course the words and deeds of other people are simply environmental influences that can affect our brain molecules.** That's how love begins.”

Jerry Coyne, Professor of Ecology and Evolution, University of Chicago, USA Today, published January 1, 2012, http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/news/opinion/forum/story/2012-01-01/free-will-science-religion/52317624/1

“Other **philosophers argue that while we may not be able to choose our actions, we can choose to *veto* our actions** — in other words, we don't have free will but do have "free won't." **But from the standpoint of physics, instigating an action is no different from vetoing one, and in fact involves the same regions of the brain.**”

**Aff: Personal Consistency Does Not Create Freedom**

Jerry Coyne, Professor of Ecology and Evolution, University of Chicago, USA Today, published January 1, 2012, http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/news/opinion/forum/story/2012-01-01/free-will-science-religion/52317624/1

“Finally, **some argue that we have free will if our actions are consistent with our personalities and past behaviors. But that says nothing about whether we "choose' our actions; only that our genetic and environmental makeup affects our actions in a consistent way.** As Sam Harris noted in his book *Free Will*, all the attempts to harmonize the determinism of physics with a freedom of choice down to the claim that "a puppet is free so long as he loves his strings."”

**Aff: Argument from Intoxication**

Stephen Cave, Ph.D Cambridge University, author, The Atlantic, published June 2016, http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2016/06/theres-no-such-thing-as-free-will/480750/

“**We know that changes to brain chemistry can alter behavior—otherwise neither alcohol nor antipsychotics would have** their desired **effects. The same holds true for brain structure: Cases of** ordinary **adults becoming murderers or pedophiles after developing a brain tumor demonstrate how dependent we are on the physical properties of our gray stuff.**”

**Aff: Determinism is Not Fatalism**

Stephen Cave, Ph.D Cambridge University, author, The Atlantic, published June 2016, http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2016/06/theres-no-such-thing-as-free-will/480750/

“The big problem, in Harris’s view, is that people often confuse determinism with fatalism. **Determinism is the belief that our decisions are part of an unbreakable chain of cause and effect. Fatalism, on the other hand, is the belief that our decisions don’t really matter, because whatever is destined to happen will happen**—like Oedipus’s marriage to his mother, despite his efforts to avoid that fate. **When people hear there is no free will, they wrongly become fatalistic; they think their efforts will make no difference. But this is a mistake. People are not moving toward an inevitable destiny**; given a different stimulus (like a different idea about free will), they will behave differently and so have different lives. **If people better understood these fine distinctions**, Harris believes, **the consequences of losing faith in free will would be much less negative** than Vohs’s and Baumeister’s experiments suggest.”

**Aff: The Randomness Objection to Indeterminism**

Robert Kane, University Distinguished Teaching Professor at the University of Texas at Austin, *A Contemporary Introduction to Free Will*, Oxford University Press, 2005, p. 37. Emphasis Original.

“Indeed, **another** frequently heard **objection to indeterminist free will is precisely that undetermined free choices must *always* amount to mere *random* choices, like flipping a coin** or spinning a wheel to select from among a set of alternatives. Perhaps there is a role for random choices in our lives - for sometimes settling choices by a coin flip or spinning a wheel - when we are indifferent to the outcomes. (Which movie should I see tonight when I like both available options?) But **suppose that all our free and responsible choices - including momentous ones, like whether to act heroically or treacherously, to lie to a friend, or to marry one person rather than another - had to be settled by random selection** in this way. **Such a consequence, according to most philosophers, would be a reduction to absurdity** of the view that free will and responsibility require indeterminism.”

**Aff: The Luck Objection to Indeterminism**

Robert Kane, University Distinguished Teaching Professor at the University of Texas at Austin, *A Contemporary Introduction to Free Will*, Oxford University Press, 2005, p. 37-38.

“**Finally, consider the** following objection, which has been suggested by a number of critics of indeterminist free choice. We may call it the **“Luck Objection.” Indeterminism,** as noted earlier, **implies different possible futures, given exactly the same past. Suppose then that two agents had exactly the same past up to a point at which they were faced with a choice between distorting the truth for selfish gain or telling the truth at great personal cost. One agent lies and the other tells the truth.** Bruce **Waller summarizes this objection as follows: if the pasts of these two agents “are really identical” in every way up to the moment of choice, “and the difference in their acts results from chance,” would there “be any grounds for distinguishing between [them], for saying that one person deserves censure for a selfish decision and the other deserves praise?”**”

Robert Kane, University Distinguished Teaching Professor at the University of Texas at Austin, *A Contemporary Introduction to Free Will*, Oxford University Press, 2005, p. 38.

“Another critic, Alfred **Mele, poses the same problem in terms of a single agent in different possible worlds. Suppose that in the actual world, John fails to** resist the temptation to do what he thinks he should not do, **arrive on time at a meeting. If John could have done otherwise given the same past, then we could imagine that his counterpart, John\*, in an alternate possible world** (which is exactly the same as the actual world up to the moment of choice) resists the temptation and **arrives on time. Mele then argues that “if there is nothing about the agents’ powers, capacities, states of mind, moral character and the like that explains this difference in outcome, … the difference is just a matter of luck.”** It would seem that John\* got lucky in his attempt to overcome temptation, while John did not. **Would it be fair or just to reward the one and punish the other for what appears to be ultimately the luck of the draw?**”

**Aff: Societal Influences Determine Your Character**

Robert Kane, University Distinguished Teaching Professor at the University of Texas at Austin, *A Contemporary Introduction to Free Will*, Oxford University Press, 2005, p. 3-4.

“The citizens in Skinner’s *Walden Two* have it better than the workers in *Brave New World*. Yet the desires and purposes of those who live in Walden Two are also covertly controlled, in this case by behavioral engineers. Citizens of Walden Two live collectively in what can be described as a rural commune; and because they share the duties of farming and raising children, they have plenty of leisure. They pursue arts, sciences, and crafts, engage in musical performances, and enjoy what appears to be a pleasant existence. Indeed, the leading figure of the novel, a fellow named Frazier, who founded Walden Two, forthrightly says that, in his community, persons can do whatever they want or choose because they have been behaviorally conditioned since childhood to want and choose only what they can have and do. **Frazier then adds** provocatively **that,** in his view, **Walden Two “is the freest place on earth,” since people there can choose and do anything they want. And in a sense he is right. There is no need for *coercion* in Walden Two or for *punishment*** (there are no prisons). **No one has to be forced to do anything against his or her will. No one harasses the citizens, and no one has to harass them. Yet we might wonder whether Walden Two *is* the freest place on earth. Is all this *surface* freedom in Walden Two not brought about at the expense of a *deeper* freedom of the will?** The citizens of Walden Two can indeed do anything they want or will to do, but **they do not have the ultimate say about what it is that they want or will. Such an objection is in fact made by** one of Frazier’s critics in the novel, a philosopher named **Castle** who visits Walden Two. But **Frazier is untroubled by Castle’s criticism. He admits that this supposedly deeper freedom of the will does not exist in Walden Two but argues that it is no real loss.** Echoing the novel’s author, B.F. Skinner (who was a foremost defender of behaviorism in psychology), **Frazier thinks this so-called freedom of the will - the freedom that Castle and other philosophers have trumpeted for centuries - is an illusion. We do not want and cannot have such a freedom anyway, he says, inside *or* outside Walden Two. In our ordinary lives, we are just as much the products of upbringing and social conditioning as the citizens of Walden Two, though we may delude ourselves into thinking otherwise. We may think we are the creators or originators of our own wills only because we are unaware of most of the genetic, psychological, and social factors that influence us.** Moreover, the idea that we could be ultimate or “original” creators of our own wills - that we could somehow be “causes of ourselves” - is an impossible ideal, according to Frazier. If we trace the psychological springs of action back to their origins - back to childhood, say - we find that we were less free then, not more.”

**Aff: van Iwagen’s Consequence Argument**

Robert Kane, University Distinguished Teaching Professor at the University of Texas at Austin, *A Contemporary Introduction to Free Will*, Oxford University Press, 2005, p. 23-24.

“The argument is called the Consequence Argument, and it is stated informally as follows by one of its proponents, Peter van Inwagen: “**If determinism is true, then our acts are the consequences of the laws of nature and the events in the remote past. But it is not up to us what went on before we were born; and neither is it up to us what the laws of nature are. Therefore the consequences of these things (including our own acts) are not up to us.”** To say it is not “up to us” what “went on before we were born,” or “what the laws of nature are,” is to say that there is nothing we can now do to change the past or alter the laws of nature (such things are beyond our control). This gives us two premises of the Consequence Argument. (1) There is nothing we can now do to change the past. (2) There is nothing we can now do to change the laws of nature. Putting these two premises together, we get (3) There is nothing we can now do to change the past and the laws of nature. But if determinism is true, then (4) Our present actions are the necessary consequences of the past and the laws of nature. (Or, equivalently, it is necessary that, given the past and the laws of nature, our present actions occur.) So if determinism is true, it seems that (5) **There is nothing we can now do to change the fact that our present actions are the necessary consequences of the past and the laws of nature. But if there is nothing we can now do to change the past and the laws of nature** (which is step 3) ***and* nothing we can now do to change the fact that our present actions are the necessary consequences of the past and the laws of nature** (step 5), it would seem to follow that, if determinism is true (step 4), **then** (6) **There is nothing we can now do to change the fact that our present actions occur. In other words, we *cannot now do otherwise* than we actually do.** Since this argument can be applied to any agents and actions at any times, we can infer from it that *if determinism is true, no one can ever do otherwise*; and if free will requires the power to do otherwise, then no one has free will.”

**Aff: Rejecting the Hypothetical “Can”**

Robert Kane, University Distinguished Teaching Professor at the University of Texas at Austin, *A Contemporary Introduction to Free Will*, Oxford University Press, 2005, p. 29-30.

“What are the “serious objections” to hypothetical analyses of “can” and “could have done otherwise” referred to in this passage? **The objection that many philosophers regard as the most serious goes like this: hypothetical analyses of “can” and “could have done otherwise” sometimes (wrongly) tell us that agents can do otherwise, or could have done otherwise, in cases where it’s clear that the agents could *not* have done otherwise. So the hypothetical analyses must be wrong.** Here is an example of Michael McKenna’s illustrating this objection. **Suppose that Danielle has been scarred by a terrible childhood accident involving a blond Labrador retriever. The accident rendered her “psychologically incapable of wanting to touch a blond haired dog.** **Imagine** that, on her sixteenth birthday, unaware of her condition, **her father brings her two puppies to choose between, one being a blond haired Lab, the other a black haired Lab. He tells Danielle just to pick up whichever of the two she pleases and that he will return the other puppy to the pet store. Danielle, happily, and unencumbered, does what she wants and picks up the black Lab. Was Danielle free to *do otherwise*** (*could* she have done otherwise) than pick up the black Lab? **It seems not,** McKenna says. **Given her traumatic childhood experience, she cannot even form a want to touch a blond-haired Lab, hence she could not pick up one. But notice the compatibilist hypothetical analysis of “she could have done otherwise” would be true in this case:** *If* Danielle *did* want to pick up the blond-haired Lab, then she would have done so. **So the hypothetical analysis gives us the wrong answer in this case and in many other similar cases.** It tells us Danielle could have done otherwise (because she would have, if she wanted), when in fact she could *not* have done otherwise (because she could not have *wanted* to do otherwise).”

Robert Kane, University Distinguished Teaching Professor at the University of Texas at Austin, *A Contemporary Introduction to Free Will*, Oxford University Press, 2005, p. 30.

“**The problem with the hypothetical analysis brought out by this example is** the following: **to truly capture the meaning of “She *could* have done otherwise,” it is not good enough to simply say “She *would* have done otherwise, *if* she had wanted to”; one must add “*and* she *could also have wanted* to do otherwise.” But then the hypothetical analysis merely pushes back the question of whether the agent could have *wanted* or *chosen* (or *willed*) to do otherwise.** And answering this further question requires another “could” statement (“She could have wanted or chosen to do otherwise”) which in turn requires another hypothetical analysis: “She would have wanted or chosen to do otherwise, *if* she had *wanted or chosen to want or choose* otherwise.” And the same question would arise about this further hypothetical statement, requiring yet another “could” statement to be analyzed, and so on indefinitely. **The result is an infinite regress that would never allow one to eliminate the word “could” and would never allow one to definitively answer the original question of whether the agent could have done otherwise - which shows that something has gone wrong with the hypothetical analysis.** For reasons such as this, defenders of the Consequence Argument think the hypothetical analysis of “could have done otherwise” favored by classical compatibilists is flawed. Such an analysis would undermine the Consequence Argument, if it were correct. But there are reasons to think it is not correct.”

**Aff: Answers to Indeterminist (Libertarian) Free Will**

Robert Kane, University Distinguished Teaching Professor at the University of Texas at Austin, *A Contemporary Introduction to Free Will*, Oxford University Press, 2005, p. 35.

“1. First, one often hears **critics of libertarianism argue that events that are undetermined happen merely by chance and are not** under the *control* of anything, hence are not under the control of the agent. **It is not “up to” agents whether undetermined events occur or not.** But if events are not under the control of an agent, **they cannot be free and responsible actions.**”

Robert Kane, University Distinguished Teaching Professor at the University of Texas at Austin, *A Contemporary Introduction to Free Will*, Oxford University Press, 2005, p. 35.

“2. A related argument was suggested in chapter 1. **Suppose a choice was the result of a quantum jump or other undetermined event in a person’s brain. Would this amount to a free and responsible choice? Such undetermined effects in the brain or body would be unpredictable and impulsive** - like the sudden occurrence of a thought or the spasmodic jerking of an arm that one could not have predicted or influenced - **quite the opposite of what we take free and responsible actions to be.** It seems that **undetermined events happening in the brain or the body would** occur *spontaneously* and would **be more likely to *undermine* our freedom rather than to *enhance* our freedom.**”

Robert Kane, University Distinguished Teaching Professor at the University of Texas at Austin, *A Contemporary Introduction to Free Will*, Oxford University Press, 2005, p. 35.

“3. **Nor would it help to suppose that the indeterminism or chance came *between* our choices and our actions. Imagine that you have chosen to make a delicate cut in a fine piece of cloth, but because of an undetermined twitching in your arm, you make the wrong cut. In this case, the undetermined twitching in your arm was no enhancement of your freedom, but a hindrance or obstacle to your carrying out your intended purpose.** Critics of libertarian freedom often contend that this is what indeterminism would always be - a *hindrance* or *impediment* to freedom. It would get in the way, diminishing rather than enhancing *control* and *responsibility* for what happens. **Note that twitching of your arm is actually a *constraint* on your freedom** in the classical compatibilist sense, **since it *prevents* you from doing what you *want* to do, that is, make the delicate cut properly.** So, far from giving us more freedom, it seems that indeterminism would turn out to be another kind of impediment limiting our freedom.”

Robert Kane, University Distinguished Teaching Professor at the University of Texas at Austin, *A Contemporary Introduction to Free Will*, Oxford University Press, 2005, p. 35.

“4. **Even more absurd consequences follow if we suppose that indeterminism or chance is involved in the initiation of everyday actions.** A nineteenth-century critic of undetermined free action, Arthur **Schopenhauer, imagined the case of a man who suddenly found his legs start to move *by chance*, carrying across the room against his wishes. Is this what libertarians have in mind**, Schopenhauer asked, **when they insist that free actions must be undetermined?** Such caricatures are popular among critics of indeterminist freedom for obvious reasons: **undetermined or chance-initiated actions would represent the opposite of free and responsible actions.**”

Robert Kane, University Distinguished Teaching Professor at the University of Texas at Austin, *A Contemporary Introduction to Free Will*, Oxford University Press, 2005, p. 35-36.

“5. Going a little deeper, **critics of libertarian freedom also note that, if choices are actions are undetermined, they may occur otherwise, *given the exactly same past and laws of nature*.** This follows, as we saw, from indeterminism, which implies different possible futures, given the same past. But **such a requirement has troubling consequences regarding free choices**, as noted in chapter 2. Here is a further example illustrating the problem. **Suppose Mike, who is deliberating about whether to vacation in Hawaii or Colorado, gradually comes to favor and choose Hawaii. If Mike’s choice, when he finally makes it, was undetermined, as libertarians require, then he might have chosen** otherwise (chosen **to visit Colorado instead), given exactly the same deliberation up to the moment of choice** that in fact led him to favor and choose Hawaii (the same thoughts, reasoning, beliefs, desires, and so on). As noted in our discussion of Molly’s choosing a career, it is difficult to make sense of this. Mike’s **choosing Colorado in such circumstances** (in which he had come to favor Hawaii) **would seem irrational and inexplicable, capricious and arbitrary.** If the choice of Hawaii came about by virtue of undetermined events in Mike’s brain, **this would not be an occasion for rejoicing in his freedom, but for consulting a neurologist** about the waywardness of his neural processes.”

**Aff: Answers to Leibniz on Deliberation as Prior Constraint**

Robert Kane, University Distinguished Teaching Professor at the University of Texas at Austin, *A Contemporary Introduction to Free Will*, Oxford University Press, 2005, p. 36.

“**Leibniz’s claim** that reasons may “incline without necessitating” **is an important one. But** unfortunately, **it will not solve the problem** about Mike’s choice described in objection 5. For **it is precisely *because* Mike’s prior reasons and motives** (his beliefs and desires about beaches and surfing) **inclined him more strongly toward the choice of Hawaii that his choosing of Colorado by chance at the end of the same deliberation would be arbitrary, irrational, and inexplicable.** Similarly, if his reasons had inclined him more strongly toward Colorado, then choosing Hawaii by chance at the end of the same deliberation would have been irrational and inexplicable.”

Robert Kane, University Distinguished Teaching Professor at the University of Texas at Austin, *A Contemporary Introduction to Free Will*, Oxford University Press, 2005, p. 36-37.

“What **if Mike’s prior reasons and motives had not inclined him more strongly to *either* alternative**? **Then, if the choice were undetermined**, matters would be even worse. For **the choice would** then **be doubly arbitrary** - arbitrary either way he might choose. **Medieval philosophers**, who discussed free will, **had a name for the condition** of an agent who has no better reasons for choosing one option rather than the other. They called it **the “liberty of indifference.”** **You have probably heard the well-known illustration of the liberty of indifference** involving Burdian’s ass - **the donkey that starved between two equidistant bales of hay because it had no reason to choose one over the other.** Jean Burdian was a medieval French philosopher to whom this famous example of the donkey is often wrongly attributed. The original example goes back to the medieval Arabic philosopher Al-Ghazzali, who imagined a camel starving between two groves of date trees. These examples of the liberty of indifference were often used later by philosophers, such as Hume and Schopenhauer, the ridicule libertarian or indeterminist free will. (Al-Ghazzali had used his example for a similar purpose.) **Of course, a human, who was not an ass, would undoubtedly not starve to death in these conditions. It would be better to flip a coin and choose one option arbitrarily or by chance than to go without food altogether. But such a solution to the liberty of indifference - choosing by a coin flip - still amounts to choosing arbitrarily or by chance. Is that what indeterminist freedom amounts to?**”

**Aff: Souls Don’t Solve**

Robert Kane, University Distinguished Teaching Professor at the University of Texas at Austin, *A Contemporary Introduction to Free Will*, Oxford University Press, 2005, p. 41.

“To see why, ask the following question: **if a free choice** (such as Molly’s choice to join the law firm in Dallas or Mike’s to vacation in Hawaii or John’s to arrive late) **is not determined by the prior *physical* activity of the agent’s brain, is the choice determined by the prior *mental* activity of the agent’s mind or soul? Dualists** who are libertarians about free will **must answer that free choices in a libertarian sense cannot be determined by prior activity of a disembodied mind or soul any more than free choices can be determined by prior physical activity of the body.** For, determinism either way would rule out the possibility of doing otherwise, hence would rule out libertarian free will. **If** God had so made us that **the activities and effects of our *minds* were also determined, we would be no better off *regarding free will* just because our minds were separate from our bodies.**”

Robert Kane, University Distinguished Teaching Professor at the University of Texas at Austin, *A Contemporary Introduction to Free Will*, Oxford University Press, 2005, p. 41-42.

“But if determinism by the mind is no more acceptable than determinism by the body, then dualists who want to defend libertarian free will cannot merely say that Molly (or Mike or John) could have chosen or chosen otherwise, given all the same past *physical* circumstances. **Dualists must also say that free agents could have chosen or chosen otherwise, given all the same past physical *and mental* circumstances. If dualists do *not* say this, all the original problems about the Indeterminist Condition will come back to haunt them.** **If Molly might have chosen the law firm in Austin, given all the same prior thoughts, reasoning, and other mental (as well as physical) circumstances that in fact led her to favor the Dallas firm, then her choice to join the Austin firm would have been just as irrational, inexplicable, and arbitrary if it issued from a disembodied mind or soul as it would if it had issued from an embodied person.** If John and John\* might have chosen differently, given exactly the same mental (and physical) histories up to the moment when they did choose, the Mele’s question comes back to haunt us: “What can account for the difference in their choices - why John failed to overcome the temptation and John\* did not - except luck?””

Robert Kane, University Distinguished Teaching Professor at the University of Texas at Austin, *A Contemporary Introduction to Free Will*, Oxford University Press, 2005, p. 42.

“For reasons such as these, **placing the agent’s thoughts and deliberations in a disembodied mind or soul does not solve the problems about and undetermined free will. Dualism simply transfers these problems from another level**, from the physical sphere to the mental. That is why a critic of libertarianism, such as Simon Blackburn, can say: “The dualist approach to free will makes a fundamental philosophical mistake. **It sees the problem and tries to solve it by throwing another kind of “thing” into the arena** [the controlling soul]. **But it forgets to ask how the new “thing” escapes the problems that beset ordinary things**. … If we cannot understand how human beings are free [in a libertarian sense], we cannot understand how [a disembodied mind] can be free” either.. Of course, Blackburn’s comment does not mean that dualism is necessarily false. But it does mean that appealing to a mind or soul separate from the body will not by itself solve the problem of free will, as some people have believed.”