

FREE WILL

Lee Kent Hempfling

October 7, 2017

ABSTRACT:

This paper examines the similarities of science and religion regarding Free Will and further explains Free Will, awareness and the higher functions of the human brain.

In a Seth Schwartz Ph.D. article from November 13, 2013 in Psychology Today¹ entitled "*Do We Have Free Will? Is free choice real, or is it just an illusion?*" what might be the most accurate description of the problem is presented: "... how is it possible that anything can occur without having been caused by something else? If we really can choose, then these choices must be uncaused - something that cannot be explained within the model of science that many of us rely on."

A choice is a selection between 2 or more options. To state that choices cannot be caused is to ignore what a choice is. To assume that a choice can only be in a straight line is to declare existence is black and white, ignoring all the gray matter between them and beyond them.

The concept of cause and effect is only acquirable backwards. The 'cause' is in the past (or more accurately prior to the) [of the] effect. Using the "IQ Matrix"² law of cause and effect: Every effect has a

¹ <https://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/proceed-your-own-risk/201311/do-we-have-free-will>

² <http://blog.iqmatrix.com/law-of-cause-effect>

specific and predictable cause. Every cause or action has a specific and predictable effect," then the only missing link to solving all related questions is perspective.

The answer to the objection of science to 'free will' is itself proof of the use of the model of science many rely on. It only considers the potential of a known cause and ignores any potential that a cause may not yet be known. It further might as well state that unless you are known to exist by someone else you are therefore nonexistent. The tree falling in the forest has no sound to it whatsoever because some arrogant human has the guts to proclaim it only makes sound where he or she is there to hear it. Then a book has never been written until a reader reads it. It is a convoluted inductive assumption. It is what happens when an aware human: attempts to describe something in a manner in which that person's worst nightmare might result in a way to keep that from ever happening. It is science's fear that somehow the existence of God would be threatening when in reality, it would be most enlightening and tend to lend to the understanding having free will screams to possess. And give substance to the meaning of life.

Perspective is where the cause is, what it stems from. Is it a direct cause or a strong enough indirect cause? Any of those could be so far back in history that an empirical study would not only miss finding it but if so led by the arrogance of deflection, would ignore the potential of any quest to begin with. It would not even know what it failed to already know. It would become the disaster it attempted to thwart.

Understanding has got to begin with comprehending that nothing travels in a straight line. Even the movement of the air changes the trajectory of a hard-hit baseball that would otherwise have steadied itself into the bleachers. When even contemplating the possibility that 'something else' might actually be something never seen before, not

something never seen: the potential of what is yet to be learned can begin to emerge as the massive unknown it is.

Misdefining anything is a shame, but incorrectly describing something that can result in stopping the acquisition of knowledge is reprehensible. Many 'scientists' will continue to subscribe to what is so obviously a falsehood simply because they always have. Those scientists are the dead weight of progress.

Just one such something else would be an indirect cause. Well actually all causes are indirect in the brain there are no direct anythings. Linear progression is great for a math problem but death to any evaluation of action or reaction and therefore the plaque to any examination of cause. If the universe was linear there would be no variations and therefore nothing worth seeing.

One important indirect cause would be speed. The short-term process runs a heck of a lot faster than the long-term process does. Memory is of an event it is not typically of every tiny part of the event until the event itself is a concept. Long term holds the concept of the event not its collection of parts (normally.) Here is a process that makes a cause that is based on all previous causes and effects; but is separate from them and looking at very small parts of the concept long term has retained. Running faster than long term more refined processes take effect. And since that short-term loops into itself in order to maintain a constant single existence continuity, the emerging self is the collection all short term pathways outputting to the same things. Speaking, moving, muscle movements. Feedback supports those connections. That speed difference allows an otherwise sane individual the ability to exercise that free will and make a decision that completely flies in the face of all that person ever knew and the current circumstances. It allows a decision to be a mistake. It also allows a decision to be right.

That same topic of right or wrong decisions applies to the original of that something else. It is the drunk falling over and making you drop your coffee. Your suit or dress is a disaster because some other person did not decide to say no to a drink. He made a mistake. You paid for it. But only because he paid for it.

And the solution itself: suffering; making you feel alone in disbelief. Your future is unclear and unfocused and alone, your present and past have been wrong because something happened that you see as a mistake and refuse to contemplate or even attempt to understand. You are the beneficiary of it. But only because He paid for it.

So yes, Free Will can be explained in the model of science many of us rely on. All we must do is realize the excuse employed violates that model of science. It claims defeat because it is too lazy to ask the next obvious question. Where did that come from? It wants the universe to be in straight lines. It wants the universe to only be that which it has already been. It wants to profess to want to know more but is required by its very nature to fight to remain what it had always been.

Free Will is not metaphysical as Schwartz postulated: "The free will issue is especially thorny because it represents a collision between two opposing, yet equally valid, perspectives. From a purely metaphysical perspective, if we don't have free will, why are we here? What is the point of life if we cannot choose our own paths?" Neither issue is valid. Neither one could collide with the other if understood. Why we are here cannot be made up from a free will. Many people spend their lives using it and refusing to admit it for fear it might lead to something greater. Life can only have a point if it first has a meaning. The meaning of life is 'to know'. The point is to learn. If the meaning of life was not 'to know' no one would ever know, therefore the question would not even be utterable. Asking the fundamental questions of why,

point and meaning: can only occur from a self-determined entity that is not solely dependent upon its past to form its present. Humans are better equipped than that. Humans can oppose the truth. Humans can create fiction. Humans can take all that entered before and merge that experience in ways no other human has previously accomplish and invent and create and expand.

That self-awareness and ability to decide independent of past knowledge is Free Will.

Free will does not violate any model of science.

Now that a truly thinking person, one who digests and evaluates has determined that there should be no inherent objection to Free Will the topic demands clarification. Just because the explanation of the objection is no longer valid does not mean that the process of proving something to have a zero value in any way proves something else to have a positive value. That would be the cause.

Free Will does itself have a cause. That cause is one aspect of the most interesting logic collection in existence. The brain. The topic of Free Will is unique to each person with it. One can define the causes of it without having to go further back in the past or prior events for more fundamental causes. Science should learn and understand what it does not know, not declare it cannot be known. That is the single known trait science and religion have in common.

Since early man, the wisdom of the day has concluded that things that are much greater than the observer's knowledge are not now, nor will they ever able to be explained. Religion is willing to accept, that on faith that which is not known will be; while science clings to what it knows because if it learned it all; it would have to be the same.