

Review of: "Free Will Stands When Properly Explained and Correctly Defined and Neuroscience Shows This to Be the Case"

W. Walker Trimble

Potential competing interests: The author(s) declared that no potential competing interests exist.

The author has dedicated a great deal of work and thought to this paper and I believe she should pursue it.

There are three major suggestions which, if followed, should lead to the paper's publication.

1. Shorten and summarize the introduction. You mention many classical sources which are not given enough context to a neophyte but are all familiar to a cognoscento. You might merely refer to a survey treatment instead.
2. You don't explicitly deal with the fundamental problem of Libet style experiments: that choices are determined. Determinism is the dominant understanding of neuroscience and scientific causality in general.
3. You presume that a choice which is not part of an appetite is not rational. This introduces a judge into the equation which externally to the chooser decides what's rational. A chooser can freely choose what's exactly in line with their urges. Did Anna Karenina rationally choose to jump in front of the train? The whole novel is about that and anyone could debate it.

See the following from your paper:

And since a brain process from RP to executing a veto will take approximately 200 msec., one can conclude that a veto does not have a readiness potential at all and is, therefore, freely chosen and executed. Additionally, Libet notes that: "There is no logical imperative in any mind-brain theory...that requires specific neural activity to precede and determine the nature of a conscious control function." (Libet: 1999, p. 52) which in effect veto is. In other words, the veto can be interpreted to be a representation of Kant's negative freedom and can be described as a manifestation of free will for it is something fundamentally disparate from an urge.

You still rely on the notion that conscious choice must intervene from outside natural processes. This is the crux of the problem. The history of neuroscience shows us that we increasingly find explanations for behaviour.

I believe in free will and so I support your project. But I think we can understand will while avoiding deterministic/non-deterministic questions; but that's my view. You need to discuss the problem of determinism and, if you believe it is important, show how a choice can be non-deterministic. I don't think the argument that 100ms is enough time is a good argument as rational pathways can be myelinated just as well as irrational ones – that's a mechanistic way explaining point 3 above.

You've done a great deal of work and I wish you all encouragement to continue.

I'm hesitating between a 2 and a 3. And do want you to continue.

