



Hell on Earth: Scientists' "Discovery" Would Destroy Civilization

No, it's not a more devastating nuclear weapon. It's not "Skynet"-like artificial intelligence. It's not the development of nanobots or a new, gain-of-function-altered virus, either. In a way, though, it's far scarier:

Some scientists and scholars claim the existence of free will is a myth.

Were this true, the implications for society would be staggering — so much so, that nuclear, AI, or viral destruction might actually be preferable.

BroBible has the [story](#):



champpix/iStock/Getty Images Plus

Stanford neurobiologist Robert Sapolsky believes humans have no free will based on over four decades of studying humans and other primates.

"The world is really screwed up and made much, much more unfair by the fact that we reward people and punish people for things they have no control over," Sapolsky told the *Los Angeles Times*. "We've got no free will. Stop attributing stuff to us that isn't here."

He explains why he came to this conclusion in a new book, *Determined: A Science of Life Without Free Will*.

Sapolsky claims neurochemical influences that occurred milliseconds ago to centuries in the past are to blame for everything that we do.

Basically, according to Corinne Purtill of the *Times*, "If it's impossible for any single neuron or any single brain to act without influence from factors beyond its control, Sapolsky argues, there can be no logical room for free will."

(As far as a "single neurons" go, cannot the whole be greater than the sum of its parts? Even more to the point, free will can be a function of the *mind*, which is different from the brain.)

Sapolsky "gives an example of a student who 'decides' to grab a pen — except it's not really a decision at all," [relates](#) the *Daily Caller's* Gage Klipper. "What the student experiences as a decision to grab the pen is preceded by a jumble of competing impulses beyond his ... conscious control. Maybe their pique is heightened because they skipped lunch; maybe they're subconsciously triggered by the professor's resemblance to an irritating relative" (relevant tweet below).

"Stanford scientist, after decades of study, concludes: We don't have free will"

Article: <https://t.co/101jay9Pwi>



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on November 1, 2023

— Brian Roemmele (@BrianRoemmele) [October 19, 2023](#)

Some other academics agree with Sapolsky, too, such as Gregg Caruso, a “philosopher” at SUNY Corning. He says that there’s no free will and that we’re not “morally responsible” for our actions (which is correlative). This is nothing new, either, as various “experts” have long made this claim.

Not surprisingly, people responding to the above tweet had some fun with Sapolsky’s “findings.” “Oh you don’t believe in free will eh?? What an interesting choice ;),” [quipped](#) “Scythian Bro.”

Robert Sperry wrote, “Let me fix the quote for you ‘Stanford scientist forced by mechanistic process to write words saying we don’t have free will.’”

Then, another tweeter [observed](#), “An interesting and appealing take especially to those who loathe personal responsibility and accountability.”

This gets at the grave threat Sapolsky’s notion poses. As Klipper points out, “Free will has long been the basis of Western morality.... If we assume Sapolsky’s rejection of free will, however, then the ‘man who shoots into a crowd has no more control over his fate than the victims who happen to be in the wrong place at the wrong time.’... Neurological conditioning gives criminals no choice to be anyone else but who they are.”

Moreover, “If humans are treated as if they are incapable of choosing to be good, then there is no reason for them to resist being bad,” Klipper later adds. Under this way of thinking, criminals don’t deserve punishment; heroes don’t deserve gratitude.

Despite all the above, however, Sapolsky (and others) claims that life in a world rejecting free will would be more “just” and “preferable.” Well, perhaps preferable to psychopaths, though even this is debateable. But then there is what’s for sure:

To claim that convincing everyone humans are mere organic robots — some pounds of chemicals and water — would make society more “just” is irrational.

Putting aside that justice couldn’t be logically reckoned better than injustice if there’s nothing transcending man deeming this so (and it’s thus just human preference), the point is this: If we’re just robots, objects — *things* — on what basis can one assert treating these robots “unjustly” is “wrong”? We always discard, or at least alter in accordance with our desires, things when they cease performing their intended function or become a burden (e.g., junking an old car). Why would it be different, ultimately, with organic robots? What could be wrong with forcibly reprogramming the robots’ software; that is, practicing social engineering? What could be “immoral” about altering their hardware; that is, pursuing genetic engineering?

Put differently, the Founders and many today assert(ed) that our rights come from God because, if so, they have ironclad credibility: No person can *rightly* strip them. So what will result if we come to believe humans do *not* come from God?

We don’t afford animals humans rights precisely because we believe they *don’t* have intellect and *free will*; that, as unromantic as it sounds, they are just (often very cute) organic robots. Why should we think that drawing the same conclusion about people — that they’re robots, bereft of free will — wouldn’t cause them to be treated as animals?

This is why, as *Psychology Today* [put it](#) last year, “Whether or not we have free will is arguably the most important philosophical and practical question of all time.” It’s also why we can be happy that



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on November 1, 2023

Sapolsky's claim is a minority view and has been refuted even by other scientists.

For example, calling him "utterly wrong" is Dartmouth neuroscientist Peter U. Tse. "'Neural activity is highly variable,' Tse said, 'with identical inputs often resulting in non-identical responses in individuals and populations,'" [related](#) the *Los Angeles Times* last month. "It's more accurate to think of those inputs as imposing parameters rather than determining specific outcomes. Even if the range of potential outcomes is limited, there's simply too much variability at play to think of our behavior as predetermined."

In reality, while the scientific packaging is relatively new, Sapolsky's error isn't. The Muslim [Jabarites](#) of the Middle Ages also preached that man had no free will. It's old heresy, different day.



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



[Subscribe](#)

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.