

Essay

Time & Free Will: Concepts & Considerations

Massimo Cocchi* & Liuva Capezzani

Paolo Sotgiu Institute for Research in Quantitative & Quantum Psychiatry & Cardiology
LUdeS Foundation Higher Education Institution, Malta

Abstract

Time is what might be called a perception, just a quantum, which is measured only on the recall of the already experienced emotions and that makes divine existence credible. With the creation, God has designed the future time, he gave dimension to it and only God is awareness keeper. This consideration opens a critical prerequisite to the understanding of the concept of free will.

Keywords: God, time, free will, predestination, choice.

Time is the great enigma of the men. It is the perception of the past that makes changing feelings, emotions, behaviors, that gives joy and pain. The change of man is a function of time that goes on in his perception. Time passes and the man changes in the memory of his past.

The man is at the mercy of time that governs every moment and it is not possible to know the next moment and the change, within it, that will be realized. In fact, the future, if one can live it, also as expected ('the present of the future' according to St. Augustine), is already past and the past is the only dimension of time that man has.

If the animal does not have the perception of the past (to show that it can recognize and store is one thing and to show that it can remember is another), then the perception of time is the real difference between man and animal. In that case, time may be the only basis of human free will, that is, the ability to make decisions as a function of the past (that can be remembered) that becomes experience.

The future, therefore, has no quantifiable earthly dimension and, without dimension, there is no material existence. The projection into the future coincides with illusion - something we do not know but that one builds with no certainty or by approximation.

Time is what might be called a perception, just a quantum, which is measured only on the recall of the already experienced emotions and that makes divine existence credible. With the creation, God has designed the future time, he gave dimension to it and only God is awareness keeper. Only if it was possible for humans to give dimension to the future, then one could discuss the deity.

*Correspondence: Prof. Massimo Cocchi, Paolo Sotgiu Institute for Research in Quantitative & Quantum Psychiatry & Cardiology
LUdeS Foundation Higher Education Institution, Malta. E-mail: massimo.cocchi@unibo.it

If man acts based on the memory of time (*e.g.*, in the case of suicide), then we can assume that there is free will. If suicide is an event in the dimension of the future, then there is no free will but predestination.

This brief consideration opens a critical prerequisite to the critical understanding of the concept of free will, considering the origin of the concept, the many interpretations that have been given and the scientific knowledge of the human body, in particular, of the brain.

The best example and expression of the concept of free will certainly refers to "suicide." In fact, suicide is the negation of life through the apparent freedom of thought and ideational capacity. The subject of suicide put into question the divine will of leaving to man the freedom to express his fate, whatever that is.

In social terms, the theme of suicide is faced with ambiguity. For example, suicide attempt in prison is punished, not because it denies life, but because it represents an element of institutional disruption (in Italian penitentiary rules). This modality of intervention affirms the concept of punishment but ignore to consider the will of those who attempt suicide - the most dramatic act that man can commit, the negation of life.

While the Church has revised its criteria of judgment with respect to suicide, restoring obsequies and burial in consecrated ground, revisiting, in this way, the concept of free will and reinterpreting it as a man's decision-making ability in a very bad situation. Therefore, a Church that no longer punishes demonstrates the capacity for self-criticism.

From the Bible to modern philosophy, theologian or scientist has raised the question of interpretation of the "concept" of free will. Two words, good and evil, follow man from creation and enable the authorities to administer a punishment.

The Bible says that in free will God grants the man's ennoblement, that is, the faculty to decide. The tolerance to the expression of evil, inherent in the concept of free will, the disobedience to the divine command, are powerful restatements of the concept of free will because God recognizes that man may abuse free will, that is, his ability to act with evil.

The great thinkers of the Christian Church have long debated on the concept of free will. They debated on the capacity to be able to choose between good and evil and on the natural inclination to be good and that the will is expressed above intellect. They discussed on the posting of free will by rationality, acknowledging that it can be expressed both, in one direction and in the opposite one. They discussed the problem that free will it is based on human morality and that only God determines human destiny.

Lutheranism provides a different approach of the Bible than the Catholic Church, and the reform leads to the negation of the concept of free will and introduces that of predestination. It gets to the modern thought, where the development of biology leads to knowledge that the human brain

is the site of chemical and physical reactions, that there is a neuro chemical and neuro electric transmission and that neurons communicate with each other.

Practically, the foundations are laid for a reinterpretation of the concept of free will, through Kant and Schopenhauer's writings in an open discussion between determinism and indeterminism of moral actions and will, practically on the freedom of the human will. Rivers of words, opposing concepts, complex definitions, are spent, in time, on the concept of free will.

Free will and consciousness intersect as the will and mind, two words used to express the impalpable conceptualism that seems to spring from molecular complexity, free will as a phenomenological synthesis of these two indefinite human expressions. As if they were not based in dedicated molecular expressions capable of generating them and change them.

For better or for worse, as final destination of the concept of free will, the condition of human supremacy in the relationship with others and with the animals, as the divine supremacy over all matter and the living phenomenology, seems to recognize itself. Free will does not remain an independent capacity and possibility of choice of the individual, but, as the case, becomes even element of guilt, then of allocation of the penalty, recognizing in this way, as the synthesis of free will and of consciousness is completely detached from molecularity.

However, how do we explain that terrible cancellation process of free will and consciousness that psychiatry was carrying out with lobotomy and, today, in some cases with drug therapy? Is it not true that a psychiatric therapy, pharmacologically wrong, raises the risk of suicide? Are we not facing with very serious molecular lesions if, this terrible practice, has deprived the individual of free will? Is it not in that wonderful biochemical and molecular complex that creation has given to the man, the brain, and within its molecular features that we should look for the right definition of free will and consciousness? Why must we deny that there are molecular conditions, such as lobotomy, that can induce states of consciousness out of control?

We do not deny God, recognizing that something wanted by Him, in the imperfection that follows the original sin, can express uncontrolled conditions towards self and others, and not always, that there is guilt.