In “Freedom and Necessity”, A. J. Ayer talks about freedom, free will and necessity of having a free will. In his paper, Ayer took two positions i.e. regarding the dilemma of determinism and favoring a compatibilist approach. In his argument, Ayer specifically emphasized on the concept of ‘cause’ and being ‘constrained’ in an attempt to practice free will. Ayer is of the opinion that the problem of free will has been the composite result of assumptions i.e. men with free will are morally responsible for their actions, and that the human attitude and behavior is the result of certain causal laws.

In order to overcome the determinism dilemma, Ayer presented a comprehensive compatibilist solution. According to this approach, freedom is only possible within a deterministic scenario or context. This means that no human beings act freely as their actions are governed or caused by certain causal laws. They cannot practice a free will. If they approach to be acting freely, their actions are probably occurring by chance which again means that a certain causal law is acting behind to promote those actions, behaviors and attitude. Therefore, it can be stated that human beings, in a practical world, do not act freely.

However, I personally disagree to this notion. I believe that it is not only the causal laws or the chance by which our actions and behaviors occur. Instead, another force that triggers our actions and choice is our inner conscience and our self-determination. There can be certain causal actions that may not be satisfying our conscience and moral philosophy. Therefore we may tend to act deviant from those causes. How would this phenomenon be justified then? I believe that our morality, ethicality and self-determination hold a significant power to govern, control and provoke our free will or actions.