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Compare and Contrast Compatibilism and incompatibilism about free will

# Introduction

Compatibilism is a belief that infers, determinism and free will are compatible with each other. It asserts the possibility of belief in both free will and determinism, without adhering to logical inconsistency. On the other hand, incompatibilism is a view that a deterministic universe is exactly at odds with the idea that humans have free will. It asserts that there is a dichotomy between free will and determinism, taking into account that an individual should choose one or the other. Incompatibilism is a view that is persuaded in three ways, libertarians negate the idea that universe is deterministic. Hard determinist negates the idea of free will and pessimistic incompatibilists deny that the universe is determined. *Compatibilism and Incompatibilism of free will is a tie that negates each other adhering to dichotomy of determinism.*

**Discussion**

The question of human existence is long debated. Humans have been discussing the essence of relationship between God and this world since Adam and Eve. There are several notions, associated with the idea, either “the divine action of Adam and Eve” was already determined or it was actually the product of certain drives? Questions addressing the idea of compatibility and incompatibility of determinism are the catchline of philosophy and theology, posing a continuous conflict. It is important to note that incompatibilism affirms three types of determinism, casual determinism highlight that everything in this world is caused by the impact of certain prior conditions, taking into account that it is impossible for anything else to happen. This type of determinism is usually illustrated by the thought experiment. Logical determinism infers the notion that all existing provisions in this world either past, present or future are either true or false. Logical determinism highlights the stance of "choices", taking into account the framework in which it is assumed that every future task is already determined. (Ekstrom, et, al. 2018). The same stance of theological determinism asserts that future is already determined, either by the creator deity that decree. In this case, the absence of content is questioned, how an action can be free if there is a being who has determined everything in advance.

On the other hand, compatibilism is a belief, stressing either freedom can be present in a situation or absent in a situation asserting that there is no connection with metaphysics. The notion of compatibilism is elaborated by many philosophers and theologians such as Alex Rosenberg who formulated an extrapolation of physical determinism as extracted by the behaviors. Compatibilism is treated as an interaction between unconscious and conscious brain activity. It is asserted that compatibilists think that freewill is a psychological state. It is asserted that freewill is entirely unpredictable much like instantaneous intentions of an entity that changes its decision with the passage of time and circumstances. The stance of unpredictability highlights “basic reasoning”, those well-defined things are “expectations”. (Willoughby, et, al. pp. 136-153). The model of physical mind is more like an illustration of the idea that compatibilist think that deterministic relationship is undiscoverable in the physical world. In accordance with various philosophers such as David Hume, free will is an illusion, while Rudolf Steiner considered it as a moral imagination. (Willoughby, et, al. pp. 136-153).

Compatibilism and incompatibilism are the two sides of the coin of determinism, taking into account that incompatibilities assert the existence of free will, taking into account the truth of determinism. It is highlighted that world is "deterministic", there is no agent in this world that has freewill. If one believes that man should have the right of free will, adhering to the moral responsibility of one’s action, then essence of incompatibility of free will and determinism assert the incompatibility of causal determinism and moral responsibility. (Byrd, et, al. 2019, pp. 1-18). Some of the incompatibilists are of view that determinism is the actual truth of this world, there is no agent that has power of decision. Such believers are named as hard determinists. While, other incompatibilists infers that world is not deterministic and there are few agents that have the right to decide, referred to as, "libertarians". Both, compatibilist and incompatibilists claims about possibility.

According to compatibilists, it is possible that a device can be both free and bound, on the other hand, incompatibilist believe that such states of existence is impossible. It is significant to note that incompatibilist asserts that first variety is rotates around the notion of having a free will, taking it as a matter of having an option, affirming that having a choice means having a genuine option of what one does. (Willoughby, et, al. pp. 136-153). The second argument laments the truth of determinism, questioning that we don’t cause our actions. The truth of determinism means that human doesn't recognize their action in a significant way, in other words, it evaluates the lack of ability of self-determinism. On the other hand, compatibilism is built on the baseline of "freedom required for moral responsibility". It shows that moral responsibility is compatible with the validity of determinism, asserting that free will is one of the basic requirements for moral responsibility. (Byrd, et, al. 2019, pp. 1-18).

**Conclusion**

It can be inferred that both compatibility and incompatibility of free will agree at some of the aspects of human conditions such outcomes of human actions, striking at the point of free will. Compatibilist assert that human is determined by some prior events while incompatibilist disagree and they think that free will is the capability to make certain choices regardless of certain influencing factors such as hereditary, desires and environments.
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