FREE WILL?

KEY TERMS:	free will choice	internal brain	external mind
NOTE-TAKING COLUMN: Comvideo. Include definitions and		ing the	CUE COLUMN : Complete this section <u>after</u> the video.
Why do we so easily understa	and the concept of ca	use and	What is the relationship between the internal and the external in regards to thoughts?
What is introspect?			
			Do we have free will?
Why could you not have free	will if you are just a bi	ain?	

DISCUSSION & REVIEW QUESTIONS:

- In making a point about thoughts being external or internal, Mr. Pastore asks, "...do you think all your thoughts have external causes beyond your control, or do you think that you control some, if not most, of your thoughts?" How would you answer his question? Explain. What are some examples of thoughts you might have that are externally caused and therefore beyond your control?
- Mr. Pastore points out that, "...if you are just a brain, you cannot have free will. You would
 just be a physical machine -- a very complex but programmed computer." Do you believe
 that all or most of your thoughts are the result of your chemistry, biology, physiology, etc...?
 Why or why not? What is the difference between a brain and a mind, if there is one?
- When explaining the process of thought in the scenario that you are something more than a brain, Mr. Pastore states, "You wouldn't be caused to think about any of these things. You would choose to think about these things, and you could stop anytime you wanted to." Why is the point that 'you could stop anytime you wanted to' so important in making the distinction between thoughts operating exclusively in a brain versus operating in a mind? Why is the distinction between thought being 'caused' and thought being a 'choice' so important in answering the question of whether a person has free will or not?
- Mr. Pastore shares with us that, "...what we have here, therefore, are two different types of things: an immaterial mind and the material brain. You are the thing that has the brain you are not your brain... Surgeons can have access to my brain, but only I have access to my mind..." Do you agree with Mr. Pastore's clear distinction between the brain and the mind? Why or why not? Do you think that the mind could be located in the brain? If yes, why? If no, where is it located? What connection do you think there is between the brain and the mind, if any? Mr. Pastore presumes that your 'self' is linked to your mind, not your brain. Do you agree? Why or why not? What is a 'self?' Does a 'self' have free will?
- Mr. Pastore frames his answer to the question of free will by stating, "...when you... choose to think about all of this... that's your choice it's evidence of your free will." Do you agree that having choice in thought is definitive evidence of free will? Why or why not? Do you believe that thoughts originate in a mind, independent of the brain, that thoughts originate exclusively in a brain, or in both? Explain.

EXTEND THE LEARNING:

CASE STUDY: Susan Smith

INSTRUCTIONS: Read the article "Susan Smith: 20 years later, drowning of 2 children is still a shocker," then answer the questions that follow.

- Why did Susan Smith murder her children? Do you think that she suffered from insanity? Do you think that people who suffer from mental illness have free will?
 Why or why not? If you were the defense attorney for Susan Smith, what would the points in your argument that her insanity prevented her from being capable of making choices be?
- Did Susan Smith have free will to do what she did? The prosecutor described her as selfish- did she have a choice to be selfish? Explain.
- The philosopher Nietzsche held the position that basically anything subject to the laws of nature, such as human bodies being hungry, did not have free will-however anything supernatural, and thus not subject to the laws of nature, such as a person's mind, did have free will. For example, if you were caught out in a snowstorm without warm clothes or shelter, you did not have a choice to be cold or uncomfortable, but you would have the choice to blame others for your predicament or not. Thus, Nietzsche believed that people have sort of 'limited free will.' Do you agree with the concept of 'limited free will,' or do you think that people have either 100% free will or zero free will?



d. Relativity

1.	Which of the following is NOT a cause of our thoughts?
	a. Internal cause b. Conscious choices
	c. Extrapolation choice d. External cause
2. facto	If all you are is a brain, your thought processes are solely determined by external ors.
	a. True b. False
	D. Faise
3. of th	One can learn the physical structure of a brain, but one still wouldn't know the workings
oi ti	
	a. Thorax b. Mind
	c. Body
	d. Cortex
4.	Materialists believe:
	a. Our society is buying too many cheap consumer goods.
	b. Only matter exists and free will is an illusion.c. People need to be content with what they have.
	d. Only supernatural phenomena are real.
	f free will exists, then the argument for is strengthened.
5. I	The will exists, then the digument for is strengthened.
5. I	a. Atheism b. Hegelism

DO WE HAVE FREE WILL?

1.	Which of the following is NOT a cause of our thoughts?			

a. Internal cause
b. Conscious choices
c. Extrapolation choice

d. External cause

2.	If all you are is a brain, your thought processes are solely determined by external
fac	tors.

a. True

b. False

3. One can learn the physical structure of a brain, but one still wouldn't know the workings of the:

a. Thorax

b. Mind

c. Body

d. Cortex

4. Materialists believe:

a. Our society is buying too many cheap consumer goods.

b. Only matter exists and free will is an illusion.

c. People need to be content with what they have.

d. Only supernatural phenomena are real.

5. If free will exists, then the argument for _____ is strengthened.

a. Atheism

b. Hegelism

c. God

d. Relativity

(Excerpted from the following article)

October 20, 2014 12:48 AM

Susan Smith: 20 years later, drowning of 2 children is still a shocker

By Harrison Cahill - hcahill@thestate.com

Investigators were so determined 20 years ago to get a confession from South Carolina's Susan Smith that they were willing to use anything, including deception, to get her to admit to drowning her two small children in an Upstate lake.

Then-SLED chief Robert Stewart said this month that investigators created a copy of a false newspaper article they were prepared to show Smith about a woman who had killed a family member. The fictional woman served her time in prison, got out, married a rich businessman and went on to lead a happy life. The plan: let Smith read the article and then speak with the woman. If the shame of killing her children didn't persuade Smith to confess, agents reasoned, perhaps hope would – hope that her life could go on beyond prison.

Not only was the article false, the woman was an undercover State Law Enforcement Division agent. Fortunately, Stewart said, Smith did confess, and investigators never had to use the scheme.

Stewart described the plan, which he has never discussed publicly, as the 20th anniversary of the case approaches. Others looking back on the Oct. 25 anniversary recall the media convergence on the small city of Union. They remember the stresses – and scrutiny – of the sudden national attention and the decisions they had to make to get through it all.

Stewart knew that if the case hinged on using deception, it would be just another tool that law enforcement had in its arsenal of coaxing confessions from alleged murderers. SLED and the Union County Sheriff's Office already were receiving help from seasoned behavioral scientists and a veteran interviewer and polygraph analyst from the FBI.

"Bear in mind, there was a U.S. Supreme Court decision that says you don't have to tell correct facts to get to the truth in interviews," Stewart said. "When you get a case like this, especially when children's lives are at stake and you don't know if they are alive or not, you're trying everything to get to the bottom of it."

The nation was riveted when Smith, now 43, pleaded in front of a national television audience to help her find her sons, saying a black man had carjacked her 1990 Mazda Protege with Michael and Alex inside.

Stewart said those with SLED doubted Smith's story early in the investigation.

"There was never any another suspect," Stewart said. "Susan Smith was a conniving, manipulative person."

Smith said she was stopped at a red light at an intersection behind the Monarch Mill Textile Plant, which is close to Union's Main Street, when a black male forced her out of the car at gunpoint and drove off with her two small sons in the back.

"We were able to show, at one point, that her story could not have happened at that intersection because she said nobody was there," Stewart said. "In order for the light to be red, a car would have had to activate the pressure pad on the intersecting street to make her light red."

The revelation about the red light pointed investigators to Smith. After nine long days of intense interviews and polygraph tests, they had their confession.

Stewart said he remembered the heartbreaking gasp that came from the crowd as then-Union County Sheriff Howard Wells made the announcement outside the courthouse that Smith was charged with murder, after she confessed to strapping her small children into their car seats and pushing the car into John D. Long Lake.

Department of Natural Resources divers returned to the lake where searches in the early days of the investigation yielded no evidence of the young boys or a car. Stewart said divers adjusted where they searched the murky waters by 10 feet further, roughly 120 feet from the shore line, and found the bodies of Michael and Alex submerged in 18 feet of water inside the car.

Prosecuting the trial

As Delk handled the media frenzy on the outside of the courthouse, prosecutor Tommy Pope and assistant prosecutor Keith Giese prepared for one of the biggest cases of their careers inside.

Pope, now a S.C. House representative, was serving as the 16th Circuit solicitor. He said he remembers first hearing Smith's pleads for her children on television while he was trying a case involving a preacher in York County who had embezzled money from a day care.

"It just didn't fit right," said Pope, who had been a SLED agent. "In a carjacking, they normally just take your car, number one; your money, number two; and maybe the woman for sexual purposes, number three. But the kids is off the scale."

Pope said as Smith asked the community for help in locating 14-month-old Alex and 3-year-old Michael, investigators began to find inconsistencies in her story.

Smith's motive for killing her two children came on the heels of a letter she received from Tom Findley, the son of the owner of the Conso Products company where Smith worked as a secretary, breaking off the affair the two were engaged in while Smith was separated from her husband, David.

"He writes her a Dear Jane letter saying you're a nice girl, but I really don't want kids," Pope said. "Rather than tell her the truth, he kind of tied it to the kids. I think that what happened in her mind is she thought with the kids gone, then there is a chance for me with the boss' son."

Pope and Giese, who had become friends in Lexington County while assistant prosecutors there, prepared for nine months to pursue the death penalty against Smith. But her defense attorneys, David Bruck and Judy Clarke, who met while working in the 5th Circuit solicitor's office in Columbia and would go on to careers on the national stage, were skilled. Bruck and Clarke argued that Smith had suffered years of sexual abuse committed by her stepfather, leading to her insanity.

"When they made that argument at trial, I never bought it," said Giese, who now practices in Columbia with his brother, former 5th Circuit solicitor Barney Giese. "Smith's overriding characteristic was she was a selfish person."

In South Carolina, a death penalty case must be tried in two parts to get a complete sentencing. The first determines guilt or innocence, and the second determines the appropriate sentencing by a jury.

"There were days, literally, where I held the key to my own jail," Pope said. "I could not seek the death penalty and make everything simpler, but I knew that wasn't appropriate for this."

Pope said it was Smith's selfish actions, of "sacrificing the kids at the altar of what's best for Susan," as one of the two reasons he decided to pursue the death penalty. The other would come after he saw the car pulled from the bottom of John D. Long Lake.

"Not for a voyeuristic sense, but I needed to see what had happened to those boys to remind me why I do what I do," Pope said. "I saw those boys pulled out of that lake, and that helped me feel better when I was tired and weak during the case."

After the jury quickly found Smith guilty of the killings, Pope and Giese showed jurors an emotional video re-creation of how long it took for the car to fill with water – nearly six minutes – as it floated farther into the lake. But Giese said the hardest part of the trial for him would be when the father of the two slain children testified.

"Looking back on it now after 20 years, it was one of the most gut-wrenching, moving experiences I have ever felt in a courtroom," Giese said. "Tommy and I had done plenty of other murder cases together, so it wasn't like we hadn't seen tragedy in a courtroom. But I was fighting back tears."

Still, after the difficult testimony from David Smith and the eerily soundless video of the car's descent into the lake's murky water, the jury decided to settle for life in prison.

"There is nothing that we would have done differently in my opinion that would have changed the jury's verdict," Giese said. "When you have a small, tight-knit town like that, it would be hard to get that verdict."

Pope said he remembers that all of his steps "reverberated in an echo chamber" and said he considers the case a loss because he had sought the death penalty.

He said the case will never truly leave him.

"I have accepted that when they write my obituary, 'Susan Smith's prosecutor' will be in it," Pope said.