Proceedings of the International Conference on Global Politics and Socio-Humanities
DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/46/20230886

Evolutionary Psychology Perspective on Free Will

Shuying Yu[1,a,*]

[1]*Nanjing Foreign Language School Xianlin Campus, Nanjing, 210023, China*
a. 2095722621@qq.com
**corresponding author*

Abstract: This essay explores the mechanism behind choice-making and the concept of free will from an evolutionary psychology perspective. The methods consist of a literature review of evolutionary psychology theories related to decision-making and an analysis of how these theories inform the dominant philosophical positions on free will from the lens of determinism, indeterminism, and compatibilism. The literature review finds that evolutionary psychology explains decision-making as the result of evolved cognitive mechanisms that weigh costs and benefits. The analysis suggests that these mechanisms support a compatibilist view that free will can exist within a deterministic universe. Though human actions have antecedent causes, evolutionary psychology indicates humans have adapted limited, pragmatic free will to make choices that aid survival and reproduction. The cognitive mechanisms behind choice-making evolved because they conferred fitness advantages, not because they allowed uncaused choices. In conclusion, evolutionary psychology offers a naturalistic understanding of the origins and limitations of free will.

Keywords: Evolutionary Psychology, Free Will, Determinism, Indeterminism, Compatibilism

1. Introduction

Throughout life, human beings make countless choices each day. To understand the mechanisms behind decision-making, philosophers developed the concept of free will-the idea that people can make decisions freely, without interference from external factors or constraints [1]. Free will suggests humans have autonomy over their actions rather than being deterministically bound by past events. This concept has sparked philosophical debates about the possibility of free will's existence. Three dominant theories have emerged: determinism, indeterminism, and compatibilism [2].

Determinism argues that all events, including human actions, are entirely predetermined by prior causes, allowing only one possible course of events. In contrast, indeterminism claims free will does exist, so humans can make uncaused choices, unhindered by past events. Finally, compatibilism contends that determinism and free will are compatible-human actions have antecedent causes yet retain a degree of freedom [3]. Currently, no consensus exists among philosophers regarding which theory is correct.

This essay will apply an evolutionary psychology perspective to evaluate the plausibility of free will within the context of these three dominant theories. Evolutionary psychology utilizes modern evolutionary principles to understand the evolved psychological adaptations underlying human behavior and cognition [4]. It proposes that much of the human mind evolved to solve recurrent

© 2024 The Authors. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/46/20230886

survival and reproductive challenges in ancestral environments. Therefore, analyzing the evolutionary roots of cognition can provide insight into complex philosophical issues like free will. Specifically, it will review evolutionary psychology theories concerning the cognitive mechanisms involved in decision-making. It will analyze how these evolved mechanisms interact with philosophical notions of determinism, indeterminism, and compatibilism regarding free will. Though evolutionary psychology and free will have rarely intersected in prior research, evolutionary principles may elucidate the origins and limitations of free will [5]. This essay aims to determine if and how free will could plausibly exist based on evolutionary psychology's naturalistic model of the human mind. To be concrete, the detailed objectives are to summarize evolutionary psychology explanations of decision-making mechanisms, analyze these mechanisms through the lens of determinism, indeterminism, and compatibilism, and draw conclusions about the existence and nature of free will from this evolutionary perspective. The significance is integrating two major concepts, i.e., evolution and free will, to gain fuller insight into this long-debated philosophical problem. In conclusion, this essay will assess whether evolutionary psychology offers a compelling naturalistic account of the possibility of free will.

2. Evolutionary Foundation of Decision-Making

Evolutionary psychology proposes that the human mind consists of specialized cognitive mechanisms that evolved to solve adaptive problems related to survival and reproduction [4]. These mechanisms generate rapid, efficient solutions to the recurrent challenges faced by our hunter-gatherer ancestors, such as securing food, avoiding predators, and selecting mates. According to evolutionary psychology, the capacity for decision-making evolved as one of these adaptive cognitive mechanisms [6]. Specifically, decision-making mechanisms evolved because they enabled ancestral humans to effectively weigh alternatives and select the optimal course of action in a given situation. Individuals with beneficial decision-making abilities, able to judiciously determine whether to fight or flee, forage or rest, share resources, or hoard them, would have out-survived and out-reproduced those with less effective decision mechanisms. Over countless generations, natural selection gradually refined and propagated ever more sophisticated cognitive machinery for judgment and choice [7].

Modern evolutionary psychology contends that, like vision and language acquisition, decision-making relies on a set of underlying mental algorithms tailored by evolution to handle the core challenges of the ancestral world. These algorithms operate based on if-then conditional logic, emotionally-charged cost/benefit calculations, and domain-specific inference procedures to swiftly guide adaptive choices and behaviours [8]. For instance, mechanisms for kin selection compel caring for relatives who share more genes, while mechanisms for reciprocal altruism drive cooperation with non-relatives to accrue future benefits [9]. Though adapted for ancestral environments, these innate decision mechanisms continue to shape modern human judgment and behaviour.

In summary, evolutionary psychology hypothesizes that the capacity for decision-making stems from cognitive mechanisms naturally selected to enhance survival and reproduction through shrewd situational analysis and choice. These evolved mechanisms generate quick, typically effective solutions to the decision problems recurrent in the ancestral world. While an imperfect fit for modern contexts, these mental algorithms for judgment and decision-making remain foundational to human cognition and behaviour.

3. Determinism

Determinism contends that all events, including human actions, are wholly predetermined by prior causes and circumstances [10]. From this view, free will is an illusion. People merely experience the

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/46/20230886

sense of making choices, when in fact, causal laws dictate that they can only act one way in a given situation. What implications does evolutionary psychology have for this theory?

First, the evolved decision mechanisms proposed by evolutionary psychology are inherently deterministic [8]. These cognitive programs operate on the basis of innately specified procedures tailored by natural selection to generate adaptive responses to recurring ancestral problems. Their deterministic logic compelled ancestral foragers to fight, flee, share, or hoard in optimal ways given the situation [11]. Modern minds inherit these same decision algorithms, which deterministically drive much judgment and behaviour. However, evolutionary psychology indicates that some indeterminacy may emerge from the complexity of evolved decision systems interacting with variable environments [6]. Though founded on deterministic genetic programs, decision mechanisms receive flexible sensory and contextual inputs that alter their outcomes probabilistically. Furthermore, mechanisms often conflict, and their interactions may produce indeterminate choices not programmed by evolution. Still, evolutionary psychology leans strongly toward overarching determinism rather than radical indeterminism. Finally, evolutionary psychology suggests that while deterministic, evolved decision systems confer pragmatic free will, the ability to deliberately act on reasons and perceived goals [5]. Natural selection shaped mechanisms for meaningful, self-directed choice from available options, even if ultimately deterministic according to compatibilism. Our ancestors needed to feel ownership over choices to survive, whether determined or not. In a word, evolutionary psychology indicates that deterministic decision systems can grant a functional, adaptive form of free will.

In conclusion, evolutionary psychology largely supports determinism but allows some room for modest indeterminism to emerge through systemic complexity. It also proposes that deterministic choice mechanisms can provide humans with a sense of rational, wilful agency. So, from an evolutionary perspective, determinism does not necessarily preclude a type of pragmatic free will.

4. Indeterminism

In contrast to determinism, indeterminism proposes that human actions are not wholly predetermined, allowing for free will to truly exist [12]. Some inherent randomness or quantum indeterminacy enables people to make uncaused conscious choices. How might evolutionary psychology address this view?

Consider this example: two ancestral foragers, brother and sister, must decide whether to share their last scrap of food or keep it for themselves. From an indeterminist view, they can make this choice freely, not bound by prior causes. However, evolutionary psychology suggests their decision stems from competing but deterministic kin altruism and self-preservation mechanisms shaped by natural selection [9]. The brother may feel inclined to share due to innate kin altruism biases, while the sister's self-preservation drive may favour keeping the food. Their choice results from these competing adapted programs, not pure indeterminism.

As another example, an ancestral hunter decides whether to hunt migrating herds on the open savannah or fish along the forest river on a given day. An indeterminist perspective would argue he can freely choose between them at the moment. Yet evolutionary psychology proposes his decision is deterministically guided by evolved mechanisms weighing factors like season, weather, prior outcomes, and individual skills [13]. The hunter does not make an uncaused, indeterminate choice but simply follows evolved decision rules.

Overall, evolutionary psychology views ostensible indeterminacy in decision-making as arising from the complexity of our evolved cognitive architecture, not any capacity for uncaused choice [4]. Theorists caution that true indeterminism enabling free choices independent of prior causes and conditions would undermine the adaptive design of human psychology. Some flexibility exists but within deterministically programmed parameters. In summary, while evolutionary psychology allows

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/46/20230886

for degrees of autonomy and self-direction, it suggests our choices always have antecedent causes rooted in evolutionarily scripted algorithms. Genuine indeterminism contradicts the adapted structure of the human mind. Any viable conception of free will must acknowledge ultimate causation.

5. Compatibilism

Unlike determinism and indeterminism, compatibilism argues that free will can exist even in a deterministic universe where choices have prior causes [14]. Evolutionary psychology lends plausible support to this reconciliatory view.

Imagine two ancestral hunter-gatherers-A young man and woman from different bands meeting for the first time. The man offers the woman a gift of food he has gathered, which evolves into a courtship. An indeterminist perspective would contend the couple freely chooses to court based on attraction. However, evolutionary psychology explains their actions as guided by deterministic mate selection mechanisms tuned by natural selection to identify optimal partners [15]. The man's giving demonstrates the ability to provide resources, while the woman evaluates his genetic fitness. Yet despite underlying deterministic factors, the couple likely feels they are freely deciding to court. Look into another example-an ancestral forager contemplates whether to share part of a large hunted animal with other members of her band or keep the meat entirely for herself and her family. A determinist view would be that selfish instincts predetermine her choice. But evolutionary psychology proposes various mechanisms come into play, including kin altruism favouring sharing with relatives and reciprocity urges to share with bandmates likely to return the favour [9]. Though shaped by these competing drives, her final choice may feel subjectively free. These examples demonstrate how individuals can experience free will and autonomous choice, yet ultimately be guided by evolved deterministic mechanisms. Evolutionary psychology suggests that while our actions have antecedent causes, we evolved a functional sense of freedom and agency. Ancestral foragers needed to feel ownership over choices to optimally guide survival behaviour, regardless of an underlying determinism. In essence, as compatibilism argues, free will arises from the complexity and flexibility of our evolved decision systems.

Theoretically, evolutionary psychology contends that deterministic cognitive programs can grant a type of compatibilist free will [5]. Decision mechanisms generate rapid, emotionally-infused cost/benefit analyses of choices and their potential consequences. While deterministic, this process provides a feeling of intentional, reasoned agency. Furthermore, mechanisms evolved to be domain-general, integrating various sensory and contextual inputs to allow flexible, adaptive choices. And competing mechanisms add some indeterminacy to decision-making. In these ways, our evolved architecture yields a functional capacity for “free will” as compatibilism understands it. To sum up, evolutionary psychology supports a compatibilist perspective in which measurable degrees of free will emerge from the complexity of deterministic evolved decision systems. Though ultimately caused, our choices involve conscious deliberation, flexibility, and a sense of ownership. Evolutionary psychology provides a framework for how free will could naturally arise through selection for functional, adaptive decision mechanisms.

6. Criticisms and Limitations

While evolutionary psychology offers interesting views on free will, some criticisms and limits deserve thought. First, evolutionary psychology's idea that the mind has genetically programmed parts remains scientifically unproven [16]. Studies of the brain show it can change a lot, raising questions about rigid mental algorithms. A person's environment likely interacts with their genes as they grow in complex ways to build decision-making ability. So, the idea that decision-making comes from pre-set genetic parts requires more proof. Also, evolutionary psychology may underestimate culture's role

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/46/20230886

in decision-making too much [17]. Through social learning, people gain cultural knowledge and values that shape choices in ways not just set by genes. A culture valuing individualism versus community focus surely impacts choices. Evolutionary psychology needs to better include how cultural learning works with evolved thinking. For example, people in individualist cultures likely make more choices based on personal goals versus duty to the group. Evolutionary psychology has to explain how learned culture and evolved cognition work together.

Additionally, some argue evolutionary psychology does not fully address the special human abilities for abstract thinking, mental simulation, and self-reflection that influence decision-making [18]. Humans have advanced capacities that allow more conscious deliberation about the future and planning that animals lack. Evolutionary psychology's focus on primal drives may fail to capture the unique complexity of human cognition relevant to free will. For example, humans can mentally simulate different scenarios and consider potential outcomes before deciding. Simple innate drives do not fully explain this foresight. Also, while compatibilism is appealing, critics say evolutionary psychology lacks the concepts to convincingly explain how real subjective free will could emerge from the brain's deterministic mechanisms [19]. Scholars debate whether this "illusion" of agency should really be called free will, or is just wordplay to make us feel better that determinism is still true. More theoretical work is needed on whether feeling free is enough, or if we must actually be free. Besides, some argue evolutionary psychology relies heavily on speculative "just-so stories" about how mechanisms evolved rather than direct proof [20]. While creative, its tales about ancestral selection pressures require more rigorous testing to avoid circularity or confirmation bias. For instance, how can we really know kin altruism evolved for certain reasons long ago without evidence? Overall, evolutionary psychology needs more solid empirical evidence for its evolutionary narratives. Testing historical hypotheses with observations today is difficult, but needs to be strengthened.

Finally, evolutionary psychology largely overlooks the possibility that natural selection may not have optimized decision mechanisms fully [15]. Ancestral humans faced rapid environmental changes and population bottlenecks that could have hindered ideal genetic adaptations. Less optimal traits can persist if they don't severely reduce survival. This evolutionary "shortsightedness" challenges assumptions that evolved cognition is ideal. For example, ancient humans likely experienced feast and famine cycles. Mechanisms evolved to binge eat in times of plenty would be less adapted to modern environments with constant abundant food. Similarly, ancient mate choices centered on strength and fertility may mislead modern judgments. Furthermore, harsh bottlenecks where populations drastically declined could have eliminated genetic diversity before optimal adaptations emerged. The smaller gene pool that rebounded may have locked in somewhat maladaptive decision traits. So, while useful, evolved mechanisms may contain “bugs” not exposed until modern contexts. In a nutshell, evolutionary psychology should address that natural selection can be imperfect and short-term focused, leading to decision tools that are “good enough” for ancestral life but not ideal for all situations.

Overall, while evolutionary psychology provides intriguing angles on free will, critics highlight uncertainties over its core postulates, the tendency toward speculative storytelling, and the limited conceptualization of human cognitive sophistication. Further theoretical refinement and empirical research are needed to fully evaluate its implications for the age-old question of free will and determinism. A multidisciplinary approach may yield the most comprehensive understanding.

7. Conclusion

This essay has explored the concept of free will and its philosophical debates from an evolutionary psychology perspective. The literature review summarized key evolutionary theories proposing that the human mind evolved specialized cognitive mechanisms for decision-making which conferred adaptive advantages to our ancestors. Analysis of these mechanisms suggested they lend plausibility

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/46/20230886

to a compatibilist view of free will, though some indeterminism may also emerge. To be specific, evolutionary psychology hypothesizes the capacity for judgment and decision-making stems from innate algorithms shaped by natural selection to efficiently analyse situations and choose optimal actions based on ancestral survival and reproductive challenges. While largely deterministic, these mechanisms involve flexible cost/benefit calculations and domain-general competencies that introduce some indeterminacy and provide a feeling of intentional agency. This supports a compatibilist notion that free will can arise from deterministic systems.

However, it is noteworthy that evolutionary psychology requires more empirical evidence for its claims about evolved cognitive architecture. It also needs to better incorporate the influences of human culture, abstract thinking capacities, and evolutionary short-sightedness that may undermine optimized adaptations. Despite these limitations, evolutionary psychology offers a compelling naturalistic framework for grounding the perplexing philosophical debates around free will in scientifically grounded theories of evolved human psychology. It integrates determinism and agency into an account of how subjective free will could plausibly arise through the selection of functional decision-making mechanisms tailored to ancestral environments yet flexible and generalizable enough to enable autonomy and choice. In the future, evolutionary psychology would benefit from more interdisciplinary collaboration with neuroscience, anthropology, philosophy, and other fields to test and refine its models. This may yield a fuller biological understanding of human volition and behaviour. Scholars could also further explore cross-cultural differences in notions of free will rooted in alternate evolutionary experiences. Overall, evolutionary psychology opens fascinating possibilities for demystifying free will and framing it as an adaptive biological trait rather than a metaphysical mystery. It dynamically engages the long-running debate on whether determinism negates human freedom. This evolutionary perspective on decision-making and agency deserves deeper analysis both empirically and conceptually to decipher the natural origins and functions of free will.

References

[1] *Kane, R. (2018). Responsibility, luck and chance: Reflections on free will and indeterminism. In Agency and Responsibility (pp. 158-180). Routledge.*

[2] *Nadelhoffer, T., Murray, S., & Murry, E. (2021). Intuitions about free will and the failure to comprehend determinism. Erkenntnis, 1-22. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10670-021-00465-y.*

[3] *Gill, M. J., & Cerce, S. C. (2017). He never willed to have the will he has: Historicist narratives, "civilized" blame, and the need to distinguish two notions of free will. Journal of personality and social psychology, 112(3), 361-382. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1037/pspa0000073.*

[4] *Buss, D. M. (2020). Evolutionary psychology is a scientific revolution. Evolutionary Behavioural Sciences, 14(4), 316-323. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1037/ebs0000210.*

[5] *Clark, C. J., Winegard, B. M., & Baumeister, R. F. (2019). Forget the folk: Moral responsibility preservation motives and other conditions for compatibilism. Frontiers in Psychology, 10, 215. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00215.*

[6] *Kenrick, D. T. (2017). Self-actualization, human nature, and global social problems: I. foundations. Society, 54, 520-523. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s12115-017-0181-2.*

[7] *Barkow, J. H., Cosmides, L., & Tooby, J. (Eds.). (1995). The adapted mind: Evolutionary psychology and the generation of culture. Oxford University Press.*

[8] *Buss, D. (2019). Evolutionary psychology: The new science of the mind. Routledge.*

[9] *Frank, R. H. (1988). Passions within reason: The strategic role of the emotions. WW Norton & Co.*

[10] *Angelini, F. J., & Efran, J. S. (2021). Motivational interviewing: Contributions from structure determinism. Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 52(4), 368-375. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1037/pro0000377.*

[11] *Sznycer, D., Cosmides, L., & Tooby, J. (2017). Adaptationism carves emotions at their functional joints. Psychological Inquiry, 28(1), 56-62. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/1047840X.2017.1256132.*

[12] *Kane, R. (2016). On the role of indeterminism in libertarian free will. Philosophical Explorations, 19(1), 2-16. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/13869795.2016.1085594.*

[13] *Smith, E. A. (2017). Three styles in the evolutionary analysis of human behaviour. In Adaptation and human behaviour (pp. 27-46). Routledge.*
[14] *Fischer, J. M., & Todd, P. (Eds.). (2015). Freedom, fatalism, and foreknowledge. Oxford University Press.*
[15] *Confer, J. C., Easton, J. A., Fleischman, D. S., Goetz, C. D., Lewis, D. M., Perilloux, C., & Buss, D. M. (2010). Evolutionary psychology: Controversies, questions, prospects, and limitations. American Psychologist, 65(2), 110-126. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018413.*
[16] *Buller, D. J. (2006). Adapting minds: Evolutionary psychology and the persistent quest for human nature. MIT press.*
[17] *Heyes, C. (2012). New thinking: the evolution of human cognition. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 367(1599), 2091-2096. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2012.0111.*
[18] *Malafouris, L. (2013). How things shape the mind. MIT press.*
[19] *Baumeister, R. F. (2008). Free will in scientific psychology. Perspectives on psychological science, 3(1), 14-19. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6916.2008.00057.x.*
[20] *Baumeister, R. F., & Monroe, A. E. (2014). Recent research on free will: Conceptualizations, beliefs, and processes. Advances in experimental social psychology, 50, 1-52. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-800284-1.00001-1.*