

**Leonard Clinton Williams III (To ChatGPT):** You said “not Kaku alone,” when I never claimed it differently. Here is what I said

“I have also seen, over the years, different physicists, like a man with the last name Kaku, speaking about quantum physics, with great enthusiasm.”

I knew Michio Kaku’s name phonetically, but I am not good at spelling people’s names sometimes and I didn’t feel like looking it up.

To continue, I read Dan Dennet’s book “freedom evolves.” This was in roughly 2010, as I wanted to find out how a real scientist explained the concept of human free will. Dan Dennet only briefly passed over the type of determinism that I see as existing, though he is a self-professed believer in determinism.

It was towards the beginning of the book, in which he said “and maybe there is a sense in which missing the golf shot was inevitable and unavoidable, but why should I care about that beyond some vague philosophical wondering,” to paraphrase.

I would have liked a whole book on to what extent missing the golf shot was inevitable, and how we get out of it not being inevitable using science.

Sam Harris had put out some content about how human free will is an illusion that, if carefully thought through, self-evidently does not exist. Then Noam Chomsky had said that human free will is self-evident, such that we are misguided to even question if it exists.

A big part of this is that I cannot conceive of anything other than a mechanistic, deterministic world, for the most part. It is, somehow, not a violation of my intuition, that human beings have free will. It doesn’t register with me as something that is inconsistent with how things work, but in examining how things work, I know of no other frame than mechanistic determinism.

It’s like people who do not believe in determinism, some of them, will posit an immaterial soul. In their books, an immaterial soul disproves determinism.

For me, they haven’t moved the needle one millimeter. How does an immaterial soul cause one to act? If one acts, the action has to be the result of something. It’s like if it were proven that we are operated by an

immaterial soul, I would still be applying deterministic logic in an attempt to understand how people work, and a world in which deterministic logic does not apply is a world that my brain is incapable of understanding at the basic level. Like I cannot conceive of what mechanism may otherwise exist.

With human brains, I do have an idea of how there may be some special, potentially emergent property, in which actions of neurons can be an internally generated cause. In other words, our brains, at some micro level, can be a cause that is self-generated, and not the downstream effect of some other cause. I can't explain why that jives with me, and it sounds like something that is not true, on its face, and so I think it is appropriate to have a lot of doubt.

The point is that there is no conceivable conception of how humans are built or how the world works, that my mind will tolerate, that does not involve mechanisms of determinism. It's like a person's immaterial soul operates according to some pattern or rule, that can be determined, and my brain, in that hypothetical scenario, is not at all distracted by the fact that we're dealing with immaterial soul. It's just business as usual.

This is something that my brain would grind on for many years, not continuously, but just as one of the recurring things that gets recycled until resolved somehow.

I had saw a man named Leonard Susskind, at some point, on YouTube or on a university's "Audit our classes for free," page, teaching about quantum mechanics and spin. That was probably my first introduction to the idea that particles behave probabilistically. It seemed interesting.

This would be something that I internalized as a kind of unresolved loop. One big thing, that stuck out to me at some point, was that the world at the human scale, with objects that we understand, *\*does\** behave deterministically. It does so in ways that largely do not confound our intuition, and then when pushed to extremes, it does confound our intuitions, but in a way that is precisely calculable. This is with Einstein's relativity. Einstein upped the level of resolution of the determinism inherent in nature.

This seemed like a big problem for quantum physics, as the untold trillions and trillions of trillions of trillions... and so on, of particles, which drive the

system from the fundamental level, are said to behave probabilistically, but to somehow magically, and \*perfectly\* result in a deterministic world at the macro level.

What I have given you is a pretty complete history of me and physics, quantum physics in particular. One thing I'll say, before I move on, is that I did agree with Victor Stenger, without reading his books. It's like somehow I sensed that we're dealing with woo woo nonsense, and I also trusted Victor Stenger's brain. I'd tell people, in social media debates, "the double slit experiment doesn't have a damn thing to do with you." I'd say this confidently. Like it was a reality that I somehow sensed as being true, stenger's stance on this.

I had a collision the other day, that resulted in this chat. I had been working on vetting my model for the eccentric personality as defined by David Weeks. I was also working on some unanswered questions concerning me specifically and others like me. I seem to be a subcategory of the eccentric personality as defined by David Weeks.

The item at hand was my particular type of curiosity, which functions like a physical drive. I knew that this was odd, and that other people, with extremely few exceptions, do not have this.

I opened up a separate ChatGPT chat, to research the different types of curiosity, and to try to find mine. Among the options, one stuck out- the type that infants have. I zeroed in on that one, and very quickly had a revelation or a sudden insight. A model, of my particular kind of autism, came to me in an instant. The details of the model unfolded in my brain at a rapid pace.

One major detail was that survival oriented brains, as you might expect to find in infants, and that also exists in non-social species like reptiles, see the world mechanistically. They operate based on an assumption that they live in a deterministic world, in which individual elements behave according to patterns and rules. This assumption is not consciously made. It is inherent in how the system is built.

The system is built such that a world outside of these parameters is something that it cannot comprehend. The brain tries to find patterns in the outside world, and it does so without ever consciously determining if patterns exist.

The reason for this, that was evident to me, is that this is how nature works. Asocial species depend, for their survival, on reality itself and nothing else. This means that nature will inevitably fashion their brains such as to converge with the actual nature of reality itself. You do not make it through 200 million years of evolution, to give an example, and not have a brain that has been fine tuned for this.

It is like with evolution, we are dealing with such a vast amount of time, that we can make assumptions without having to be concerned with precision. In other words, if the evolution of every creature had only taken place over a period of 500,000 years, or 2 million years, it would be a legitimate question “did the brains of asocial creatures ever get to the point that their cognition is aligned with how nature itself operates.”

It's like of like throwing a piece of wood in a wood grinder, in a way. It's like if you have a big machine that chews up pieces of wood, and you throw a piece of wood in it, 10 seconds later, it is reasonably an uncertain question “has that piece of wood been ground up yet.” If the wood grinder runs for months at a time though, you have a situation of “it's not going to last that long.”

Similar here, in that nature is working in a consistent direction, and though there will always be one offs or duds, you just don't make it this far and not have brains that are engineered in the way I describe. There is no point in thinking in precise terms and saying to ourselves “did it take 20 million years, or is it that it wasn't fully complete until after 75 million years.”

What happened next, following ruminating on my model for autism for a small amount of time, was a mental collision with this notion of a non deterministic universe at any level. My survival brain theory was based on a deterministic universe, and it triggered a tangential reopening of this quantum physics conundrum.

What immediately came to my mind, was that this notion of particles behaving probabilistically and thus leading to a non deterministic universe, was not right. It was an error of human intuition. What seemed logical to me, that was sort of hard to put into words why, was to consider the probabilistic behavior of particles as just another fixed part of a deterministic universe.

It is like behaving probabilistically is a fixed attribute that a particle can have. It is not how our intuitions work, and so it doesn't come to us, but it's actually an internally consistent way of thinking. A particle having a fixed attribute is not inconsistent with a deterministic universe, in which everything is fixed. I quite quickly came to the conclusion that I fleshed out in this chat, that the smallest particles are not the lowest level individual elements in the system.