

## GOD IS TO BLAME FOR OUR CHOICES

Religion blames us not God for evil for God is said to be all-good and all-powerful. It says he gave us the gift of free will and we abused it. This idea supposes that God gave us the power to go against him. But the doctrine that God creates all says that we do not create our choices - he does! We supposedly use free will to sin because of God not in spite of him.

Free will is essentially about making a choice in the present time and making it about choosing an aspect of the future. God knows the future. So we are told that if he knows the future he cannot change it and so cannot have free will. That argument forgets knowing what is going to happen has nothing to do with causing it. In fact the person who does not know the future is the one who does not have much freedom to choose. We all make guess choices rather than real ones. To say free will is worth it is unfeeling and silly for how could a guess be worth all the trouble? Is it worth having free will so that you might love with it when in fact there is more guessing involved than productive love? It makes an idol of good intentions where the suffering of others is just something to be exploited to have a good intention over. We do not choose our wants which is another limitation. A man cannot choose to be a dog for he does not want to be. Everybody makes the best choice they can think of so thinking limits free will. You are not free if you choose x not seeing it clearly. That is not a choice in any significant sense. If x is about morality that it's not a moral responsible choice in any significant sense. If you don't have free will as some say one thing is for sure. You virtually don't have free will.

Free will is presented as only working in a framework that you do not cause. God then is a collaborator with your sins if you can sin.

If God tells you it is your choice to sin and you attempt but the end result is not your choice then the murder you commit is really all him.

And he is evil for blaming you and punishing you.

Belief in God would be inherently immoral even if the worshippers do not see it. They should be looking so they need a reprimand.

The existence of free will can be undeniably refuted. To be responsible for an action, I have to know what I am doing the very moment I am doing it. But I can only concentrate on one thing at a time. The moment I will something it is one thought in my mind that makes me do it. I am not conscious of my motives so I do not know what I am doing. I cannot be responsible for what I do therefore determinism is true.

Everyone who has examined their conscience is aware of this truth that there is no free will because that job requires examination of whether or not you were conscious of what you were doing the moment you acted badly. Those who contradict the determinist need to learn about right and wrong.

Free will is one hundred percent disproved. There is no question about it.

Read the proofs against free will and about how dangerous a doctrine it is in my other pages.

People think God gave us selfish genes and is to blame for our social problems. Genes are called selfish. They just replicate themselves in ways that look selfish. They are not selfish anymore than sand is selfish for making it to the sea shore while other sand does not. Its just mechanical physical competition. But if a being is responsible for how they are then he is selfish for causing such behaviour.

Some argue, "God makes and causes all that makes us free therefore God causes our decisions so they are really his decisions." But it is possible to imagine God creating something that behaves freely and only if you assume that freedom is a concept that makes sense. He gives it all it has including the power to be free but he does not make its decisions for it. He is creating the choice but he is not making it. Suppose there were no God and there was just matter would it follow from the fact that we are material beings that if we are free that matter makes the choices? No way. So there is no problem with God making us free if freedom is possible.

The objection has value of a different kind. For us to be free God must let us go. He has to withhold his omnipotence. He gives us the power to create the choice from nothing. This is open to the same absurdity there is as having God make things from nothing. God is supposed to be infinite in power when he can bring something out of nothing for the distance between something and nothing is endless. So there is no power outside God. But yet the universe is not made from God or his power so we must ask what God had to do with producing it. If it is not made of anything then there is power outside God

which contradicts his alleged infinity. And if we can create nothing every one of us is just as much a God as God which is also absurd and we are that powerful then surely we could have created all things.

It is certain that God cannot program us to do what is good of our own free will. That would be forcing us to be good. All he can do is put us in an environment in which we will be reluctant to do evil because of our free will. For example, he could stop us thinking of the things that are likely to lead us to sin. He accepts the good works we do without thinking of sin and without remembering it exists as meritorious so he can reward us if we don't think of sin at all.

John Hick claimed that a flawless person like Adam could not have used his free will to rebel (Evil and the God of Love, page 75). He believed that a being knowing what good was could not prefer wrongdoing and misery to it and so would not choose it. It is replied that Adam's choice was not between good and evil for he had no motive. It was something like the choice between two equally attractive friends. You have no motive to choose one but you do. Adam's choice was alleged to be between himself and God (page 66-69, Arguing with God, Hugh Sylvester, IVP, 1971). This solution is wrong because you do have a reason for picking one of the friends. The motive is, "I have to pick one so I choose you." It was the same with Adam and it is impossible to see how anybody could sin when they feel that evil is just as good as good and one of these has to be picked.

In a Christian book we read that "all theories of the will that appeal to motive tend to destroy the notion of freedom" for "to suggest that the motive somehow moves (as the etymology suggests) the agent to action denies that he is active; he is not active, he is passive following his genes and environment" (page 66-67, Arguing with God, Hugh Sylvester, IVP 1971). Let them err and destroy their doctrine of freedom if they want for we know motives do move us.

Hick claimed that we cannot be free when God knows how we will act in the future. This is correct because if I know what Jack the Ripper did and my memory is wiped and I go back and become the Ripper through a time machine then clearly I will do what I knew before. Something is causing what I knew and what I did to be exactly the same. Knowing is not causing for us but in issues to do with God it is different.

God rapes when a man rapes. We do evil because of God more than ourselves. Some would say we do evil solely because God decides we must.

A choice is not just a choice but a reaction. You need have loads of opportunities to choose from. To choose bread when there is nothing else there is not choosing at all. It is reacting. It still feels like a choice which is what we mean when we say we had to choose it under the circumstances. But it is not really one and proves that feeling free or that you have made a choice has nothing to do with making a real choice. To choose bread or cake when there is nothing else is reacting but is also choosing. The less options you face and are aware of the more your choice is not choice but reacting. Reacting is not a choice. So God is a partner in our evil if he gives us any free will. As creator he is more than partner but far more responsible for our evil than we are.

## BOOKS CONSULTED

- AN INTELLIGENT PERSONS GUIDE TO CATHOLICISM, Alban McCoy, Continuum, London and New York, 1997  
AN INTRODUCTION TO PHILOSOPHICAL ANALYSIS, John Hospers, Routledge, London, 1992  
APOLOGETICS AND CATHOLIC DOCTRINE, Most Rev M Sheehan DD, MH Gill & Co, Dublin, 1954  
ARGUING WITH GOD, Hugh Sylvester IVP, London, 1971  
CONTROVERSY: THE HUMANIST CHRISTIAN ENCOUNTER Hector Hawton, Pemberton Books, London, 1971  
EVIL AND THE GOD OF LOVE, John Hicks, Fontana, London, 1977  
FREE INQUIRY, Do We have Free Will? Article by Lewis Vaughn and Theodore Schick JR, Spring 1998. Vol 18 No 2, Council for Secular Humanism, Amherst, New York  
GOD AND EVIL, Brian Davies OP, Catholic Truth Society, London, 1984  
HANDBOOK OF CHRISTIAN APOLOGETICS, Peter Kreeft and Ronald Tacelli, Monarch, East Sussex, 1995  
MORAL PHILOSOPHY, Joseph Rickaby SJ, Stonyhurst Philosophy Series, Longmans, Green and Co, London, 1912  
PHILOSOPHICAL DICTIONARY, Voltaire, Translated by Theodore Besterman, Penguin, London, 1972  
RELIGION IS REASONABLE, Thomas Corbishley SJ, Burns & Oates, London, 1960  
THE CASE AGAINST GOD, Gerald Priestland, Collins, Fount Paperbacks, London, 1984  
THE LIFE OF ALL LIVING, Fulton J Sheen, Image Books, New York, 1979  
THE PUZZLE OF GOD, Peter Vardy, Collins, London, 1990  
THE REALITY OF GOD AND THE PROBLEM OF EVIL, Brian Davies, Continuum, London-New York, 2006  
THE TEACHING OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH, Ed. Canon George D Smith, Ph.D. Burns and Oates and Washbourne, London, 1952  
THE TRUTH OF CHRISTIANITY, WH Turton, Wells Gardner, Darton & Co Ltd, London, 1905  
UNBLIND FAITH, Michael J Langford, SCM, London, 1982  
WHY DOES GOD? Domenico Grasso SJ, St Paul's, Bucks, 1970

