

FREE WILL AS FOR ALTRUISM IS DANGEROUS

Free will if it is about being good and compassionate and loving implies that we should be altruists. It implies that free will is really about helping others. If altruism is bad then belief in free will is bad.

Altruism or selflessness is completely evil. You are more sure that you exist than you are that other people exist. Therefore you have to put yourself first and others next – which when done correctly means we behave in a decent way towards all.

Those Altruists who argue that extreme forms of Altruism such as walking one hundred miles to get somebody some small unimportant item are hopelessly inconsistent.

Egoism is harmless. Egoism recognises that you can only love (love as in feel good about and want to help them not altruistic love) others to the extent that you can love yourself. Altruism tells you that it is immoral to love yourself meaning that you are not worth loving - and so it must be evil to look for help from anybody – and must try to eliminate doing anything to gratify feelings. You will end up murdering fifty people and go to jail and not care if you become a real Altruist.

Altruism puts an attitude in you that makes you capable of anything when the conditions are right.

Altruism is not possible for whatever we do we want to do it under the circumstances and we do it to feel better in ourselves so it is all selfish and there is no such thing as sacrifice. The impossibility of altruism proves there is no God because what would be the point in God letting us suffer if we only do what pleases ourselves? We cannot love God – his devotees are self-deceivers - or them either and God is supposed to have given us free will to see if we will love. We might as well enjoy ourselves all the time when we can make no real sacrifices – to sacrifice something for reasons of self-interest is not to make a sacrifice at all for you want to do it to be better off.

We know that there can be no free will at all without the ability to practice Altruism.

If God gave us life so that we can practice altruism, if altruism is the reason we are given life as the proponents of the God hypothesis allege, then it follows that a life that is not capable of it is not important or at least not as valuable as the life of a free agent. Free will fans believe that beings with free will are the highest beings and that that is one of the reasons why animals are lower. Some schizophrenics cannot exercise their alleged free will or be altruistic. Neither can the victims of advanced Alzheimer's Disease. Altruism or free will then implies that they are only human in appearance and should be neglected in favour of the person who is "normal" for according to Altruism or free will, making a person altruistic is the most important thing and this cannot be done with them. Altruism or free will's supporters may say that the insane people cannot use their free will but it is still there and so they are equal to the rest of us. They know fine well that it is not enough just to have the power to have the faculty. The faculty does not exist unless it is active. It is as silly as saying that the power to calculate is enough to make you a mathematician but how can it be enough when you do not generate any thoughts for then you might as well not have the power at all. Altruism or free will is elitist which is one reason for its popularity. It is no use for Altruists or free willers to respond that they look after babies and they have no free will. Babies have to be cared for because if they were not, there would be no altruists. They might also say that the person who has severe Alzheimer's is still a human being with human dignity. But they hold that animals do not have the same dignity as us no matter how similar to us and loving an animal appears to be. Though an animal has some logic, consciousness and feeling and so it is hardly honest or altruistic to invent an excuse for treating a person with few faculties as being superior to an animal. The only real reason could be because the animal has no free will but they cannot admit that for then their elitism would be made evident. This is all very offensive to the victims of mental deterioration and their carers for these victims have no free will either. But this is what they are saying no matter how hard they deny it. We can avoid being derogatory to those poor people with these diseases by denying free will. Humanism can and will campaign for laws to be made prohibiting belief in free will for they incite to hatred and are unnecessary. It is slander to say something bad about somebody that you don't have to think is true so it should be the same with free will if the law is to have any credibility.

My The Case Against Altruism refutes the arguments that Egoism is bad news. We also know that anybody who says they love the sinner but hate the sin is not telling the truth which gives us a further reason to discard the doctrine of free will as harmful. When all do wrong how can there be any free will to love anybody? The only answer is to deny that sin or immorality exist but hold that wrongdoing is the symptom of a sickness.

Bad Arguments for Malice of Free Will

Beware the rejection of free will as a good doctrine for the wrong reasons.

Argument: Nobody knows what another person is like inside. You can never tell what a person's motives are. No two

persons are alike. Therefore you are never sure if a criminal meant to offend. The criminal might have thought he or she was doing right. Even if you believe in free will you cannot tell if this person is really evil or misguided. So what is the point of believing in it?

Reply: The argument is too sceptical. It would have you think that all the evidence can do is show who it is safest to imprison. For instance, it is safer to punish a person who is found guilty of manslaughter in case he did it intentionally than to punish a person who was not even there or whose sanity is questionable for it. But this is an absurd conclusion. The doctrine of free will is no use for anything but trouble because it is pro-judging and is therefore a charter for those who practice calumny. If it is true that we never know others or never can say that they are probably bad then even if you don't agree with free will at all then you still have the bad results for you will have to let people get away with the evil they do. We have an idea of what others meant to do.

Argument: Any good we do freely, merits an infinite reward because it shows we would do endless good if we could. The bad we do is a vote for chaos and chaos can do infinite damage. So it is infinitely bad in intent. So, there is a choice between rewarding a free agent and punishing him. It would be right to do the reward for doing the latter would then be an unnecessary evil. This means that complete anarchy has to be approved. If you believe in punishment you can never punish too much but too little.

Reply: When there is a choice you have to pick the one that suits the circumstances best. For example, you can't let people commit murder so you would have to forget the good they have done and make them pay but if they tell little lies you cannot do the same. We have to tolerate things that are not serious. I cannot say punish them for the attitude is that they should not receive retribution but be hurt to deter them and others off crime. However, the deterrence theory is dangerous if taken and supported in isolation.

Posted on Debunking Christianity - Nov 13

Christians argue that we must be free to the extent that we can become pure evil for God wants us to love and to love voluntarily without any compulsion. If we have free will, I think Christians exaggerate how much we have. Most philosophers believe that we don't have free will or in something called compatibilism. This is the view that our will being programmed and our will being free are compatible which seems to mean that our will is not completely free but is partly programmed. Compatibilism is the accepted view of the majority of psychologists and psychiatrists. In that case, we should not be given the power to seriously hurt others. God is to blame if we have that power. It is simply evil to exaggerate our freedom in order to pave the way for believing in God. That is really putting faith before people at least in principle. Logically, accepting the free will excuse for God standing by as babies suffer at the hands of tyrants should make people callous.

Conclusion

Belief in free will is inexcusable if it does harm. Proponents cannot say that it is justified because it is true. And that is because there is no proof for it.

BOOKS CONSULTED

A CONCISE INTRODUCTION TO PHILOSOPHY, William H Halverson, Random House, N.Y. 1967
BASIC PHILOSOPHICAL ANALYSIS, Charles C Reid, Dickenson, CA, 1971
BEYOND GOOD AND EVIL, Friedrich Nietzsche, Penguin, London, 1990
CONTROVERSY: THE HUMANIST CHRISTIAN ENCOUNTER Hector Hawton, Pemberton Books, London, 1971
DOING AWAY WITH GOD? Russell Stannard, Marshall Pickering, London, 1993
FREE TO DO RIGHT, David Field IVP London, 1973
GOD AND THE NEW PHYSICS, Paul Davies, Penguin Books, London, 1990
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
MORTAL QUESTIONS, Thomas Nagel, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1979
ON THE TRUTH OF THE CATHOLIC FAITH, BOOK ONE, GOD, St Thomas Aquinas, Image Doubleday and Co, New York, 1961
PHILOSOPHICAL PROBLEMS AND ARGUMENTS, James W. Cornman and Keith Lehrer, 2nd Edition, Macmillan Network, 1974
PHILOSOPHY – THE PURSUIT OF WISDOM, Louis P Pojman, Wadsworth, California, 1994

RADIO REPLIES VOL 1, Frs Rumble & Carty, Radio Replies Press, St Paul, Minnesota, 1938
RADIO REPLIES VOL 2, Frs Rumble & Carty, Radio Replies Press, St Paul, Minnesota, 1940
RADIO REPLIES VOL 3, Frs Rumble & Carty, Radio Replies Press, St Paul, Minnesota, 1942
REASON AND RELIGION, Anthony Kenny, Basil Blackwell Ltd, Oxford, 1987
RELIGION IS REASONABLE, Thomas Corbishley SJ, Burns & Oates Ltd, London, 1960
THE FUNDAMENTAL QUESTIONS OF PHILOSOPHY, AC Ewing, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1985
THE SATANIC BIBLE, Anton Szandor LaVey, Avon Books, New York, 1969