

FREE WILL DISPROVED

Main Points - "I choose" is to be redefined as "I wish therefore I do". Whether you are free or not that is all that matters - the theory of freedom is nothing compared to that. Free or not it is only wishing that counts. If free will is important and good then it is more important to be regarded as free than to be free or to be treated as free than to be free.

Could it be that free will, the existence of which is taken for granted by nearly all religions and by the state, does not exist?
 Could billions of people who accept its reality be wrong?

"You may choose to act the way you wish, but you do not choose the way you wish to act" Barbara Smoker. Another way she puts it is, "While we may choose to do what we prefer, We cannot chose what we prefer to do".

COMMENT, You cannot control how you will feel about things. If you fall in love or are depressed there is nothing you can do about it. If you try and help yourself out of depression, it only works not because of you but because there were other feelings that were there to deal with them and they too were feelings that happen to you but which you didn't make. How we feel about things causes how we act and the "choices" we make. If you really love your child you will not be able to kill her because of how you feel. Even if you have free will you cannot use it for your feelings control it and it is because they do that that you think you feel free! To correct Smoker we must have, You may "choose" to act the way you wish, but you do not choose the way you wish to act. The choosing to act the way we wish is only an illusion. We can do other than what we do because of the way our feelings control us. No matter what we do it is in response to some feeling that cries for gratification. Sometimes that feeling cries for a painful gratification such as when you admit you stole \$400 though you don't have to admit it.

Another way to put what Smoker said is to say, That you cannot do other than what your nature makes you do. It is objected that nobody believes this for a paedophile for example has the nature of a paedophile and yet it makes no sense to say that he cannot help abusing children. But it is possible to have the nature of a paedophile who will abuse or the nature to have a paedophile nature that does not draw one to abuse. So we are back where we started.

In the absence of proof or evidence for free will, we are entitled to deny it. The burden of proof is on those who say we have free will.

Barbara Smoker argues that free choice is often confused by philosophers with free will. What can she mean? She says free choice means you are not forced by other people or what is outside of you. Free will is the idea that you are not programmed by past and present circumstances to do what you do now.

The logical disproof of free will

Determinism means that our will is caused by our past and present and so just as cutting somebody's head off kills them so we cannot do other than what we do.

Indeterminism means our will is uncaused by anything but then if we don't cause it then it is not our will!

Do we cause our choices as compatibilism, the view that free will and determinism are compatible says? One interpretation of this view says that determinism is absolutely true but mistaken in saying that because what is in our minds makes us do what we do that this means we are not free (page 159, Ethics: Key Concepts in Philosophy). In other words, even though deterministic forces made me feel I freely chose my coffee this morning I am free though I couldn't choose any different. This is simply pretending that an unfree action can be called free.

If we cause them we need no other causes. And if we cause them without other causes then that is indeterminism. Confused? Good. you should be for compatibilism makes no sense.

How can we be free when the two options, indeterminism and determinism have no room for the concept of free will? How can compatibilism defend free will when the two components, determinism and indeterminism are mixed to create it and deny it themselves? They cannot any more than water and wine can make cement.

For compatibilists to hold that being caused to do something by your past and by your present environment agrees with free will is believed not because it is possible but because they think or want to think we have free will and they cannot deny causation so they hold the two in paradox and call the result compatibilism though there is no need for the paradox for there

is no proof for free will or evidence. To say we are free because of the consequences of denying freedom is like saying that a paedophile priest never touched children for his family would never get over it if he was guilty and convicted. But that's the nature of the evidence that is used for compatibilism for it makes no sense and has to be mere wishful thinking.

When you see that it is a matter of I wish therefore I do that you don't call up the wish it is just there that explains why you are programmed and why you feel free. Also, free will makes no sense which forces us to accept determinism.

BIBLE QUOTATIONS FROM:

The Amplified Bible

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

ETHICS, KEY CONCEPTS IN PHILOSOPHY, Dwight Furrow, Continuum, New York, 2005 chapter 7

FREE TO DO RIGHT, David Field IVP London, 1973

GOD A GUIDE FOR THE PERPLEXED Keith Ward, OneWorld, Oxford, 2003

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 BIG QUESTIONS, Simon Blackburn, Quercus Books, London, 2009

THE END OF FAITH, RELIGION, TERROR AND THE FUTURE OF REASON, Sam Harris, Free Press, London, 2005

THE FUNDAMENTAL QUESTIONS OF PHILOSOPHY, AC Ewing, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1985

THE REALITY OF GOD AND THE PROBLEM OF EVIL, Brian Davies, Continuum, London-New York, 2006

THE SATANIC BIBLE, Anton Szandor LaVey, Avon Books, New York, 1969