

FREE WILL IS UNTRUE AND WE ARE TRICKED INTO THINKING WE WANT IT TO BE TRUE

Free will means that you own your action so much that if you could go back in time you may do it or do something else. You are free to go either way. This is called indeterminism or libertarian free will.

Some say we are programmed by psychological forces that we picked up over time unawares and these make the "decisions" we think we make. This view is called determinism.

Compatibilism is just a redefinition of free will - if you don't feel forced you are free. It can be safely ignored as semantics.

Libertarian free will is thought to be an oxymoron for it implies you have no character and like a psychopath can do anything at all. Its regarded as a denial of free will for such randomness implies your actions are not saying what kind of person you are but just come out of nowhere.

Determinism does not pretend to believe in free will in any real sense.

Compatibilism is nonsense for if neither of these give free will then mixing the two or blending them is only going to be worse than either of them.

If libertarian free will is not free will or nonsense they assume that free will must mean some kind of compatibilism or determinism. That is a process of elimination. It does not work in this case. It assumes that if they cannot explain free will then something should. It ignores how none of them may give you free will as a concept for the concept is nonsense. Surely the process means that libertarian free will despite the problems is better than determinism which is a blunt denial of free will? A process of elimination in a matter like this means you have to think to tell yourself you have free will and you have no direct evidence! You should if you are a free agent!

We could still be programmed though we may feel free for we could be set to feel that way and to act free though we are not really free at all. Nobody is able to explain how free will works. Indeterminism and compatibilism tell us nothing. Occam's Razor says that you must always follow the simplest explanation which is invariably the one easiest to understand. We can understand programming therefore to believe in free will is to oppose his principle and to oppose reason. You cannot believe without reason so the result is faked belief.

Free will is a fascist doctrine for its proponents claim to know they have free will and they cannot know and they are often hostile to anyone who contradicts them. They claim to know you have it too as if your lived experience does not count and as if you don't count. The doctrine calls them to be hostile to deniers because it claims to exalt human nature so it follows that deniers do not. A doctrine that calls you a free agent cannot be tolerant to somebody that says this is not true for it says they erase and disparage your actual identity. It calls on the believers to discriminate and ostracise deniers for the deniers would have to be seen as insulting them and hating their dignity. Free will then is a battle cry against the rights of the determinist or the person who believes in free will but that we have so little of it that we are only a tiny bit accountable for what we do and so nobody should punish us much no matter what we do.

The opposition of free will to logic tells us that guilt is abnormal and a sickness caused by the perception of moral responsibility but there is no such thing as moral responsibility and there cannot be.

The divorce between logic and free will also tells us that religion is abnormal for if there is no free will we should not need religion. We should not need it to program the environment we are in to be good. We should need only ourselves and our reason.

Any system be it religion or whatever that claims to be founded on reason and then says that free will exists is a sham. That is because when free will is a fundamental issue to be solved, it has to be the bedrock on which the religion system is built just as our system is built on the abnegation of freedom. Free will as a doctrine is the root of religion and if the root is bad and useless so is the tree.

If Occam's Razor is wrong as free will tells us, then it follows that there is no such thing as morality or right and wrong as distinct from morality. Right and wrong are founded on the principle of doing the good the simplest way possible. In other words, follow the Razor! The atheist who understands his or her philosophy and the need for atheism to improve the world has to dispense with free will. It is a purely religious hypothesis anyway and does not belong in atheistic or secular ideologies. The reason I say that is because none of the reasons given for believing it work so it is only an excuse for turning to belief in a God of love. The only reason people want the free will belief is because they want to believe in a God

who evilly condones their sin and yet they use the belief as an excuse for "punishing" those who offend them. They want to believe in sin and condemn everybody for sinning but themselves while they are smugly assured that they themselves are forgiven.

Free will has no relevance to making the world a better place but is just a recipe for trouble and whatever trouble comes about because of the doctrine is as much the teachers of free wills' doing as the disorderly persons. The only thing you need is to give people reasons to do good and that can be done without the doctrine of free will for people do nothing without reasons.

Even if we do have free will we cannot know it. Believing something and being right does not constitute knowledge but luck.

Time refutes free will

As William of Ockham, of Occam's Razor fame, taught, the moment I make a choice I am not free to avoid the choice because the past has led me ineluctably to it. So if I sin at moment X, I am not free to avoid sin and I haven't incurred it at moment X for I am not free and cannot help it. Ockham dubiously solved this problem for he wanted to believe in sin by advancing the nonsensical solution that I must have sinned before moment X. So you the sin happens before it happens and not after! He was desperate. If I decide to sin that happens only in the present. That is obvious. I can no more incur the same single sin before I incur it than I can incur it after I incur it. I cannot sin and so I cannot do what is immoral and if I cannot do what is immoral I have no free will.

Desire refutes free will

When you unconsciously put one foot past the other you are said to be responsible because you knew what you were doing. But if you are sleepwalking you are not responsible because you are unconscious.

We do not have free will because when we make a so-called decision we do not know what we are doing and you need to be aware to be responsible. We might be free if we could concentrate on several things per moment.

Some would say that when you walk down the street and are reading the paper that you can be free in walking and not know what you are doing. They say you freely walk down the street or that you are using your free will to walk down it. You freely intend to walk down it. But it is just a part of your brain that obeys a past command from you that does it while you engage your consciousness with another activity. It is like you commanding a computer to print and it doing it while you organise the filing cabinet. You might have freely chosen to walk and your brain obeys you though you no longer freely command it to for it is working by a command in the past. You program the brain to carry on without being directed consciously by the will. Yet it is said that I am walking intentionally. It is nonsense to say I am intending to walk now when I am not aware of anything but the paper for intention is something I have to be aware of. The intention that caused the walking is in the past and it programmed a part of my brain to carry on without it and it does not exist any more.

When I make a choice, it is the strongest desire I am aware of that moment that causes me to make that choice. No matter what I always do what I want under the circumstances. Free will is the power to do other than what I would like to do plus the power to do what I want. Since I am egoistic (not egotistic which means selfishness that abuses others) and incapable of selfless love I do not have free will. And if I only please myself there would be no point in me having free will either.

Religion itself does not sincerely believe in free will because it says that we only do what we think is right. This renders evil to be insanity rather than deliberate badness though religion insistently denies it and still strangely still says it is insanity. Religion says we cannot have free will to do good unless we have it to do evil as well. But if evil is insanity then it follows that we are only free when we do good and should be set to do good only and have no desire to do evil implanted in us by nature.

They cannot call evil a mistake for even if evil is a mistake that is not all it is. A mistake as such is a different thing.

We know that we can only do what we feel or think is good, so evil is a sickness that commands our concern and compassion as much as any other sickness does. Evil is not a sign of strength but of weakness. Evil is not a sign of cleverness but of foolishness. It is not a sign of badness or criminal responsibility but insanity.

Religion says that when you sin you damage and hurt yourself and yet many of its victims allow anger against sin. Jesus often got mad. But if you damage and hurt yourself where does the sympathy come in? You need sympathy if sin is its own punishment or part of the punishment. And yet when it is self-inflicted there should be no sympathy! To damage yourself is worse than to damage another person for we all know we care about ourselves most and love others not for themselves but ourselves and can't help it from which it follows that sympathy for the sinner should be predominant. It implies the person

hurt should not resent you but pity you.

Some have argued that determinism misunderstands the nature of mental phenomena. Feeling is a mental event and they admit that this occurs in the mind. But then they insist that that which makes the difference between voluntary and involuntary acts is not a mental event for you cannot feel anything in your mind. This implies that the source is something outside what is determined by nature. But nature could determine this source too. There is more to nature than what we see. And we know we have subconscious feelings that we are not aware of and these influence our actions. In short, they think the force that makes us follow one feeling and not another is not a feeling itself and is something spiritual. That is untrue for the crave for happiness is a feeling and is the reason why one feeling is gone for and not another.

The doctrine that when a being with free will does evil just because they think it is good (page 71, Moral Philosophy; chapter 95, Summa, Book One) is really a repudiation of free will. You can't even say evil is deliberate ignorance. Ignorance is bad and you can only be ignorant on purpose if you are attracted by the good side of the ignorance not the ignorance itself. Choosing to be ignorant could not be meant to be evil if you can only choose what seems good. Ignorance that is not deliberate must be behind what you think is your deliberate ignorance so we are going around in a circle.

The doctrine of free will assumes that only rational or good creatures with free will can exist. In what sense? In the sense that even when we are evil we mean to be good and are being rational as we know it. But be this true or not, it need not be true and you only need your eyes opened to see that. The doctrine is founded on a circular argument and circular arguments are not only stupid but downright evil for they logically undermine reason totally. A real free agent could choose something simply because it is evil. Religion says there is no such thing as anything that is just evil. But what an evil is and choosing something for you think it is pure evil is a different thing. The latter is about you. So pure evil not being there does not mean you cannot aim for it. You can intend to break the steel door down with a push. Yet all say nobody really aims for pure evil. There is no real free will in this.

The doctrine of free will is anti-rational therefore it is anti free will for you cannot use the power to choose good or believe in good if you reject reason to believe in free will. Free will is supposed to be the power to do what is really good or really real good so it is supposed to exalt rationality but we see that it does not and tries to stunt it. If your starting point in philosophy is absurd the whole edifice you built on it is as well even if it looks rational for anything that is based on an irrational assumption is irrational itself. What lies on an irrational foundation is necessarily irrational.

Paradox halts free will

Suppose you have no proof for or against free will and believe in it or assume that it is true. Or suppose that it is a paradox and so you don't know if it makes sense or not for you can't prove its existence. Examine yourself. Are you really sure that you are free? You won't be sure. And you are so sure then why do you practice so much determinism? For example, you always assume that such and such an action will lead to a person doing X and another will result in Y. For example, if you offer Boris a baked Alaska or meringue you can know that your act will make him choose meringue.

Free will is no good to you when you are not sure if you have got it or not. You need to consciously use your freedom to be responsible for your acts. I cannot be free even if I have free will when I don't know if I have got it. Christians will accuse me of dishonesty but this is a slur. They will say that when a man can see he still sees even if he is not sure if he is really seeing the object. They will say that you use your free will even if you don't believe in or remember it. But the man physically sees the object but in a sense he does not see it for he does not believe it is there. He doesn't see it for he refuses to take it in.

The disproof from egoism

Altruism is doing good for no other reason than for another person's benefit without seeking anything for yourself. It is sacrifice or something you don't want to do and it hurts you. Egoism is doing whatever is best for yourself and means helping others because you want to do it and enjoy it and it is really about just loving yourself. The two are opposites and are opposed because when you make the "choice" that directly results in the action you can't have both motives at the one time. If you carry a stranger ten miles to the hospital and seek nothing back you have in fact got something back. You wanted to experience doing this difficult thing and that gratified you. Analysing the act proves there is no altruism in the act. Yet it would be taken by wishful thinkers to show a combination of altruism and egoism.

Altruism is absolutely impossible because when you "choose" something it is the strongest desire you are conscious of at that moment that makes you do it. And you wouldn't be doing it only to fulfil or relieve that desire to make you happy. Even if you desire to suffer for some good you only desire to suffer because you see and feel the suffering as the lesser evil. Sometimes we want to suffer to experience it or to remind ourselves of how great the joys of life are or just to feel that we are not driven by pleasure-seeking all the time. Examine yourself and this will become clear.

People may object that doing good because of the desire is not the same as doing good to satisfy the desire. But then you are doing it because you feel like it and not because of other people. Thus it is selfish or egoistic. And their argument ignores the fact that you are only aware of one moment at a time and the desire you have in one moment determines what you will do the next.

So we have no free will to be altruistic.

If we have free will we only have it to choose between different types of self-indulgence.

We cannot choose to love other people for we only value ourselves but we can choose to do good to them. We only value them for ourselves, which means we really just value ourselves.

The view that free will is for deciding between self and others is mad. If I can only choose for self-indulgence, then it follows that I only go for what I see as the best for myself. I cannot help my desires. Even when they change it was because I had the pre-determined desire to change so I could not help changing. Free will in the sense they mean is meaningless and impossible. It can only be true if altruism is possible. This would imply that altruism alone is moral no matter how much harm it does for it is what we are naturally meant to practice for free will was given for its production. Egoism would be like trying to destroy free will. If altruism is bad so is the free will hypothesis and altruism is rotten.

Are we free because we feel free?

People think they have free will because they feel free. You never feel as free as you do when you are drunk though you are not. A drug is affecting your mind. The main argument for free will, the reason so many who should know better can't discard it, is that we are led to think that we seem to be told by our experience that we are free. We seem to feel that we have different options and that nothing programs us to choose one of them and not the others.

Feelings prove nothing. If I feel that Jesus is God that does not make me right. You can be programmed by nature to feel free. And we are for we simply cannot be free.

Even free willists know that we can feel free and not be free like when we are mad or when we have a lucid dream that seems very real and when we are making decisions in that dream for even they agree that these are not decisions or choices for most of the brain has been closed down. Dreams prove that free will is only an assumption.

Does progress refute determinism?

As we can't go back in time to test free will, some present progress as evidence that free will is true. It is the only real attempt at evidence for though people talk about feeling free as evidence for free will they must see that it is not really evidence but could be interpreted as an indication. That is so weak.

It is said that if we were not free we would not make progress. That is an odd argument for progress has to be made in one form or other for us to even survive in the first place. For example, even a caveman eating, that is progress! If that kind of progress is possible so is progress as in man leaving the caves to build houses.

Is free will a form of progress? Yes - to have something and use it is progress in itself. In what way? Even to do evil is to do something and to experiences something. Doing and experiencing are still good in themselves even when used to do bad for it is not the power to do or to experience that is the problem. It is how you use them.

A computer that always performs at the same level of efficiency can contain an element waiting to work that makes it improve. It does not need free will to do that. A dog can learn tricks sometimes on his own and nobody says a dog has free will. Often our memory makes mistakes that turn out to be for the best. Our memory is not under the control of free will but does what it wants and experience shows that we can progress and improve without free will. For example, when we are drunk we have no free will but can still improve our dancing!

CONCLUSION

We must destroy belief in free will for free will does not exist and put determinism in its place for the sake of truth and human welfare. We must reject everything, for example, belief in God, that depends on the sinister doctrine of free will. The notion that disbelief in free will is in some way harmful has nothing at all to do with free will existing or not. Just because an idea does harm doesn't mean that it is false.