

## Psychology Supports Opposition to Free Will Doctrine

Religion claims to be fundamentally about turning us away from selfishness towards God or others. But people who are selfish to a sociopathic degree are likely suffering from narcissistic personality disorder. Yet such people, eg Pharaoh, Herod, Satan, Judas and antichrist, are held up as proof of how bad we can get. Its only a waste of time saying what Hitler did is sinful and abominable and heinous if he had a disorder that is in fact what is to blame. Psychology will only diagnose somebody who is a social menace. It follows that most cases of narcissism will go undetected and untreated. It is known that a scary number of clerics and religious leaders are sufferers. The point is, there is no point in giving much importance to religion, Jesus or God or free will if they are that useless when it comes to people who cause the most suffering. Religion is just a bigoted lying con for it asserts the importance.

Modern psychology supported by statistics knows that hereditary and environment and perception – no two people see things the same way – all have a very heavy influence on the way we behave and since nobody can tell how much pressure is behind a person's anti-social acts nobody can really judge how evil a person is and how long they should pay for it. This has only recently been accepted by the legal system and has been implemented terribly a lot of the time and it shows that even if there is free will we have to treat people in a way so close to the way determinists would do it that we may as well do away with free will. When people worry about determinists abolishing morality it is the fate of the punishment principle that perturbs them – for rewards are not for being good but for the actions you produce and a real reward rewards the motives as well as the actions - but punishment is no good but painful rehabilitation is. The Christian book, Free to Do Right, accepts what modern psychology says (page 105-6). It imagines that the Bible agrees. But then how could anybody go to Hell forever when they can't be capable of being fully freely evil but only partly freely evil meaning that their evil act is the product of hereditary, environment and perception plus free will?

We know all believers in free will say that when we do evil there is a part of us that is insane and deluded which draws us to do the evil thing thinking that it is good. But perhaps the delusional element could be stronger in one person than another. Religion agrees for some people are more evil than others. But what if they are deluded in such a way that they are not as responsible as we would think or as we would be if we did the same thing? The force could work unpredictably and be strong one day and be weak the next. You do not punish a lunatic for having attacked a person they believe is out to destroy them. You could send a cold-blooded killer to jail for life and perhaps judging by the amount of real freedom he had when he did the evil and which level of evil will it would have required he will not be able to estimate for himself he should only have been jailed for a year. Free will cannot safeguard the current regime that has been erected on it at all. It is a foundation of sand. Perhaps he has to be punished just in case he is fully guilty. Why then don't they do the same with all criminals for whom they make allowances?

This wonderful thing called forgiveness that people claim is necessitated by belief in free will on the grounds that you can forgive people unless you see them as freely having done wrong actually destroys the belief. It is psychologically impossible to forgive without understanding why the person did what they did to you first. They all admit that. But why should understanding be so important? If a man kills your mother you will forgive him easier if you understand that he had an awful childhood and took his anger out on your mother. The reason you could not forgive was because you saw his action as totally unnecessary and free. Therefore understanding could only help you to forgive by making you see that that it was more necessary than you think and not as free as you thought. You have to partly excuse the person to be able to develop forgiveness. In other words, you have to deny that they were fully accountable. So when forgiveness needs understanding to precede it, it follows that forgiveness can only happen to the degree that you understand. To fully forgive, to forgive properly, you have to understand fully. You have to understand that the person was not to blame in order to forgive. So you were as bad as the poor killer for blaming him! You will still claim to believe in free will but your saying he was free when he murdered is just from your lips for you do not believe that he was free – you are slandering him which is hardly what people who forgive do. Or you are believing in free will except in his case therefore you are condoning what he has done while in the previous case you are trying to condone which does not make you any better. To condone evil is to give evil pride of place on the throne of life and to deny yourself any right to condemn what a bad person has done or to do good.

If free will exists, forgiveness is evil. To be able to live in this world and care for others we have to repudiate free will to get forgiveness out of the way. God and Jesus with their gospel of forgiveness were deceivers. They cannot complain if we do evil because of our faith in them.

There is an argument for free will that says that says that if we don't have free will then the following scenario is true. Two people meet. They talk. One replies to the other. If there is no free will they are not communicating. They are the same as two tape recorders playing in which one recorder is set up as if it answers and speaks to the other. People think about this and they conclude that because we communicate we know that free will is true. The same people who speak to a hypnotised person believe that person is communicating with them and they feel it though they deny that the entranced person has no

free will. They feel they communicate with a drunk person who the drink is talking through. Determinists believe that that though we are programmed by our past, it is us communicating with our thoughts, with nature and others that make us what we are. For example, if you think of a dog you are communicating with that image because you sense it and keep it in mind and have feelings because of it and it gives you ideas. Communication does not demand belief in free will.

The doctrine of free will that I can just do the opposite of what I normally do – can kill my beloved child just like that is a bad influence. If it is not true it is dangerous if people think it is true.