

Is loving a person about loving their free will?

FREE WILL IS ABOUT WHAT YOU ARE

You may say human beings have the power to create good or sin by their will without being programmed etc. This is the doctrine of free will. Free will means that you use yourself to make evil or to make good and turn yourself evil or good as a person. You are your will according to the free will doctrine so if you make it evil you are evil. The evil you do is a symptom of the evil you have become. Though free will is about what you do, it is more accurate to say it is about you. So free will is not about a mere faculty you have but about you.

Christianity flip flops. It treats the abuse of free will as a faculty when it suits. That is what its teaching of love the sinner not the sin is saying. It does not want to reveal its hatred for those who are bad. Then other times it admits the truth. The truth is that free will in a way is a faculty but it is more accurate to say it is the person. The freedom makes the person a person.

A person who flip-flops like Christians do, who says free will is a mark of your tremendous dignity, and then who says and diminishes you by saying it is a mere faculty so that she can seem loving and caring is not showing true love but a good copy. Admitting the truth leaves you being good and loving to good people but as the bad are their badness you have to hate them. Either way there is trouble. What is not acceptable is how Christians act as if there are no problems.

If you cannot become evil as a person by abusing your free will to hurt others, it would make no sense to punish or jail you. If it were just about what you did and not you, jailing you would be immoral.

THE PROBLEM OF GOOD

Some people struggle with the notion that you become evil for Hitler seemed a nice person who was caring towards family and friends and a vegetarian. But to do grave evil you must make it feel and look reasonably good which is why you need to do good. The good helps you tell yourself that the terrible things you do are justified. The good helps you do the evil better and with more peace of mind. It makes you feel you still have friends and support. So the good is really the biggest part of the problem. It is not real good. Those who say Hitler was nice and praise him are in fact enabling him. You should say he was nice but refuse to praise it. Condemn it. Praising good when it is part of the cog in an evil machine is being part of the evil.

LOVE SINNER HATE SIN

Free will contradicts religion's core dogma of love the sinner and hate the sin. It is absurd to say sin is dangerous - it is the sinner that is dangerous. Fear of the sinner leads to hate and hate largely consists of fear and feeds on fear. Fear is the reason a person may hate another person. The lie shows that religious faith is a minefield. You can thank your lucky stars if it does not explode in violence.

Love the evil person but hate their evil is risky but at least you are not bringing sin into it. Sin and wrongdoing differ in the sense that the former worries about how evil mocks and disobeys God while wrongdoing pertains to people not God. So religion and God and faith make it worse. They make a hypocrite double the hypocrite if he becomes a man of faith. And as believers hold that sin infinitely offends God the person will become an infinite hypocrite!

LOVING THE FACULTY OF FREE WILL

We have proven already that to love a person is to love a free agent and you could describe it as loving free will.

Suppose free will is merely a faculty that the person has. It is part of person and must be loved then if you are to fully love the person. To say "I love you" with a "but" is not love. The trouble with a good replica of love is that it is based on a lie and is always ready to turn nasty when provoked.

You may say that you love the fact that people have free will. You may say that you love that they have this power to do good or evil for if they didn't have the power to do evil they would be unable to do voluntary good. The problem with that is that you see them as worthwhile only if they do good. This is concerned about you being a good person and not a person. It is demeaning.

The good would come from them and be created by them and that is all you want them for. That is really conditional love because their capacity for evil or potential for evil is not loved. Loving the person's freedom means it is not loved for itself but because the person can refuse to use it for evil and do good with it. Not using it means they become good of their own free will. Their faculty of free will is only loved as long as they use it the way you believe it should be. Conditional love is not real love. It is loving the conditions and not the person or thing. We do prefer to be loved conditionally though we think we do not. That is why we try to be nice to people and look nice so that we will be loved. This preference proves that we only fool ourselves by adoring God for he is based on unconditional love and condemns conditional love. He is claimed to represent unconditional love. Devotion to God is intrinsically self-deceptive.

PARADOX?

Is there a paradox?

If we are to love a person we are to love their free will.

But to love their free will means loving their power and willingness to do evil.

Assuming that doing evil is harming yourself in all kinds of ways is that good? No. If doing evil puts you at risk of harm and when it harms others it is not love at all. It is sentimentalism not love.

A person might say that you hate the using of the power to create the sin - that is actually using the power - but not the power to sin - which means you do not use it but could. The person says she cannot hate the misuse but not the power to misuse for it is merely potential. But even if not used, the power to create evil is still evil in the way that any potential danger is evil. Are you to love the power or not care about it? No you are to love that it makes good possible and hate it for its potential to become evil. It is not loved for itself. It is in fact treated as a necessary evil.

Your freedom is not really loved. You are not loved as a free being but as a good one. This is conditional love. So far we prove that God as in a God of unconditional perfect love is an impossibility. Saying such a God exists implies that you approve of our power to do evil and your condemnation of cruel acts is pure hypocrisy.

WHY LOVE THE FACULTY?

Pretend we love freedom. Do we love the power just because it is freedom or because it is good? Perhaps it is both for freedom is good? But suppose it does not have to be seen as both at the one time. Many separate it in their heads even if it is not separate. To love freedom as freedom is humanistic. It implies that you don't care about good as in the abstract principle. You care about freedom as a benefit. Not caring about good in principle means that we care about whoever we want to care about and we are selfish in that sense. Even if it means God will suffer forever and be left out we do not care.

SIN OR WRONGDOING STRICTLY SPEAKING ARE NEVER CONDEMNED

We do not make a separation between the person and her good works so why should we make one between her and her sins? To say you must love the sinner but give no love to the sin is saying you do not love the sinner as a sinner. And how could we love sinner not sin anyway? A sin is not an entity that is separate from the person it is part of the person for sin is in the will and the will is part of the person, one of the main parts. Sin is the will and the will is the person so the person can be said to be the sin so to hate the sin is to hate the person who commits the sin as well. Sin is evil will that is expressed in an act and is not the outward act. Thus sin is shorthand for sinner.

The religious person sees wrongdoing as a sin against God. The non-religious says it is not against any God's law for God has no law or does not exist so the issue is that somebody has been harmed.

To hate the evil will is to hate the willer. But to call the person a sinner and hate the alleged disobedience to God is worse.

A CONSEQUENCE

If you can't treat evil or sin as something that people do and that people create freely then how can you judge when you have to focus on the person being lovable when they are not? Is a mother a good judge when the child who is the apple of her eye does wrong? And you need to judge if you are seriously a hater of sin or an opponent of evil or wrongdoing. You need to judge if not an act in itself then how it is going to impact on others. Those who say they do not judge what you do but speak of the bad consequences are judging you for there is no point in caring about right and wrong or what anybody does if the consequences do not matter.

SHOULD WE CELEBRATE OUR FREE WILL?

Necessary and unnecessary evils are not nice. Our freedom to do evil is a necessary evil. That means we do nothing to celebrate it. We drop all doctrines that help us to celebrate it. Believers say that free will is a gift from God. So the idea of God and adoring him necessarily, essentially and fundamentally celebrates free will. The doctrine that we can go to Hell forever because we abuse our free will is pure spite if free will is not a nice or harmless doctrine. And it isn't nice or harmless even if it is a necessary evil.

FINALLY

We cease wanting to believe in free will when we realise that what matters to us is feeling we are free. The notion that free will is a good doctrine is based on social and religious tricks.